

to a local authority and an individual wishes to appeal against an action or a decision made by the local authority on behalf of the Commissioner for Main Roads, under the delegated powers, to whom shall the wronged individual appeal? Will he appeal to the Minister for Works or to the Minister for Local Government?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I would say he would appeal to the Minister for Works.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 7 put and passed.

Title—

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, what happened to the amendment proposed by Mr. McNeill?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was not put.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Have I permission to make a comment before he is given power to withdraw his amendment?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, he does not have to withdraw the amendment. We are now past it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If the Minister would like to press the amendment we will stay for another hour.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I do not mind. I want to read to the Committee a letter written by the Local Government Association of Western Australia expressing complete opposition to the proposed amendment.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! I must remind the Minister that we are now dealing with the title of the Bill.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 11.54 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 19th April, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS (33): ON NOTICE

#### 1. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

##### *Contributions to State Revenue*

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

Since the answer given to question 3 on Thursday, 13th April, 1972 stated that the S.G.I.O. made no revenue contribution to the State because of a deficit in one of its accounts, does it follow that

irrespective of statutory requirements in the present Act or proposed Bill the S.G.I.O. may escape future liability in similar instances?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I have the next episode of what has become a serial. The answer is as follows:—

The S.G.I.O. is assessed for tax in the same way as a public company, except that S.G.I.O. pays the tax to the State Treasury and not to the Commonwealth.

However, during the year in question payroll tax, local government rates—where applicable, water rates, fire brigade charges, etc. and all other normal charges were paid.

If in any year a public company has no assessable income it pays no tax—neither would the S.G.I.O.

#### 2. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

##### *Taxes*

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

Since the answer to question 3 on Thursday, 13th April, 1972 states: "The present Act and the proposed Bill specifically require the S.G.I.O. to pay all tax to the State that is normally due to the Commonwealth", how was it that no contribution was made to State revenue in 1967-68?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

The audited statement shows that no contribution was made to State revenue in 1967-1968 because there was no taxable income in that year.

#### 3. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

##### *Agents: Government Officers*

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

Since when have Government servants acted as agents for the S.G.I.O.?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

As previously advised, apart from its own staff, the only Government servants who act as agents for the State Government Insurance Office are Clerks of Courts (including Police officers who are Clerks of Courts) and Mining Registrars. These have acted as State Government Insurance Office agents from inception, but

as indicated in answer to an earlier question, it is only since April, 1961, when the former Government was in office, that they have been paid the 5% commission on new business written by them.

#### 4. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

*Agents: Canvassing for Business*

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

- (1) Having regard to the fact that S.G.I.O. agents are paid on the basis of new business written, would he condone Government servants, acting as agents, canvassing for such business?
- (2) Has he had any complaints of agents so acting?
- (3) If so, what action has been taken?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) As it was the former Government which permitted the introduction of the scheme whereby civil servants be paid a commission for new business written, and as the member himself, as Minister in charge of the State Government Insurance Office, did for six years (to use his words) "condone" the practice to which he refers, I have until this point of time accepted as satisfactory and without question, the situation which I inherited. However, as I indicated in reply to question 41 of 11th April, 1972, I have an open mind on the matter and will consider any alternative agency system, should any member make such suggestion during the course of the debate on the S.G.I.O. Bill.
- (2) The S.G.I.O. has not received any written complaint, either from the departments concerned, from other insurance companies or from the public and the only recollection of the General Manager, S.G.I.O., of anything like a verbal complaint was the suggestion on one occasion in conversation with a private insurance company executive that such agents gave the S.G.I.O. a competitive advantage as they were unpaid, a suggestion which the General Manager countered by advising of the commission. I have personally received no written complaints and can recall no verbal complaints though the matter may have been raised in one of the number of meetings over a 12 months period with senior insurance executives.

- (3) Not applicable.

5.

#### PRICE CONTROL

*Legislation*

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Does he propose to discuss with the Chartered Institute of Secretaries at a meeting of members and students on Thursday, 27th April, the proposed new legislation on control of excessive prices?
- (2) Can it be expected that the Government's proposals to legislate for price control will have been introduced by that date?
- (3) If not, would he not agree that it is a most unusual practice to discuss proposed legislation with outside organisations in what is in effect a public forum before presentation to Parliament?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

6.

#### SHEEP

*Percentage of Ewes*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

What are the number of ewes in each division of the State and also would he express this as a percentage of the total sheep numbers?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

Division	Sheep as at 31st March, 1971		
	Breeding and other ewes	Total sheep	%
Perth	61,603	134,308	45.84
South-west	731,237	1,490,622	49.05
Southern agricultural	4,476,131	9,782,232	45.75
Central agricultural	5,283,283	10,431,030	50.64
Northern agricultural	3,522,460	7,087,960	49.83
Eastern goldfields	1,334,808	2,604,354	51.25
Central	579,162	1,174,407	49.31
North-west	663,619	1,390,193	47.69
Pilbara	238,020	507,833	46.86
Kimberley	50,124	122,750	48.16
Total, W.A.	16,948,937	34,705,749	48.83

This information was obtained from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

#### 7. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS: INCREASED CHARGES

*Chief Secretary*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

Mr. Speaker, I seek permission to table this answer.

The SPEAKER: Permission granted.  
The answer was tabled.

## 8. STOCK

### *Number Slaughtered and Exported: Report*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When was the meat industry advisory committee requested to undertake an examination of stock numbers that can be slaughtered and/or exported without endangering the stock population in Western Australia?

- (2) When is this report expected?

- (3) Will he table a copy when it is available?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) Since its inception the Meat Industry Advisory Committee has been concerned with assessing the need for abattoir facilities in relation to livestock population.

One facet of these continuing investigations has been the matter in question.

The views of the committee will be made known when available.

