

sheep makes it possible for such identification to be made, whether it be in the saleyard by an inspector of agriculture, or on the property by an inspector of police who may be searching for sheep that have strayed or have been stolen.

The member for Swan said that some farmers told him that they would prefer to have the old tar brand. This has long since become obsolete. It has been proved that the use of tar depreciates the value of wool, and it is now an offence to brand sheep with a tar brand. I myself believe that there is still a lot to be desired concerning the fluid that is currently used to brand sheep, but experiments are being conducted in an effort to improve the type of brand and the staying qualities of the brand on the wool under all types of conditions such as rain, heat, and the like. It is considered this is the only way by which we can ensure the identification of stock.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 9.44 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 24th August, 1966

CONTENTS

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL	Page 506
BILLS—	
Bills of Sale Act Amendment Bill—2r.	505
Brands Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt: 1r.	502
Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill—	
Receipt: 1r.	502
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt: 1r.	502
Health Act Amendment Bill—2r.	504
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill—2r.	503
Poisons Act Amendment Bill—2r.	503
Potato Growing Industry Trust Fund Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt: 1r.	502
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt: 1r.	502
MOTION—	
Land Prejudicially Affected by Resumptions or Other Activities—Inquiry by Select Committee	496
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Gosnells School—	
Extension of Playing Fields	498
Old Quarters: Demolition	495
Government Buildings—Observatory Site: Departments Housed, and Night Lighting	495
Iron Ore—Yampi: Royalties Received	498
Liquor Rights of Natives: Extension to Kalgoorlie-Boulder Area	495
Public Service—Chief Veterinary Surgeon: Appointment of Non-British Officer	494
Wyndham Meat Works—Negotiations for Disposal: Views of Pastoralists	495

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

QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

PUBLIC SERVICE

Chief Veterinary Surgeon: Appointment of Non-British Officer

- The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:
 - Is it a requirement under section 21 of the Public Service Act that permanent officers of the State Public Service must be British subjects or naturalised British subjects?
 - Is it possible for an appointment to be properly in order if the provisions of section 21 of the Public Service Act are not complied with?
 - Was the Chief Veterinary Surgeon of the Department of Agriculture at the time of his initial permanent appointment to the department, a British subject or a naturalised British subject?
 - If the answer to (3) is "No", what steps are being taken to ensure that the provisions of the Public Service Act are being complied with?
 - If the appointment of the Chief Veterinary Surgeon was not in accordance with the provisions of the Public Service Act, was not his previous permanent appointment as Chief Veterinary Pathologist in the Department of Agriculture also contrary to the Public Service Act?
 - If the answer to (3) is "No", why was his previous appointment to the permanent staff allowed to continue until his promotion to Chief Veterinary Surgeon without any action being taken to ensure that there was compliance with the provisions of the Public Service Act?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- Section 21 of the Public Service Act provides—
A person is not eligible for appointment to an office on the permanent staff of the Public Service and his appointment on probation shall not be confirmed as an effective appointment on the permanent staff, unless—
(a) he is a natural born or naturalised British subject or, if not such, is competent to become, and undertakes to become, and does become, a naturalised British subject within six months of the appointment.
- No.
- No.
- The officer has applied for naturalisation.

- (5) It appears likely that the previous appointment as Chief Veterinary Pathologist did not comply with the provisions of section 21 of the Public Service Act.
- (6) The matter of Dr. Gardiner's ineligibility under section 21 was apparently overlooked at the time of his original appointment in 1959. Attention was only recently drawn to the oversight and Dr. Gardiner applied for naturalisation.

LIQUOR RIGHTS OF NATIVES

Extension to Kalgoorlie-Boulder Area

2. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to grant an extension of native liquor rights under the Licensing Act, to natives in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder area?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", when will such rights be granted?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) There are no present plans for extending liquor rights to the eastern goldfields.

GOSNELLS SCHOOL

Old Quarters: Demolition

3. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Have negotiations commenced for the demolition of the old school quarters at the Gosnells State school?
- (2) If the reply to (1) is "Yes"—
 - (a) when will demolition commence; and
 - (b) when is it expected to be completed?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Specifications for the calling of tenders are now in course of preparation.
- (2) Subject to acceptance of a tender it is expected—
 - (a) that demolition will commence towards the end of September,
 - (b) and be completed early in November.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Observatory Site: Departments Housed, and Night Lighting

4. The Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) How many Government departments are housed in the Government block of buildings on the old observatory site?
- (2) What are the Government departments?
- (3) Is there more than one shift worked per day?

- (4) If the answer to (3) is "No", will the Minister advise the House why lights on all floors, and in practically all offices, burn into the early hours of the morning?
- (5) For what reason is a large percentage of floors and rooms lighted right through to daylight?
- (6) What is the cost of power for lighting and other requirements per week?
- (7) Is cleaning done by contract or by Government employees?
- (8) Are there any regulations or stipulations laid down with regard to control of electricity usage?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH (for The Hon. L. A. Logan) replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) The Public Works Department and the Metropolitan Water Board.
- (3) Cleaning staff work two shifts daily—6 a.m. to 8 a.m.; 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
- (4) and (5) All lighting within the building is turned off at 7 p.m. except where it is necessary to retain limited lighting for officers who are working beyond normal hours. In these cases the night watchman ensures that all lights are extinguished when no longer required.

Ground lights around the yard and walkway lights on the 14th floor are left on throughout the night. Walkway lights are required for safety purposes and yard lights assist in the security of the building. Lights are used in the morning by the cleaning staff.

- (6) Total electricity charges per week: \$1,036, including operation of air-conditioning and lifts.
- (7) Government employees.
- (8) Staff instructions on the matter have been promulgated. Caretaker and night watchman's duties include rigid control of lighting during the hours of 7 p.m. to 8 a.m. each day. They ensure that lights are kept off except when required.

WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS

Negotiations for Disposal: Views of Pastoralists

5. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Before any arrangements are made to transfer control of Wyndham Meat Works to private operators, will the Government obtain the opinion of each cattle grower patronising the concern,

and advise Parliament of their views?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

At this stage no decision has been made even to negotiate for the transfer of the control of Wyndham Meat Works to private operators, although approaches have been made to the Government.

If and when a decision is made to pursue negotiations, the interest of all parties will be taken into account.

GOSNELLS SCHOOL

Extension of Playing Fields

6. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the approaches made to the Education Department for certain land resumption in order to facilitate the extension of the playing fields at the Gosnells State school, will the Minister advise—

- (1) Has the Architectural Division of the Public Works Department made any recommendations to the Education Department?
- (2) If so, what are the recommendations?
- (3) When will a final decision be made by the Education Department as to which of the recommendations, if any, will be adopted?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) to (3) The Architectural Division of the Public Works Department has submitted a report to the land resumption officer who is now assessing the value of the land concerned. This will then be submitted to the Education Department for decision.

IRON ORE

Yampi: Royalties Received

7. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

What was the total amount of royalty received by the Government from the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. for iron ore shipped from Yampi deposits during the 1965-66 financial year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
\$336,141.

LAND PREJUDICIALLY AFFECTED BY RESUMPTIONS OR OTHER ACTIVITIES

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That because of the many instances of hardship or inequity caused to persons whose land is resumed or pre-

judicially affected through town planning, road or railway construction, public works or industrial activity, this House agrees to the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate the position and make recommendations for an equitable solution of the problems involved.

In moving this motion I point out to members that during seven of the eight sessions I have been present in this Chamber I have raised numerous complaints against the inequity of resumptions—principally made for the purpose of industrial expansion, roadways, railways, or wharf construction—and the unfortunate position in which people have been placed as a result. I have no desire to rise from my seat and continue to complain year after year in this House that injustice is being meted out to people following resumptions being made, and for that reason I have moved this motion with the view to Parliament appointing a Select Committee to inquire into the relevant provisions of the Public Works Act, and other Acts which prejudicially affect people when resumptions are made.

At the outset, I state that this is not a political move. If the Labor Party were in office I would be taking action similar to that which I am taking now if I could not achieve my objective by other means; namely, as a result of airing the complaints in the party room. In my opinion any member who has not encountered complaints from people as a result of resumptions would be very fortunate indeed. I am certain, in fact, that all members who have been in this Chamber for several years would have received complaints from people concerning resumptions, because they are extremely numerous.

I consider it is the duty of Parliament—and this House particularly—to take action so that during this session of Parliament recommendations will be returned to us which will result in equity for, and confidence being restored to, the people who are being evicted from their homes, and who have had their land resumed; or who, through other activities, have suffered injurious affection to their land as a result of the implementation of the provisions of the Public Works Act.

Last week I referred to two cases concerning a market gardener and a lady who had been waiting for some 10 years for her property to be resumed by the Public Works Department or the Main Roads Department. I could go on listing the cases that come readily to mind, but I would not be able to finish by 10 o'clock this evening. I could mention strings and strings of names of people who have approached me over the years; and I could also, offhand, mention the cases I have referred to in this Chamber during the past seven years.

Such people who come readily to mind and who, I consider, contrary to the pro-

visions of the Public Works Act, have sustained injurious affection to their land are Iucalano, the two Carbones, Meakin, Aberle, Ricci, and others. Those are the people within one region who have been affected. Then there are the cases involved in the resumptions at Canning Bridge. The ones in North Fremantle are too numerous to mention; and there will be many others—possibly running into hundreds—when the East Fremantle traffic bridge is constructed next year.

Under the Public Works Act it is not possible at any stage for a replacement property to be given. A valuation can be made by the Public Works Department or the Taxation Department valuers, whoever is carrying out the valuations, and they can allow a 10 per cent. margin for disruption. In the case of a home, the replacement cost usually runs into many hundreds of pounds, irrespective of the type of dwelling being resumed or the type being purchased, even if they are of comparable standard. It still costs the house-owner many hundreds of pounds to replace his home or dwelling. In most cases we find that the people affected are living on pensions; and I elaborated on that aspect the other evening, so the matter is completely fresh in the minds of members. For that reason I shall not deal with it again.

I bring to the attention of members this afternoon two cases in which injustice is being done. Most members will be aware of one of these cases in particular, and they may have been into, or seen the building concerned. I am referring to the fish markets at Fremantle. The one on the south side is known as Cicerello's Fish markets, and it was established some seven years ago by Mr. Cicerello, who obtained a lease from the Hawke Government while it was in office. Under the terms of the lease he had to reclaim the land on which to construct the fish market buildings and freezing works. He reclaimed a large area, but I cannot give the exact measurements or the area involved. I imagine it is in the vicinity of one acre. He had to pay for the filling to be carted to the site, and he reclaimed approximately one acre of land from the sea. He also had to construct a retaining wall to hold back the water to prevent the filling from being washed away.

Furthermore, he had to pay for the diversion of a sewerage or drainage pipe, and the cost ran into several hundreds of pounds. He had to divert the drain so that traffic could make use of the land, and so that he could construct the buildings. He did that some seven years ago, and since then has established a thriving business on land under lease from the State Government.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What was the tenure of that lease?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Originally it was for 21 years, but now he has been

told that it is for 10 years. It was the understanding, originally, that the rental was based on a 21-year lease.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Does the written document provide that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The lease has not yet been signed, because of the argument as to who was responsible for signing it. There has been some confusion over the lease. Although the building has been constructed, and he has been operating for seven years in those premises, no lease has been signed. He, and members from another place who knew about the lease, and who were possibly instrumental in granting it, claim it was for 21 years.

Recently, in a discussion between Mr. Cicerello and Mr. Jarvis of the Public Works Department, I heard the latter tell Mr. Cicerello that his tenure was 10 years, and not 21 years as he thought. However, due to the construction of the standard gauge railway it was necessary to resume—although that might be the wrong word to use at this point of time, because the view of the Public Works Department is that it is not resuming any land, and that under the leasehold agreement it can take the land they require for the standard gauge railway and roadway construction.

We are not disputing that; what we are disputing is that the cost of the filling, reclamation, and other work, which was in the vicinity of \$100,000, and it could be up to \$150,000, will be lost to Mr. Cicerello. These figures are being checked in order to ascertain the actual cost. They are not yet available, otherwise I would have quoted them. These were the figures given to me by that person: That the cost is in the vicinity of \$100,000 to \$150,000.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: Does that include the cost of the buildings?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Excluding the buildings. Some members might be able to picture the position of this fish market. Directly in front of the premises of the Fremantle Fishermen's Co-op. Society Ltd. is a toilet block under some pine trees. Between that toilet block and what is known as The Rocks there is a stretch of land measuring half to three-quarters of a chain to the edge of the ocean. Mr. Cicerello reclaimed an area in a southerly direction; and this enabled quite a large private parking space, an amusements park, and his fish market premises and freezing works—which also house a fruit shop—to be built.

The Public Works Department told him that it will not pay any money as compensation for the cost of the filling work undertaken by him on this property. This was said to Mr. Cicerello and his son in front of me, Mr. Fletcher, the member for Fremantle, and Mr. Tonkin, the member for Melville, "We do not owe you

anything for the land we are taking because it is leasehold and it belongs to the Government of Western Australia." After much discussion—not argument—he was advised that the only compensation that was due to him was for the loss of trade.

With the construction of the railway line, the level crossing and the driveway into his premises will be removed as well as another entrance in front of the Fremantle Fishermen's Co-op. Instead, a pedestrian overway is being constructed and it will come out right in front of Mr. Cicerello's premises. It is a rather long, high structure and is well built. However, there is no immediate road access to the property. It is necessary to travel approximately three quarters of a mile, I would think, to get into his property, the fishing boat harbour, and the Fremantle Fishermen's Co-op. building. It is necessary to travel towards South Fremantle, make a right-hand turn, and come back along a service road.

According to what we were told, the Fremantle Fishermen's Co-op., Mr. Cicerello, and the public will not be entitled to use this road. It is a road to give access to the fishing fleet tied up at the jetties. The only persons who will be permitted to use the road will be those who have legitimate business in connection with the fishing boats.

Mr. Cicerello has made claims to the department. He was told that he would be compensated for the loss of trade only. At the present time no trains are using the line as it is only in the course of construction, and people can still walk across the line. Despite this fact Mr. Cicerello has said that up to date his business has fallen by 50 per cent. His weekly takings are now 50 per cent. less than they were four to five weeks ago when the work was first started.

I have verified that with his tenant who conducts a fruit market. He told me that his takings were down by between 40 and 50 per cent. already. If this man is to be compensated for loss of trade only, such treatment will be unfair, unjust, and unreal when we take into consideration the fact that the Railways Department would not, had not Mr. Cicerello filled it in, have had the land available for the construction of either a roadway or a railway line, unless the department had done the filling itself.

This man has been enterprising. He has invested possibly several hundred thousand dollars and has built up a business, but now he can just about wipe it off. He can just about say goodbye to his business; and as far as compensation is concerned it will mean that he has paid for part of the construction of the standard gauge railway line.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: He has too.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is no denying this. He has paid for earthworks for part of the construction. These are some

of the anomalies caused by the provisions of the Public Works Act. It is high time that such anomalies were overcome and some justice was brought to bear in respect of people whose circumstances are similar to those I have just outlined.

I am now going to deal with another resumption which caused some publicity earlier this year. It concerns the case of a market gardener by the name of Caratti who lives in Moylan Road, South Coogee.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: Is that the same Caratti who owns half of Western Australia?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: To my knowledge he is not even a relation. He may be a distant one, but as far as I know he is not. This man has been on his property for some 20 years and he has, during the past 10 or 12 years, earned his living wholly and solely from his efforts as a market gardener. He had to resort to market gardening because of an injury he received whilst working as a quarry man. He could not continue with that heavy work so he turned to market gardening and, with the assistance of his wife, he has eked out a living and earned enough to raise his family.

Late last year, without any notice of resumption having been served on him—or on 14 or 15 other persons in the district—a survey line was put through his property. When he asked what it was for, he was informed that the standard gauge railway line would be going through his property. His house faces east and the back of his property, of course, is on the western side. The length of his property is 25½ chains from north to south and it covers an area of some 31 acres.

When he was talking to the surveyors he said he did not mind the railway line going through his property because it meant progress. The survey lines were put through his property and, as I have said, he did not raise any objections whatever—until several months later; namely, in January of this year, when he got in touch with me because the survey line had been altered and he objected to this alteration.

I went out and had a look and I discovered he had good reason to object to the changing of the line, because originally the line was going to pass through on the western boundary of his property, over some pretty rough ground of no value to him as a market garden. It would not have had any injurious affect whatever on his property. However, when the line was switched to the front of his premises, running contiguous with Moylan Road, the constructed roadway, he did raise objection; and, as a result, I drafted a letter for him which he sent to the Railways Department and received a reply from the Deputy Secretary for Railways.