## 9. BUSINESS NAMES AND OFFICE ADDRESSES

### *Registration Forms*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is it a fact that to change a business name or registered office address with the companies office the form to bring this change about must be purchased from the Imperial Stationery Centre?
- (2) If so, can he give reasons why these forms cannot be supplied by the Government Printer and made available at the companies office?

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

- (1) No. A change of registered office address can be effected at the companies office by completing a form provided by that office. Bulk supplies of Companies Act forms are not available from the office. They may be obtained from the Imperial Stationery Centre. Business Names Act forms are printed by the Government Printer and provided by the companies office on application.

- (2) Companies Act forms could be supplied by the Government Printer through his publications offices at Subiaco and Perth with no increased convenience to the public.

The cost of maintaining stocks of stationery which has been borne by forms publishers for many years would then be assumed by the Government Printer. The sale of monetary forms of this nature at the companies office would necessitate additional security and administrative controls.

## 10. UNMANNED POLICE STATIONS

### *Recorded Information*

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

As suburban police stations are at times unmanned because of the exigencies of the moment or through lack of staff will he give consideration to having a recording made which will give appropriate information such as what other number to ring to any caller who is in distress or is seeking help?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

It is considered that recordings are not warranted at present. However, the alternative number to ring, which was inadvertently omitted from the present edition, will be shown in the 1972 telephone directory.

In the meantime attention can be obtained by ringing the emergency number shown inside the front cover of the telephone directory.

## 11. FRUIT TRANSPORT AND HANDLING COMMITTEE

### *Functions*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

While it is appreciated that it is too early for a conclusive report to have been received from the fruit transport and handling committee, can he give an indication of—

- (a) which aspects of the industry have been examined by the committee to this date; and
- (b) the intentions and functions of the committee with regard to investigation of marketing overseas, particularly the United Kingdom?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (a) The total industry structure and procedure from orchard to shipside for export fruit has been examined for the 1972 season.

- (b) The nature and potential of the United Kingdom market is being examined by an international consultant who is working within guidelines prepared by the committee. The Department of Agriculture is supporting the consultant in the U.K. with one of its own staff.

## 12. TEACHERS

### *Overseas Recruitments*

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

- (1) On how many occasions and upon what dates has the Director of Education or his officers visited Britain for the purpose of recruiting teachers?
- (2) How many teachers, in addition to the 38 secondary and 10 primary teachers mentioned in his reply to question 12 on 13th April, are expected, and when?
- (3) Is the recruiting campaign still in progress?
- (4) How many primary teachers are seeking employment—
  - (a) where the teacher is willing to serve in any part of the State; and
  - (b) where the teacher has applied a restriction as to the area in which he or she is prepared to serve?
- (5) In respect of teachers recruited overseas—
  - (a) has the department entered into a firm contract guaranteeing employment and, if so, for what period;
  - (b) does the "recruited" teacher have the right to nominate the area in which he or she will serve or is this at the discretion of the Education Department;
  - (c) how many are presently serving—
    - (i) in the metropolitan region; and
    - (ii) in country areas?

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

- (1) Five occasions: July 1966, November 1969, May 1970, November 1970, November 1971.
- (2) Because of the improving staffing position and the increased outputs of trained teachers from the colleges, it is not anticipated that further overseas recruitment campaigns will be necessary. However, the department is still short of certain categories of secondary teachers, particularly in mathematics and science, and teachers

from the United Kingdom with these qualifications will continue to be accepted. No forecast can be given as to how many such teachers are likely to come to Western Australia, but the number will be very small.

- (3) No.
- (4) (a) None.  
(b) 280.
- (5) (a) A firm offer of appointment is given with the proviso that it must be taken up within twelve months.  
(b) Teachers are required to give an undertaking to serve anywhere in the State. However, in making appointments preferences are taken into account.  
(c) This information is not available.

## 13. NATIONAL FITNESS COUNCIL AND YOUTH COUNCIL

### *Legislation*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the stage of preparation for a Bill to deal with administration and co-ordination of National Fitness Council and Youth Council of W.A.?
- (2) When is introduction proposed?
- (3) What consultation about the proposals has taken place and is intended with interested bodies and organisations that will be affected?

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

- (1) Draft legislation has been prepared by the Crown Law Department.
- (2) During the latter part of the 1972 session of Parliament.
- (3) Recommendations and suggestions have been requested and received from both the National Fitness Council and the Youth Council and these have been taken into account in the preparation of the draft legislation.

## 14. STREET LIGHTING

### *Increased Cost*

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

- (1) Has the State Electricity Commission advised local authorities of an increase in the cost of street lighting, and, if so, would he give details?
- (2) Has the S.E.C. received an objection from the Melville City Council that the initial increase proposed would cost that council's

ratepayers an additional \$4,811 per annum, bringing the total annual cost to almost \$21,000?

- (3) Have any other local authorities lodged objections; if so, which ones?
- (4) What is the current annual cost to all local authorities for street lighting, and what will be the new annual cost?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Yes. Annual tariff increases to apply from 1st July, 1972.

Metropolitan system—

1.15 a.m. switch off	Present tariff \$	New tariff \$
60 watt	2.75	3.60
100 watt	5.99	6.48
200 watt	9.00	11.76
300 watt	12.00	15.60

Dawn switch off—

60 watt	5.00	6.00
100 watt	7.50	9.00
200 watt	13.50	16.20
300 watt	20.00	24.00

Country system—

Street light tariffs—From 1st July, 1972  
Country System  
(Excluding Esperance and Port Hedland)  
Switch Off Times

	11 p.m.		Midnight		12.30 a.m.		12.45 a.m.		1.15 a.m.		Dusk to dawn	
	Present	New tariff	Present	New tariff	Present	New tariff	Present	New tariff	Present	New tariff	Present	New tariff
60W	\$ 3.48	\$ 4.58	\$ 3.84	\$ 5.04	\$ 3.96	\$ 5.16	\$ 4.08	\$ 5.40	\$ 4.20	\$ 5.52	\$ 5.88	\$ 7.08
100W	5.28	6.96	5.88	7.83	6.12	8.04	6.24	8.16	6.48	8.40	9.12	10.92
200W	8.88	11.04	9.96	12.96	10.44	13.68	10.68	13.92	11.28	14.04	16.60	19.02
300W	13.20	17.16	14.76	19.08	15.60	20.28	15.96	20.76	16.80	21.86	25.32	30.48
500W	....	....	24.72	32.16	26.04	33.96	....	....	....	....	....	....

Tariffs for mercury vapour lamps were not altered.

- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes. City of Nedlands.
- (4) Annual total to 30th June, 1971—\$761,442.  
Expected increase—\$95,000 approximately.

15.

## TOWN PLANNING

### Maylands High Density Housing Project

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Was it essentially correctly reported in the 16th April issue of the *Sunday Times* that a \$10 million project to house 3,000 people has been agreed to in Maylands on the river shore?
- (2) What is the density per acre of this project, calculated exclusive of a 66 ft. strip of land from the river shore?

- (3) Have there been similar projects with the same or lesser density proposed in the past along the river foreshore either north or south or nearby the present project in Maylands?
- (4) If (3) is "Yes" have these proposals been accepted or rejected by his Department, and if rejected what were all the grounds of the rejection(s)?
- (5) Has there been any precedent for such a high density per acre for any approved residential development alongside the river in the metropolitan area?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes, but the Minister for Local Government has yet to give his consent to the proposal as a variation to the general residential codes under the Uniform Building By-laws.
- (2) Excluding foreshore reserve of approximately 6½ acres the net density of the proposal is approximately 110 persons per acre, or 44 dwellings per acre.

I interpolate to say that by way of comparison, the Wandana flats at Subiaco, with which most members are familiar and which are owned by the State Housing Commission, have approximately 150 persons per acre and approximately 80 units of accommodation per acre.

- (3) Yes.
- (4) The decision to accept or reject such proposals rests essentially with the local authority concerned, although Town Planning Board is involved but only when a modification to the general residential codes is necessary. The Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority would be required to give its observations where a regional reservation is affected.
- (5) Yes—on the South Perth foreshore, for example.

## 16. EDUCATION

*"Little Red School Book": Contents*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Education Department aware of the contents of *The Little Red School Book*?
- (2) Will it be used in Western Australian schools?
- (3) Will he lay a copy of the book on the Table of the House?

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

- (1) No.
- (2) As the book has not been examined by departmental officers, no decisions regarding it have yet been made.
- (3) No copy is available in the department.

Perhaps the honourable member might like to ask the Library Committee to buy one for the Parliamentary Library.

## 17. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

*Conference of Ministers: Decisions*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) What requests, suggestions or decisions were made at the last meeting in October, 1971, in Perth of the Federal and State Ministers responsible for environmental matters for legislative or administrative actions in the States?
- (2) Will his department act according to these requests and/or decisions, if any?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) There was no such meeting in October, 1971.
- (2) Answered by (1).

## 18. ORANGE GROVE SCHOOL

*New Establishment*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

In view of the fact that the Orange Grove primary school has been a demountable school for many years, and that a new school has been promised, will he advise when this new school will be built?

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

Within the limits of funds available, a replacement programme for Bristol classrooms is being undertaken. Schools which have been housed in six or more Bristol classrooms are receiving first

priority but it is intended to replace other schools as funds become available. It is not possible at this stage to give a definite date for the replacement of Orange Grove primary school.

## 19. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

*Investigations and Report*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

Will he advise the House what investigations and reports the Environmental Protection Authority,

- (a) has completed;
- (b) is currently handling?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (a) Since being appointed on 15th December, 1971, the Environmental Protection Authority has completed a report on the Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Act, 1971 and has reported on a draft of the Mining Bill presently before the House. It will be appreciated that the major task of the E.P.A. in the first months of its existence has been the first-mentioned report.

- (b) The E.P.A. is currently carrying out, in collaboration with the Environmental Protection Council, an investigation of matters pertaining to the Fitzgerald River reserve. It is keeping a wide number of other matters under continued review utilising the services of the Department of Environmental Protection. In addition the E.P.A. is collaborating with and being consulted by other Government departments and organisations on many projects and activities associated with the environment.

## 20. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

*Non-payment: Legal Action*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In how many cases has legal action been taken for non-payment of road maintenance tax over the last three months, six months, and nine months periods?
- (2) How far has the legal action been taken in each of the cases, including the number of warrants that have been issued for non-payment of road maintenance tax?

- (3) If legal action has not been followed up with the issue of warrants, etc., for non-payment, why has action stopped short and on whose instructions?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1)	Convicted	Adjourned
For 3 months 1/1/72 to 31/3/72	175	270
For 3 months 1/10/71 to 31/12/71	143	231
For 3 months 1/7/71 to 30/9/71	205	345

- (2) Legal action is completed to the extent indicated in the answers to question (1). No warrants have been issued for non-payment of road maintenance contributions during the past nine months.

- (3) On the instructions of the Government, warrants of commitment are not being proceeded with.

## 21. AGRICULTURE PROTECTION BOARD

*Representation: North-West*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are any of the members of the Agriculture Protection Board resident in the area north of the 26th parallel?
- (2) If "No" have any requests been received for direct area representation on the board, and with what result?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).

## 22. HOUSING FOR NATIVES

*Mission-controlled Properties*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Does the policy of the Native Welfare Department allow for Government funds to be used for the provision of housing for Aborigines on mission-controlled properties or areas excised from mission land and set aside as town-sites?
- (2) If "Yes" to what extent have Government funds been utilised for this purpose and in what localities?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes. By Government decision of 25th May, 1971.
- (2) Grants-in-aid of \$10,000 each have been offered to Mowanjum and Balgo missions this financial year. To date these amounts have not been expended.