In the letter to the department he stated he had not raised objection to the line going through the rear of his property because it would not affect his livelihood, his house, or the value of the property; but he did object to the changed route. The following is the reply received, dated the 28th January:—

Dear Sir,

As promised in my letter of the 11th January 1966 the question of the resumption of portion of your property for the standard gauge railway has been investigated in the light of the comments contained in your letter of the 7th January 1966.

2. A careful re-examination of the original alignment proposed for this railway revealed that it passed through the centre of a high grade limestone reserve owned by Swan Portland Cement Ltd. and a minor re-alignment became necessary to avoid greatly complicating the Company's quarrying operations and causing the loss of a considerable quantity of valuable limestone.

3. The new alignment will not pass through the market garden section of your property or deprive you of the loam soil referred to, the area traversed being mainly stony ground, some of which is undeveloped and the remainder partly cleared for grazing purposes.

4. It cannot, therefore, be agreed that the resumption of this section of your property will seriously interrupt your occupation as a market gardener or deprive you of your livelihood as stated in your letter.

5. The necessity for the change in alignment of the railway is regretted, but in the circumstances this is unavoidable. You will, of course, be compensated for the severance of your property and arrangements will be made to meet you to discuss the question of access when this becomes necessary.

Yours faithfully,

The point I take a strong stand on is that this man has been unfairly treated because he is a small person; and that is why I say some changes should be made to the Act to protect persons who have no influence, against those who can sway people to change the course of a railway line, as was done in this instance. I can prove the route was altered because I have a plan here which indicates it.

Mr. Lavery and I attended a meeting in Gosnells when the standard gauge line through that area was first contemplated, and the engineer—I think his name was Mr. Fullarton—is the best engineer to whom I have ever spoken. He wanted local knowledge and know-how. He stated at that meeting that the line had to run as straight as possible, with as few bends,

curves, and grades as possible because speed, as well as low construction costs, was essential.

The original route through the Cockburn area would not have been a bad alignment and was one to which Mr. Caratti raised no objection. However, the new route weaves like a snake, and I am going to invite members to have a look at this plan. The original route would have required 2½ acres of this person's property, but now his land will be seriously affected because 10 acres in all will be required; and at our request 7½ acres are to be used so that this person can be given back the amenities and services he previously enjoyed.

It was at this stage that the letter writing and arguments commenced and I say that people should not be subjected to the necessity of having to go through this form of argument to obtain justice in connection with property which has been rightfully theirs for many years—in this case for 20 years. The first offer was made to Mr. Caratti on the 8th April, 1966—and I must point out that all these offers were verbal. Nothing was put in writing.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Had he received a notice of resumption?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: At that stage, yes. He did not receive a notice until he wrote to the department.

On the 8th April he received an offer of \$15,000, or £7,500. On the 27th April, after some argument about the matter, the figure was increased by \$2,400 to a total of \$17,400. That was over a period of 19 days. More discussion took place following a written request for further resumptions, the reconstruction of a road-way, access to the property, and the right to subdivide. Foolishly—and I say this with all due respect—Mr. Caratti said he wanted a minimum of £1,000 per acre compensation. That was one mistake I made; we should have asked for a figure much greater than £1,000 an acre.

If one looks at the injurious affection involved, and the affect the department's proposal will have on the rest of his property, I think it will be realised that the figure should have been nearer £2,000 an acre. However, he said he wanted a minimum of £1,000 an acre and so that figure was stated in the written request. On the 9th June the offer was increased from \$17,400 to \$20,000.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He should have kept it going for a couple of years more.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There were further discussions and more argument and, at a later stage, the figure was increased to \$22,000; and by letter dated the 11th July, 1966, it was increased still further to \$23,000.

This offer was for 10 acres of land and let us look at the property in question.

It is 30 acres in area and the railway line is to be built in the valley part of the property, which comprises all the best soil. The rising land on either side of the valley is mostly limestone country; one can see the limestone jutting out of the ground.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Isn't the final price pretty close to £1,000 an acre?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will give the correct break-up in a minute to show what the final figure really was. After taking everything into consideration the figure was approximately £770 an acre, which is still some £230 an acre short of the amount asked for, without taking into consideration the other aspects I have mentioned.

As I have just said, the railway line will be built on this beautiful dark rich loam country, which means that Mr. Caratti will be deprived of the best land on his property. It is not yellow or black sand; it is a rich red loam and the building of the railway line will mean the taking away of a strip of his property 3 chains wide. This means he will have a strip 2 chains wide of red loam while the rest of his property is limestone country. Therefore it can be seen that out of 20 acres of land he will have left, possibly, only 5 acres would be suitable for market gardening. He could have subdivided the property under the approval granted by the Town Planning Department and made a good deal of money out of it; but now, because of the injurious affection, he will not be able to obtain half of what really is the value of the property.

A person certainly would not buy the property under the present circumstances; because, as I said, most of the good rich red loam soil will not be available for purchase. Had the railway not been built through his property it would have been a good market gardening proposition.

Out of the £23,000 offered on the 11th July he has to construct, at his own cost, 25½ chains of road which will cost £200 a chain. Therefore this will cost him \$5,100, and so his compensation is reduced to \$17,900 for 10 acres 1 rood 25 perches of land.

The sad part of this story is that only yesterday the officer who is carrying out the resumptions in this area rang me and said he had been to see the Carattis, had spoken to Mrs. Caratti, and she had told him that it would not be possible to negotiate any further with Mr. Caratti because he had had a serious nervous breakdown due to all the trouble I have mentioned. I have called it a nervous breakdown; I could say it is something worse but I do not wish to do that.