23.

## NATIVES

*Kimberley: Survey of Needs*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Have the consultants W. D. Scott & Co. submitted a report and recommendations to him in connection with the study they undertook to evaluate the needs, and opportunities available to Kimberley Aborigines?
- (2) If "Yes" will he table a copy of the documents submitted by the firm?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. But I am prepared to allow the member to examine a copy in my office.

24.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT

*Assistance Fund: Distribution*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What proportion of the local authorities assistance fund has been distributed by the Government?
- (2) What was the basis for determining the value of assistance that should be accorded to each of the local authorities?
- (3) What amount has been paid from the fund to each city, town and shire in the State?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) \$498,807.
- (2) The amount of \$378,716 was distributed to local authorities which obtained less than \$1,000 in rate revenue per square mile of its district, on the following basis:—  
First 1,000 of population—\$2 per head.  
Second 1,000 of population—\$1.50 per head.  
Third 1,000 of population—\$1 per head.  
Fourth 1,000 of population—75c per head.  
Fifth 1,000 of population—50c per head.  
Sixth 1,000 of population—25c per head.  
subject to a minimum grant of \$2,000 and a maximum grant of \$6,000.  
The amount of \$120,091 was distributed as grants or free of interest loans to local authorities with pressing needs.
- (3) I would like to table the answer to part (3) which consists of the names of 123 shires.

*The answer to part (3) was tabled.*

## 25. LAKE ARGYLE

*Introduction of Fish*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Will he briefly outline what steps have been taken in relation to the introduction of fish to Lake Argyle?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Action has not been taken to introduce fish into Lake Argyle. However, the question of introductions is being considered by the department.

## 26. ABATTOIRS

*Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Feasibility Study*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government received a copy of the feasibility study undertaken by Civil & Civic Pty. Ltd. for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. abattoir?
- (2) If "Yes" as the Government is considering guaranteeing the whole of the money for the establishment of these projects would he table a copy of this study?
- (3) If not, what are his reasons for refusal?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) A copy of the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. feasibility study for the construction and operation of three abattoirs was made available for examination by officers of the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Treasury.
- (2) The study is the property of U.F.G.A./T.L.C. and has now been returned to this body.
- (3) Answered by (2).

## 27. ABATTOIRS

*Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Feasibility Study*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

Has the Government been requested to assist in any way for the payment of a feasibility study for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. abattoir proposal?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The fee for the feasibility study for U.F.G.A./T.L.C. has been included in the estimated capital cost of the venture for which the Government has been asked for a guarantee.

## 28. EDUCATION

*Boarding-away-from-home Allowance*

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Education:

Where the living-away-from-home allowance is insufficient to permit parents in isolated areas to send children away for secondary school education, are there any special grants available, and, if so, what are they, and on what conditions are they granted?

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

Grants are available to meet cases of special hardship. The amount is determined according to the needs and financial circumstances of the parents.

## 29. WATER SUPPLIES

*Vasse Electorate: Streams and Catchments*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Would he say what streams and possible water catchment areas are and have been under investigation in the Capel, Nannup, Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River shires?
- (2) Will he give detail of results achieved to date?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) In the Shires of Capel, Nannup, Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River, the flows down the following rivers are or have been gauged:—

Joshua, Preston, Capel, Blackwood, Tanjannerup, Millstream, Barley, Donnelly, Carey, Vasse, Margaret, Rosa and the Scott.

Gauging of these rivers is part of an overall programme to enable an assessment to be made of the water resources in all areas of the State and so permit future development if required.

- (2) The technical data collected on river flows are voluminous but can be made available if required. If the honourable member requires details of any specific river these can be made readily available from my office.

## 30. LAVERTON POLICE STATION

*Lockup*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the conditions that exist at the Laverton Police Station in respect of prisoner accommodation?



- (2) Does he realise that serious health problems exist due to lack of space and inadequate toilet and cooking facilities?
- (3) In view of the fact that the lock-up sometimes needs to accommodate twenty prisoners, where there is normally only room for four, would he investigate ways of remedying this situation?
- (4) Are there any plans to erect a new police station or upgrade the present one?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) and (4) Plans have been prepared for a new police station at Windarra, which is approximately 15 miles from Laverton. When completed, there should be sufficient accommodation to house prisoners.

### 31. ROADS

#### *Katanning-Wagin-Arthur River: Expenditure*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Works:

What moneys have been spent by the Main Roads Department on the Katanning-Wagin-Arthur River roads for the years 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Expenditure by the Main Roads Department on the Katanning-Wagin-Arthur River roads for the years 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72 is as follows—

	\$
1969-70 ....	99,055
1970-71 ....	99,853
1971-72 (to 31st March)	22,150

32. *This question was postponed.*

### 33. NATIVE RESERVES

#### *Medical Tests*

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How frequently are medical tests conducted on Aboriginal reserve dwellers at Broome, Derby, Wyndham, Kununurra and Halls Creek in order to determine if they have contracted hookworm?
- (2) During 1971, what was the incidence of hookworm in—
  - (a) adults;
  - (b) children,
 at each of the centres referred to in (1) above?
- (3) Are people who are admitted to hospital and subsequently cured, kept under medical surveillance?

- (4) During 1971 how many people who had been hospitalized with hookworm were later re-admitted with the same complaint?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The answer is long and contains a number of medical terms which I could not hope to pronounce correctly. I request, Mr. Speaker, that I either hand it in or that the member for Subiaco should read it.

The SPEAKER: The answer will be handed in.

- (1) Broome reserve—Blood and faecal examinations are conducted annually.

Wyndham reserve—A formal survey for hookworm was carried out on reserve residents during 1971. Derby reserve—No formal survey was carried out for hookworm at the reserve during 1971.