This has been brought about as a result of the protracted negotiations and the trouble he has been caused in trying to get just compensation. He could see his life's work and his life's savings being taken

away from him and he is now in a position where he is unable to negotiate further. In my view the Government should pay this man the difference in the two figures, which is £1,225; because even working on the minimum figure he will lose a great deal of money. Any subdivision of the land now would not realise the same amount as would have been realised previously had he proceeded to subdivide his land at that time.

Secondly, this man's health has been affected as a result of the haggling that has taken place, the uncertainty that has resulted, and the concern he has felt about his future position. On the first occasion he was not even offered road access to his property; occupational access was all that was originally provided for. However, at this stage, I would like to pay a sincere compliment to the resumption officer who has carried out the resumptions in this area. He could not have been fairer or more obliging in his dealings with the people concerned. He made himself available on Sunday mornings and at night times to suit my convenience, and I pay him a sincere compliment for what he has done.

However, this officer is still governed by the Act; he has to work within its framework, the same as other people have to do. Ten other properties in close proximity to the one I have mentioned were also resumed and, in most cases, the resumption officer concerned, whoever was dealing with those cases, had them settled within a matter of days or weeks, not months. The reason for this is that the people agreed, so I am told, to the propositions that were put to them. Apparently, the resumption officers concerned said to them, "That's all you are getting. That is our valuation and if you don't agree you will have to get another valuer to come in and lodge his valuation with us. But that is all we are offering you."

These officers have broken down their valuations into various items, such as unimproved capital value, water piping on the properties, wells, cost of dislocation, and so on. The lists were much the same as the one quoted by Mr. Clive Griffiths the other evening—some 23 items were involved in some cases. The people concerned, foolishly I think, accepted the valuations offered. I think they were foolish because in most cases they were entitled to many hundreds, if not thousands of pounds more than they actually received. These people rely on their land for a living and they definitely should have been awarded higher compensation.

The other evening Mr. Lavery said that 67 homes in one street were to be resumed within the next 12 or 18 months, and most of the people concerned are elderly.

If the House agrees to my motion the Act can be looked at very closely, and recommendations can be made regarding amendments which will provide that where a person has his home taken from him

provision will be made for a home to replace the one being resumed—it should be either built or purchased and should be suitable for his needs. No person whose home has been resumed should suffer a financial loss or incur a burden of any kind. It is most unfair if a person suffers a loss in a case like that.

I realise the work involved in any type of planning but I believe that the metropolitan region plan, the Town Planning Act, town planning schemes generally, and all other Acts involved with this subject, should be looked at in conjunction with the Public Works Act so that people will know where they stand. This will do away with the uncertainty which faces so many people. There would be thousands of people in and around the metropolitan area who will, at some stage or other, have their homes taken over; and Government planning should go hand in hand with resumptions for public works such as road and rail construction.

Provision should be made to ensure that people have alternative homes provided for them before they are forced to leave the houses they now occupy. They should be given prior notice of resumptions; they should not have to wait until the bulldozers arrive before they realise that their homes are being resumed. They should be given time to make inquiries about what is to take place, what compensation they are to be paid, and what provision has been made for their future.

There are many people in the Bibra Lake, Jandakot, Hamilton Hill, and South Fremantle areas, and even in Fremantle, who have been and are still being placed in a position similar to that mentioned by Mr. Clive Griffiths the other evening. These people find out that their land is to be resumed only when they make applications for redevelopment purposes. Only this morning I was trying to get an answer from the regional planning authority regarding a proposed roadway in South Fremantle. I was told that the plans have not yet been drawn and I am to ring back in approximately three weeks' time.

These are the problems which can be investigated by the committee, if it is appointed, to ensure that justice is done. I do not criticise this Government, or any other Government, in regard to this matter because they have all worked within the framework of the Act. But we are living in the year 1966 and Acts, like our way of life, our standards of living, and everything else, should be brought up to date and made to conform with the conditions under which we live.

Most of the provisions of the Public Works Act were enacted in 1902. There have been some small amendments but, by and large, the Act is much the same as it was then. I have tabulated many sections of the Act which I consider to be out of date, and which I could mention.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have been through the Act pretty thoroughly, and I could speak for possibly another hour on amendments which I think are necessary. However, members with more experience than I have in this Chamber have also possibly been through the Act from time to time, and I do not think it is either opportune or necessary for me to remind them what should be done, or how it should be done, because I am merely asking the House to agree to the appointment of a Select Committee which will make these decisions. I would not like it to be said that "Thompson has got up, made his speech, and has told us of everything in the Act that should be altered." There was no argument at all among the members of the last Select Committee of which I was a member. Everything that was done or recommended was unanimously agreed to by the members. It was all done very pleasantly and there was no argument or minority report.

If the House should agree to this motion, I would like to see much the same thing take place; where we could ask people to submit evidence to us and to indicate where they have been harshly dealt with, or unjustly dealt with. We could ask them what they consider is the right type of legislation that should be written into our Statutes. From such evidence a report would be made.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Your market gardener will not be able to give you much help as to what should go into the Statutes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That may be so, but there are hundreds of others who have been affected by this legislation.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: And thousands who will be affected in the future.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As I say, there are hundreds of people, that I know of, who have been affected. There are members in the Chamber who have complained of resumptions; namely, Mr. Jones, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Griffiths, Mr. Wise, Mr. Lavery, and Mr. Willesee.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How far in history do you think your Select Committee would go back in making its inquiries from people who have had their land resumed?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That would be something for the Select Committee to determine.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you think it might be one of the terms of reference?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am quite easy on that aspect. We could place a limit of, say, three or five years on it.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: If the honourable member desires we could direct this to the future.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is the point which I have been trying to get over. I am looking to the future. If I have failed in getting my point across, I apologise. I have been looking to the

future all the time in this matter. I do not see how we can protect people who have accepted compensation for their land and for their houses; and it would probably be unfair, or unjust, for me to suggest that present-day valuations should be applied to resumptions that took place in the 1940s or the 1950s. I do not think we could refer them to the committee.

I would have no appreciation at all of how much land was per acre, or per quarter acre, in 1940. I have no idea of the values then as compared with those of today. I would like the findings of the committee to protect the people in the future; even those who are affected, or will be affected, by resumptions for the freeway. Some of these resumptions have already taken place.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The inquiries that the committee would make in relation to the cases of the past would have little effect on the amendments that the committee may recommend in the future with respect to the Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: On the contrary, I think the inquiries we would make would have a great bearing on the future, because it is only by having these injustices pointed out to us that recommendations could be made to protect the people in the future.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: By an amendment to the Act?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Which would not be retroactive?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So their inspections would not have any relation to the amendments that would be made?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would be the Government's responsibility either to accept or reject the Select Committee's findings.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But you could have the amendments without a Select Committee.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Possibly. If the Minister is trying to foreshadow legislation, mention of which appeared in the newspaper recently, I am not prepared to fall for that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am not asking you to fall for anything. I merely posed a question to you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Select Committee would look at everything objectively, and members appointed to the Select Committee would be charged with the duty to look at these points constructively; to see what injustices have occurred, and to examine future resumptions, and make recommendations as to what sections of the Act should be amended. In this connection I am not merely referring to the Public Works Act,

because I think it may be necessary to also have a very close look at the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But if an amendment to the Public Works Act were introduced you would not expect its progress to be impeded until next year due to waiting on the Select Committee's deliberations?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will not oppose any amendment that might be proposed to the Act during this session of Parliament; I would certainly not oppose such an amendment if it brought a little more enlightenment and a little more democracy into the Act. I am all for any improvement that can be made to the Act; as long as it is an improvement. There are no politics in my motion. It is not my intention to stand up here and make political capital out of what this Government has not done; or out of what the previous Government has not done; or out of what some future Government will do.

My object is to have a look at this matter constructively. That is all. If tomorrow, or next week, the Government introduces amendments which agree with my line of thought, and the lines of thought of other members, we may even ask permission to withdraw the motion seeking the appointment of a Select Committee. But before we do so we must be certain that such amendments tidy up the Act to the satisfaction of the people affected. The people affected are not myself or members in this Chamber generally; the people affected are our constituents, and we are here to serve our constituents. They look to us for guidance, and it is our duty, when we feel changes are necessary, to bring the matter to Parliament.

I do not want to delay the House any longer, nor do I wish to labour the point I am making. Members have listened to me very patiently, and I thank them for doing so. I feel sure they will agree with me that something should be done in the interests of the people we all serve.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines).

BILLS (5): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill.
2. Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill.
3. Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment Bill.
4. Potato Growing Industry Trust Fund Act Amendment Bill.
5. Brands Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Justice) [5.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The terms of this Bill have been recommended by the Barristers Board and are supported by the Law Society of Western Australia.

The purpose of the Bill is to set out the qualifications to be possessed by a person before he or she can be admitted to practise in this State as a legal practitioner, which expression is defined in the Act to include both barrister and solicitor.

Some two or three years ago, representations were received from the United Kingdom for the recognition in this State of qualifications, first as a Scottish solicitor, and, secondly as an English barrister. The Barristers Board considered the representations and did not favour them. It thought, however, that it would be better if there were uniform qualifications for admission throughout Australia, and twice endeavoured to secure recommendations for this purpose through the Law Council of Australia, but without success. The board itself, therefore, reviewed the whole question of qualifications for admission in this State, having regard to qualifications recognised elsewhere, to the question of reciprocity, to the broad policy that a proper administration of the law requires the services of a profession learned in the law and possessed of some practical experience in its administration, and to the standards required of our own students.

The majority of persons admitted to practise as legal practitioners in this State are now graduates of the University of Western Australia. Such persons have done a four-year law course, and then, after graduation, have served two years' articles and passed further examinations in technical subjects prescribed by the Barristers Board.

This system has been entirely satisfactory. It was assisted by amendments to the Act made in 1948. Prior to the amendments in that year, certain qualifications obtained abroad—for example, the qualification of English barrister—were regarded as sufficient qualification for admission in this State, subject to compliance with formalities. A person, however, could then qualify as an English barrister within three years, and thus there was a "back-door" method whereby students who could afford to qualify as an English barrister could qualify for admission in this State in three years, instead of taking the six years required to qualify through our local University, followed by articles. The amendments in

1948 encouraged Western Australian students to qualify locally.

The Bill makes no substantial change in the law in its application to local graduates. The main effect of the Bill will be to make changes in regard to qualifications obtained in other States and countries. The present law has been found to be too liberal in some cases and too rigid in others.

The systems of law in the various countries constituting the British Commonwealth are each, to varying degrees and in different areas of the law, developing independently. One can no longer say that, because a person has been admitted to practise as a solicitor in England, or in any other common law country, he is necessarily fully competent to practise as a legal practitioner in this State.

He will probably be adequately qualified in certain areas of the law, but may not be in others. To admit such a person to practise here as a legal practitioner without further qualifications could be unsafe, and to ignore his qualifications altogether could be unfair. Cases have occurred where a person possessing qualifications which are not fully recognised in this State, but are in Victoria, has, on the strength of those qualifications, been admitted in Victoria, and then, on the strength of the Victorian admission, has become qualified for admission in Western Australia.