In Derby soil samples from the reserve have been taken and are known to contain nematode larvae sometimes morphologically resembling *ancylostoma duodenale*. In addition the Public Health sisters are continually checking for clinical evidence of anaemia. Any suspicious case has blood taken for examination.

All children admitted to hospital have routine haematological and faecal examinations. Only antenatal adults have routine haematological examination performed. Anaemia and/or eosinophilia results in faecal examination.

Kununurra reserve—No formal survey for hookworm was carried out at Kununurra reserve in 1971.

Halls Creek reserve—No formal testing of whole reserve has been carried out for hookworm. The Public Health sister at Halls Creek refers anybody appearing ill; or with overt weight loss or clinical anaemia, to the R.F.D.S. clinic for consideration for haematological investigation. Anaemia or raised eosinophil count results in routine faecal examination.

- (2) Broome reserve:—No figure available for the Broome reserves. In Broome Town during 1971 there were 21 positive cases of hookworm picked up in surveys. The number diagnosed in outpatients or whilst in hospital is unknown.
- Wyndham reserve:—Of 112 faeces specimens examined hookworm was found in—

(i) Adults—30.

(ii) Children—57.

Derby reserve:—

- (i) Adults—nil.
- (ii) Children—1.

Kununurra reserve:—Incidence is not known. Hookworm is considered relatively common in Aborigines in this area. Cases where clinical diagnosis is hookworm infestation are not always confirmed by faecal examination.

Halls Creek reserve—No hookworm detected during 1971.

- (3) Broome reserve—Yes.  
Wyndham reserve—Yes.  
Derby reserve—Yes.  
Kununurra reserve—Yes.  
Halls Creek reserve—Yes.
- (4) Broome reserve—Figure not available.  
Wyndham reserve—None because of hookworm alone.  
Derby reserve—No re-admission with hookworm.  
Kununurra reserve—None.  
Halls Creek reserve—None.

#### QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE

##### 1. ALUMINA REFINERY AT UPPER SWAN

###### *Environmental Protection: Meetings*

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to agree to the attendance of the Ministers for Development and Environmental Protection and the Director of Environmental Protection (Dr. O'Brien) at the meeting convened by the Swan Shire Council and referred to in today's issue of *The West Australian*?
- (2) Will a detailed report be issued after the proposed meeting between Pacminex, himself, the Minister for Environmental Protection, and the E.P.A. to consider the arguments of Pacminex in refutation of certain aspects of the E.P.A. Pacminex report?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for adequate notice of this question. The answer to this part is that the Government is not opposed to the attendance of Ministers who have been invited or to the attendance of the Director of Environmental Protection. I might add that I wonder at the reason for the question because this Government has never yet denied Ministers the right to attend meetings to which they have been invited.

Mr. Court: Officers were bracketed in the Press report. That is the only reason.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I would further say that it so happens the notice given to the Ministers is too short to enable them to attend, because each Minister has a firm engagement for the time the meeting has been arranged.

- (2) The answer to this part is "No."

##### 2. ABATTOIRS

###### *Trades and Labor Council and Farmers: Feasibility Study*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

I refer to my question 27 wherein I asked the Premier—

Has the Government been requested to assist in any way for the payment of a feasibility study for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. abattoir proposal?

The Premier replied—

The fee for the feasibility for the U.F.G.A./T.L.C. has been included in the estimated capital cost of the venture for which the Government has been asked for a guarantee.

I therefore ask—

- (1) Does this mean that the Government, through its guarantee, is going to pay for the feasibility study?
- (2) If not, will either one or both of the organisations be paying for the feasibility study, which is quite apart from the guarantee?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The question asked by the honourable member gave him an opportunity to make a speech. No decision has been made in connection with this matter and, therefore, it is impossible to give an answer to the question.

##### 3. METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE BOARD

###### *Plumbing Inspectors: Shortage*

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

In view of the fact that the volume of inspections of plumbing work by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board has increased by approximately 100 per cent. since 1968 while inspection staff has only increased by approximately 25 per cent., and because the additional workload is causing delays of up to two and three weeks in inspections thereby causing great inconvenience to builders and owners and putting Metropolitan

Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board inspectors under undue pressure, can he say whether he will take immediate action to recruit a substantial number of new inspectors?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Yes. Approval has been given for the immediate employment of one additional inspector and action is being taken to obtain three more.

#### 4. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### *Submissions in Writing to Speaker*

Mr. COURT, to The Speaker:

May I address a question to you, Sir, in connection with the matter I raised yesterday? I wrote to you today listing the questions I would like you to answer. You will recall it was not possible to put them on the notice paper. Are you in a position to answer them tonight, or will you deal with them tomorrow?

The SPEAKER replied:

I did not receive these questions until 2.40 p.m. today. As the questions are quite long and I would like my answers to be accurate, I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to put the questions on tomorrow's notice paper.

#### 5. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

##### *Nonpayment: Legal Action*

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

Further to question 20, in view of the fact that it is too late to place a question on the notice paper, will the Minister obtain from his colleague the reason for no warrants being issued under his Government's direction?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: There is not enough room in the gaols.

Mr. COURT: That is not an explanation at all. What about the people who are paying?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I will answer the question directly—because of Government policy.

Mr. Court: That is very interesting. Do not pay your debts if you support the Government!

#### BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

##### 1. Iron Ore (Goldsworthy-Nimngarra) Agreement Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and read a first time.

##### 2. Stock (Brands and Movement) Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

##### 3. Noise Abatement Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Davies (Minister for Health), and read a first time.

#### WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

##### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and transmitted to the Council.

#### METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

##### *Third Reading*

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.06 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [5.07 p.m.]: I do not wish unnecessarily to delay this legislation, but the Minister did not answer the question asked by me and also by the member for Floreat in relation to clause 18 of the Bill now before us.