The solution offered in this Bill is to give to the Barristers Board a discretion to judge each case upon its merits, with power in any particular case to require the applicant for admission to take such further examinations or to serve such further period of articles as may be necessary to make good such deficiencies which, for the purposes of legal practice in this State, should appear to exist.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

POISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Twelve months have elapsed since the Poisons Act was proclaimed and the advisory committee has suggested several amendments which would improve the administration of the Act. There is also the unresolved matter of cultivation of opium poppies.

There is no law in this State prohibiting the growing of opium poppies. Commonwealth jurisdiction does not cover matters arising within the State. The Commissioner of Police and the Director of Agriculture both support the proposal to legislate, and favour the inclusion of this subject in the Poisons Act.

There may be good reason to permit the cultivation of opium poppies and other plants from which narcotics can be derived, and an outright prohibition is not proposed. With regard to opium poppies, there is the reason that their seeds are used on the top of certain types of bread. It is intended that persons engaged in the cultivation, sale, distribution, or supply of any plant from which a drug of addiction may be obtained should be licensed, and also keep such books and records and supply such information as may be prescribed or required by the Commissioner of Public Health.

The principal Act requires wholesalers, manufacturers, and retailers of poisons to obtain a license. Other persons may be granted a permit to secure supplies for industrial, educational, or research purposes. Licenses are issued by the commissioner according to a simple procedure. Permits are granted on the advice of the advisory committee. This committee meets irregularly and at considerable intervals and this involves applicants for permits in long delays. The committee recommends that all permits be issued by the commissioner in the same way as licenses are processed.

Section 34(1) of the principal Act was intended to prohibit the sale of prescribed poisons to persons under the age of 18 years, and to strangers. The wording of this section is widely misunderstood and it has been reframed to clarify the position.

It is intended to repeal subsection (1) of section 39 of the principal Act as the matter dealt with in that subsection is adequately covered by section 22.

Before a new drug is allowed to be released for sale, the manufacturer must apply to have it listed in one of the eight schedules. Until the committee determines its classification the provisions of the Act relating to poisons apply. An anomaly occurs where the committee decides that a drug is innocuous and need not be placed on any schedule. The Act does not provide that such a drug is released from control as a poison. It is intended to correct this anomaly.

The list of drugs published by the United Nations now uses the term "Diacetylmorphine" to refer to the drug described as "Diamorphine" in section 41 (2) of the principal Act and, as the Act was being amended, the committee felt that this point could be adjusted without inconvenience.

Section 50 of the principal Act requires all poisons containers to be labelled "poison" with the exception of stocks in use in pharmacists' dispensaries. A review of other establishments, such as chemical laboratories and analysts premises, indicates that the exemption should be extended to them also, and it is proposed to give the Commissioner of Public Health power to grant exemptions from labelling.

The Bill is commended to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MACKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend the Health Act in several respects. Its provisions are intended to come into operation on a date to be proclaimed.

The first amendment contained in clause 3 of the Bill introduces a new feature. Regulations already in existence make it an offence for any person to use in any sewerage or drainage work, a fitting which is not of the required standard. Included amongst such fittings is the reinforced concrete cover used on septic tanks and soak wells. Some manufacturers are marketing a product where the concrete is of very poor quality, and in some cases the reinforcing is omitted. As the law stands, only the person who uses such a defective article creates an offence. In order to protect the building industry and the public against these deficient products it is proposed that a new section be inserted in the Health Act under which a manufacturer would become liable if he manufactured substandard fittings.

Clause 4 of the Bill simply corrects a misspelt word in section 134 of the Health Act.

Clause 5 envisages a change in the application of existing restrictions imposed upon some operations now classed as offensive trades. At present all laundries and drycleaning establishments must register with a local authority and are subject to a number of town planning and other controls. Some modern drycleaning machines have dispensed with the use of highly inflammable solvents and the machines may be operated in any shopping area without creating an offence. A number of other examples have been disclosed by an investigation recently undertaken by the Public Health Department. The proposed amendment would allow of amendment to the list of trades contained in the second schedule to the Health Act and also permit certain exemptions to be granted where justified.

Clause 6 seeks to amend an authority contained in section 240 of the Act for regulations to be made concerning the inspection and branding of meat. As the section stands the regulations must apply to the whole of any local government district if they are to operate at all in that district. The practical situation does not always require this. The amendment, therefore, will enable regulations to be

made applicable in such areas and parts of local government districts as is indicated by the circumstances.

Clauses 7, 8, and 9 are concerned with the same subject. The general penalty for an offence against the Health Act since 1911 has been a fine not exceeding \$40. After reviewing the situation, and taking into account strong representations from local governing authorities, the Government has agreed that it is necessary to increase the maximum penalty to a sum not exceeding \$200.

The final clause seeks to repeal section 361A of the Health Act. This section is merely concerned with the machinery of fixing penalties, and was inserted in 1957 when the minimum penalty was deleted from the Act.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise.

BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan — Minister for Justice) 16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals in the main with the registration of bills of sale out of time. The period during which bills of sale are required to be presented for registration vary according to the location of their presentation.

For instance, if presented at a place not more than 30 miles distant from Perth, a bill is required to be presented within 10 days from the day of execution. Fourteen days from the day of execution is allowed in respect of bills executed at or within 50 miles of the Municipality of Albany, Southern Cross, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Menzies, Geraldton, or Cue. There are further variations which I do not think it necessary to detail to the House at the present time. They are clearly set out in section 10 of the Act.

Under section 13 of the Act, which is mainly affected by the amendments contained in this Bill, a judge of the Supreme Court, on being satisfied that an omission to present for registration a bill of sale, or an affidavit of renewal, within the time required under the Act, was excusable, may, at any time, upon application being made to him, extend the time for such registration.

Accordingly, the position now is that, if a bill of sale is not presented for registration, registered or renewed within the time prescribed by the Act, only a judge of the Supreme Court can extend that time.

Arising out of representations made to me by the Law Society of Western Australia some time ago, it has been decided to modify this provision to the extent of enabling the registrar to extend the time,

within which registration may be effected, for a period not exceeding seven days. This Bill does not take away the power of a judge but, concurrently with the power of a judge, the registrar, under the Bills of Sale Act, can extend the time for a period not exceeding seven days in those cases, on application being made to him by the grantee of the bill of sale, or his agent, if the registrar is satisfied that the omission to present for registration, register or renew registration, was unavoidable, accidental, or due to inadvertence. The registrar's power must, however, be exercised within three months after the time the bill of sale should have been presented for registration, or registered or renewed.

The Bill further provides for the applicant to go to a judge if the registrar refuses his application, and the judge may extend the time if he thinks fit. There is provision for the registrar to refer any application for extension of time to a judge where he has any doubt or difficulty in respect thereof. The Bill also protects the rights of third parties that are acquired between the prescribed time for presentation for registration or renewal of registration, and the time the bill of sale is actually so presented or renewed.

It will be appreciated, therefore, that the amended legislation will retain unfettered the present power of judges to grant or refuse extensions in all cases, and merely grants to the registrar a concurrent power in relation to extensions within the three months' period, subject to an appeal to a judge in the event of a refusal by the registrar to grant an extension and subject, in the case of a grant, to a condition preserving the rights of any person who may acquire any interest between the time when the bill of sale should have been registered and the time of the actual registration of the order. The amendment will empower the registrar not only to grant or refuse an application but also to refer it to a judge for a determination in the case of doubt or difficulty.

The second main feature of this amending legislation is the extension of the provisions under section 17P of the Act, which enable a bill of sale to be registered without giving notice of intention to register if it is taken over crops. The amendment contained in clause 5 extends existing provisions for the purpose of, *inter alia*, securing the payment of the purchase money of spraying material for crops or of the cost of spraying crops.

I might explain that section 17P of the Act enables a bill of sale over wool or stock and crops sown or growing on lands mentioned in the bill of sale, where such bill of sale is granted to secure payment for the purchase money of seed fertilisers, bags, or twine for use by the grantor in putting in, taking off, and harvesting such crops, to be taken without giving notice of intention to register.

The amendment now proposed merely extends this provision to bills of sale in respect of the spraying of crops, and materials for spraying. The thirteenth schedule to the principal Act contains the list of fees. Clause 6 of the Bill provides for the insertion in the thirteenth schedule of a fee of \$4 payable on the lodging of an application to the registrar under section 13A, which is the new section being introduced into this Act by this amending Bill. This fee includes the affidavit in support of the application.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willsee (Leader of the Opposition).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [6.5 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 30th August.
Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 24th August, 1966

CONTENTS

	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL	519
BILLS—	
Brands Act Amendment Bill—3r.	509
Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill—3r.	508
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment Bill—3r.	509
Licensing Act Amendment Bill—2r.	513
Potato Growing Industry Trust Fund Act Amendment Bill—3r.	509
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill—3r.	508
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill—Intro.; 1r.	508
Wood Distillation and Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry Act Amendment Bill—2r.	516
Wundowie Works Management and Foundry Agreement Bill—2r.	517
MOTIONS—	
Mitchell Freeway: Re-examination of Proposed Cutting	510
Traffic Act: Disallowance of Regulation 1613 (2)	509
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Albany Central Primary School: Plans for Resiting Albany Regional Hospital—Geriatric Wards: Provision	508
Flooding—Collie: Compensation for Damage	506
Government Boards and Instrumentalities—Rights of Appeal by Officers: Introduction of Legislation Land—Application by W.A. Development Corporation: Tabling of Reports	508
Liquor—Australian Wine Licences: Number in Goldfields	507
Potato Growers' Licences: Termination and Appeal	508
Railways—Quarterly Tickets: Greenmount-Koon-gamia Area	507
Sewerage: Hills Area—Discharge into Swan River: Concern	507
Traffic Lights—Main Street—Scarborough Beach Road: Right-hand Turn	507
Wandana Flats—Maintenance: Receipts and Expenditure	506

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

QUESTIONS (17): ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT BOARDS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

Rights of Appeal by Officers: Introduction of Legislation

1. Mr. **FLETCHER** asked the Premier:

(1) Is legislation likely this session which will afford right of appeal to salaried officers of boards and State instrumentalities on a similar basis to that applying to the Civil Service?

(2) If not, when can such legislation be anticipated?

Mr. **LEWIS** (for Mr. Brand) replied:

(1) and (2) This matter is receiving consideration. I am unable to state, at this stage, whether such legislation will be introduced.

2. to 4. *These questions were postponed.*

FLOODING

Collie: Compensation for Damage

5. Mr. **MAY** asked the Premier:

(1) Did the Government make representation to the Commissioner of Taxation and the Prime Minister to have compensation payments to banana growers for cyclone damage made exempt from income tax?

(2) If so, will he make similar representations for income tax exemption on flood loss compensation paid to the business people and residents of Collie?

Mr. **LEWIS** (for Mr. Brand) replied:

(1) Yes. Exemption was granted on the grounds that payments were made to enable growers to restore personal effects and provide sustenance for their families.

(2) It is considered that representations would serve little purpose since—

(a) any compensation payments which may have been included in the assessable income of persons carrying on business have been so treated because they represent a reimbursement of business losses which are themselves allowable deductions.

(b) payments made to private residents in respect of losses of personal effects do not represent assessable income and have not been treated as such.

WANDANA FLATS

Maintenance: Receipts and Expenditure

6. Mr. **GRAHAM** asked the Minister for Housing:

Respecting the Wandana flat project—

(a) What is the total amount received from tenants in their