Clause 18 provides that a *caveat* may be placed on a title to land where the payment of rates or prescribed charges levied for the supply of water is in arrears, and the board may deliver a memorial to that effect to the Registrar of Titles. As a result of this memorial the title will be endorsed—in other words a *caveat* will be placed upon it.

This is a very generalised description of the action which can be taken to place a *caveat* on a person's title to his land for any debt incurred. The Minister said in his second reading speech that the *caveat* was only intended to refer to concessions for deferments granted. The concessions related to pensioners and people—

Mr. Jamieson: Now don't you put words into my mouth.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is the last thing I want to do.

Mr. Court: Read what the Minister said in the second reading speech.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I will do this because, as I said, I do not want to put words into the Minister's mouth. The Minister said—

Another proposal in the Bill is one which would operate only in special cases. There are a few cases where, because of the particular circumstances of the owner, such as the state

of his health, a poor financial situation, or his age, there is a possibility of a sale being made without the board being protected for its rates and charges.

I would like to add there, the board is protected for its rates and charges because of concessions for deferment which have been granted by the board. That is one aspect. I will continue with the Minister's remarks—

Also, because of the special circumstances of the owner, the board would not resort to its normal recovery or cut-off action. In these particular cases only, the board desires an authority to lodge a *caveat* on the land.

These are the Minister's words which I was attempting to paraphrase. The Minister said, "Now don't put words into my mouth." I have now given the Minister's exact words. I am sorry if I did not correctly interpret the Minister's remarks.

I would like to refer to the concession without directly quoting the Minister. Towards the end of his second reading speech the Minister mentioned that if he and the member for Cottesloe did not pay their excess water rates or water charges, the board would have the water supply cut off. However, if an aged couple were not able to pay charges levied on property they own, the board would not cut off the water, but would attach the amounts to the title by way of a *caveat*. We have no objection to the *caveat* where concessions have been granted in circumstances such as these. However, the wording of the Bill is so generalised—and all members should be aware of this—that with the passage of this legislation the board could attach a *caveat* to any title for debts incurred.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you think that the board which you set up would do that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I do not know whether the board would do that or not. However, I said it could do it.

Mr. Court: The board does not have to give notice to the owner to do this.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Again this is true. Attachments can be made to the title without notice.

This is not good legislation. During my years in this Chamber, I have heard members on both sides say that legislation which is wrong in principle should not be passed. In fact, the Premier himself has said that.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

Mr. Bickerton: I'll say there is!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: During the second reading of this Bill, I asked the Minister to look at clause 18 with a view to amending it to ensure that the intention of the legislation as expressed by him was carried

out. As I have had no response to my submission, I would like to suggest an amendment along these lines: After the word "arrear" in line 6 of the clause, we could add words such as "as a result of concessions which have been granted to defer payments," and then continue, "a *caveat* shall be placed," and so on. I am not a "legal eagle" but I feel the exact circumstances of the attachment of a *caveat* should be prescribed.

I again ask the Minister to adopt this proposal. At the present time the wording of the clause is too general. It should not be possible in such circumstances to attach a *caveat* to a title. No member of Parliament would agree with that. Debts can be recovered by other means. We do not oppose the provision when it applies to owners of properties who have been granted a deferment.

Will the Minister assure us that he will take this matter up with the Crown Law Department in order to keep his word that the special circumstances will be catered for? The support of this side of the House will be dependent upon the Minister's assurance, and no doubt it will have a great bearing on the fate of this legislation in another place, although I cannot speak for that other place.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.15 p.m.]: I rise to speak on this occasion as a result of the public reaction to this legislation. The reaction has been tremendous, possibly due to—

Mr. Jamieson: You have had one complaint about it. To you it is always tremendous if an elector approaches you.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister will realise that water is of the utmost importance to the general public; therefore, there is every justification for the public taking a great interest in this legislation. As a matter of fact, I was just about to give the Minister a small plaudit. The media reported the second reading debate of the measure in this House virtually by saying the Bill was passed with minor amendments. I must say that when it was explained to the general public that the Minister had agreed to the proposal of the Opposition that this most important provision be retained within the control of Parliament, the public appreciated that fact. However, until they realised that—and the matter has been rectified since in a subsequent report—they were most concerned indeed.

I would like to ask the Minister to reconsider the clause relating to the collection of excess water charges from the owner when the charges are incurred by a tenant. I have already pointed out that this legislation contains contradictory provisions. In the first place it is endeavouring to provide for the preservation of water. In the words of the Minister,

we are doing our utmost to act responsibly in connection with the water resources of this State. Yet the measure also includes a provision which will have the opposite effect. I say to the Minister in all seriousness that the provision to which I refer could have an effect opposite to the one he is seeking; that is, an irresponsible person—and there is an irresponsible section in our community—might waste water so that the owner of the land will be required to pay for it. Surely that point should receive further consideration.

During the second reading debate the Minister made the point that the water board should be subject to normal business practices. I would like him to state where, in the normal course of business, debts incurred by one person are recovered from another. During that debate I mentioned the fact that the owners of property will include in their rents a factor to provide for the recovery of excess water charges. Therefore, rents will automatically be lifted, and that is something we do not desire. For those valid reasons I ask the Minister to reconsider his intention and to have this provision removed in another place.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Belmont—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.19 p.m.]: I do not intend to give any assurance about changing the general intention of the Bill. The intention is clear enough. The *caveat* provision will be applied humanely under certain circumstances, and the member for Cottesloe is merely picking on a feature of it. If the honourable member's deputy leader were not to pay his water rates, naturally the normal cut-off proceedings would take place if he stood by and refused to meet his responsibility and continued to live on his premises, as often occurs now. We must have some lever in such a case.

On the other hand, if a tenant leaves a property and does not pay then we must have some redress. The tenant could go home to England—as has occurred—and the water board could lose a considerable amount of its income.

**Mr. Hutchinson:** That is the point I make. You are going to attach the owner's title. Let members of Parliament hear that.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** That is all right; it is already done in respect of local government rates.

**Mr. Hutchinson:** You make it far worse than I anticipated.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** Have the circumstances of which the honourable member is frightened ever occurred in regard to State Housing Commission homes in Northam, Collie, or any one of a dozen other country districts in which the Government has a right to recover debts from the property owner? This has never occurred, and it will not occur. I am surprised that the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition assumes that the board would be so irresponsible as to attach a *caveat* before a normal notice is issued. Under the Act it is required that an early notice must be issued, and it is also required that a final notice must be sent out.

**Mr. Court:** You are missing the point. They could go and slap a *caveat* on the title without the owner ever knowing anything about it.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** The owner would soon find out if he wanted to sell the property; at any other time it would not be of concern to him.

**Mr. Hutchinson:** You get more ludicrous.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** The member for Cottesloe gets ludicrous also, because I indicated during the course of my reply to the second reading debate that on occasions—whether it be the State Housing Commission or any other department—we find that the files are haywire and a title might have an appendage which it should not have, and *vice versa*.

However, the position is quite clear. As soon as the person concerned examines the title—and at the time of sale the title is always examined—he would become aware of the *caveat*. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that the title is the first thing to be examined. As soon as the water board is notified that the *caveat* may be improperly attached to the title it is required under the provisions of this measure to establish whether or not that is so. Of course, the *caveat* could be wiped out at a minute's notice. So I do not think there is anything to worry about.

**Mr. Court:** Before you sit down: You introduced your Bill on the basis that you were asking for this protection in respect of relief cases.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** No, that is one of the instances in which the provision could be applied. It is clear, and I have stated this during the debate, that the provision has a general application. That is why the member for Floreat argued about it. He spoke about a person going overseas and coming back to find an attachment to his title. The honourable member clearly knew what was intended. There is no doubt that it is the intention of the Metropolitan Water Board to exercise this right where it is considered necessary. I will give no assurance that it will be altered.

The provision has not been misused in respect of country water supplies, or in respect of local government rating. I cannot foresee that the water board would take any drastic action such as that referred to by members opposite.

**Mr. Hutchinson:** I guarantee it will be altered if it is not altered in this Chamber.

**Mr. Bryce:** What? In another place?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILLS (5): THIRD READING

#### 1. Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill.

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

#### 2. Beekeepers Act Amendment Bill.

#### 3. Bee Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

#### 4. Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

#### 5. Zoological Gardens Bill.

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

### COCKBURN SOUND DEVELOPMENT

#### *Master Plan: Motion*

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.27 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the evidence given to the Commonwealth Standing Committee on public works at the recent public hearings in Perth about the Navy's plans for Garden Island, the obvious advanced stage of the Navy's research work and the magnitude of the project, and the anticipated early Commonwealth decisions following the Committee's report, there should be a top level study—with independent specialist consultants if need be—to produce a master plan for the integrated development of Cockburn Sound and all of the shire council areas immediately involved, especially as estimates of at least \$150 million of Fremantle Port Authority installations alone are in contemplation.

In considering this plan, it is important to have regard for the fact that the future of some of the towns and particularly Rockingham is at the crossroads. Therefore this master plan needs to have regard to such things as:—

- (a) the future of towns like Rockingham which involve close association with developments in Cockburn Sound;
- (b) Point Peron reserve;
- (c) the future of beaches;

(d) the future of Kwinana beach and township;

(e) provision for industry generally;

(f) Fremantle Port Authority installations including container and LASH ship berths;

(g) Naval facilities;

(h) provision for a major commercial dry dock, ship survey, building and repair facilities jointly with or independent of Navy facilities; and

(i) transport facilities.

At the outset I appeal to the Government and to members generally to support my motion for the reasons I am about to give. It is obvious to all who interest themselves in the future of Cockburn Sound and adjacent areas that the previously announced concept for the development of the sound has changed drastically as a result of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to install a naval facility. We have moved from speculation to reality. Although there has been close co-operation between the Commonwealth Government departments and the State Government departments involved, the earlier expectations of the Fremantle Port Authority will not eventuate. We understand that all political parties have urged the establishment of a naval base in Cockburn Sound; and that all political parties have urged industrial development in the Kwinana area.

It is generally acknowledged that the present Leader of the Opposition (Sir David Brand), together with other members, was the catalyst which induced BP to establish a refinery in Western Australia, and thus set off the very large industrial complex that exists there at the present time.

The present Premier attempted to attract one of the largest chemical industries in the world to establish a plant on the shores of Cockburn Sound. The fact is that the industry has not been established here, but the present Premier did attempt to attract it to Cockburn Sound. That rather puts all political parties in the same group in respect of endeavours to establish industry in this area, so I approach this subject on that basis.

There is an obvious need for a review of the plan of development by independent specialist consultants, because to my mind this is a billion dollar industrial complex. One cannot place values on people, but one can put a value on public and private developments that will take place in this area related to industry, and the services that will be required to support industry. This will be of tremendous magnitude. When I add up all the assets that will be established in this zone of the

south-west corridor—that is, if corridor development is to be implemented, and not discarded—the total would be of tremendous magnitude.

I refer to a booklet that has been produced in relation to the Kwinana area. This was published in 1971. I shall refer to a few brief extracts in that booklet, and will draw attention to some of the figures because they are applicable. We all know that this industrial complex at Kwinana has been developing for something like 19 years. In that time at least \$400,000,000 has been invested in industry in that region, although other people might have different figures. Under the corridor plan proposals at least 200,000 people are projected to live in that area, and it is suggested the work force will total 80,000. This is, indeed, a very large number of people.

The booklet indicates it will be the major industrial centre of Australia. These are significant words. All this means that the Kwinana industrial complex will be of tremendous magnitude. At this point of time we are moving from speculation to reality. The naval base is to be established, and other huge developments are going on. So, now is the time for us to take stock.

It is acknowledged that from this industrial complex came the standardised railway; this means that all the people of Western Australia have benefited from the Kwinana developments. These developments will continue, and that is why I suggest we should put everything right for the future.

Mr. Graham: Does this motion derive from any request made by a local authority or a number of local authorities?

Mr. RUSHTON: No, it is my own observation, as I have taken a very keen interest in this matter in the last seven years, and especially since I have been a member of this House. This motion derives from the fact that so much has been happening in the Kwinana area. I have some concern for certain items of proposed developments, and I shall explain them. I would like the Government to reconsider its attitude towards some developments, and I shall explain why.

Mr. Graham: I asked the question, because details of the developments were outlined and explained to the three local authorities in the area, and my appreciation was that they were all very pleased and accepted the plan.

Mr. RUSHTON: I can say this: Certain features of the plan are very limited in scope. To my knowledge certain features are not acceptable, and I will explain why. It is not on the initiative of the local authorities that I am taking this action; I am doing so on my own initiative, relating to the developments in the whole zone.

Mr. Graham: The last objection I heard from the local authority representatives was to the statements that the honourable member had made with regard to proposed developments in that area.

Mr. RUSHTON: I shall proceed along the line I desire to follow in presenting my motion to the House. I hope the Deputy Premier will support the motion when he realises what I am endeavouring to do. I am sure he realises from my submission that certain of the developments in which he is interested can be improved; and certainly second thoughts should be given to them.

In respect of his own doubts about the corridor plan, the Deputy Premier did obtain the services of a consultant. To my mind the developments at Kwinana are of equal magnitude. I only mention this fact to illustrate that in different circumstances the Deputy Premier did obtain the services of a consultant.

I suggest that the whole Kwinana industrial complex is of tremendous importance to Western Australia. I suppose that political views will be expressed by me during the presentation of this motion, but they are put forward in accordance with the political beliefs that I hold, and some of them might not be acceptable to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Graham: Have you read the report on the Cockburn Sound developments?

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes. Of course, in addition to that the Minister for Works gave me a tremendous amount of literature yesterday which I have not as yet digested in full, although I have had a cursory look at it. I was illustrating the magnitude of the developments in this general zone. There is a commitment to build a steelworks in that region by 1978. I do not have expert knowledge to indicate what this will mean to the State, but I am sure other members with a greater aptitude to appraise these things will be able to tell us. A work force of some 12,000 people comes to mind, but that figure might not be accurate. If we project a work force of that magnitude to the men, women, and children involved in supporting industries and in the general servicing of the community, we will realise the tremendous build-up of population which will result from the establishment of this steelworks. This is something which is real, and will be established.

Mr. Court: I think one point should be made clear fairly early by you. Although this motion refers to Cockburn Sound, no doubt you will cover in your motion something which is greater than the sound itself.

Mr. RUSHTON: I hope that message is received by all members, because this motion is all-embracing. It affects the whole State, and it very directly applies to the

industrial and residential region which is supported by Cockburn Sound. One of the reasons for bringing this motion forward is that I have doubts about the proposition that has been put forward in the report, relating to the magnitude of the developments and the concept. I have a doubt that it is totally adequate for the future. I have many reasons for suggesting that further consideration of the various aspects be given by the Government, and I shall elaborate on them.

Regarding harbour developments, I link the Cockburn Sound developments with the development of the Fremantle outer harbour. There are 115,032 acres in the outer harbour, but only 200 acres in the inner harbour. That shows the tremendous importance of the harbour developments in relation to the developments at Cockburn Sound. I understand that the depth of water in Fremantle Harbour is 36 feet, and that it requires constant dredging. At this point of time there might be a variation in the depth. However, through the dredging of the Parmelia Bank there is a depth of 45 feet at Cockburn Sound, and a second channel is in the course of dredging. This allows tankers of 85,000 tons to enter Cockburn Sound. With facilities to accommodate tankers of that size, the impact on cost structure is of the utmost importance.

I will now touch briefly on the development by Co-operative Bulk Handling, and this development is also of the utmost importance to the State. This is a \$40,000,000 grain terminal. One of the reasons I have moved the motion is that the proposals relating to the terminal are under challenge as a result of certain moves that are taking place at this very time.

Mr. Gayfer: What do you mean by being under challenge?

Mr. RUSHTON: I refer to the establishment in that locality of an industry incompatible with the grain terminal. I am not suggesting that my motion is related to the placement of the C.B.H. installation, because I realise when we established the installation on its present site consideration was given to the creation of buffer zones of trees and gardens. C.B.H. entered into this commitment willingly, and now a first-class development is taking place.

Unfortunately a little to the north of the locality a change is occurring. I therefore make the point of asking the Government to reconsider its proposals, or to have them fully investigated by an independent specialist consultant, so that the people concerned will know where we are going. I am constantly receiving inquiries as to what is to take place down there. A person living in that area could have his life savings invested in his home.

Mr. Nalder: Has the caravan park been shifted?

Mr. RUSHTON: It is still there. Of course the C.B.H. installation is a \$40,000,000 grain terminal. It is next to the northern extremity of Rockingham township, and it has an 11-acre buffer zone. This is a very well planned zone, and it is essential.

C.B.H. has made plans for a 50,000,000-bushel capacity grain terminal. The important factor is that by establishing the terminal in that area, it is able to take advantage of the huge carriers which are able to offer low freights. I suppose the low freight costs is one major reason for the terminal to be located there; and another major reason is the advantages that are to be gained in handling grain that way.

Then there are the developments of the marshalling yards, which extend right through from Fremantle. Recently the Deputy Premier opened the railway terminal at Robb Jetty, and on that occasion he made some very challenging statements which disturbed the atmosphere in that region. It was a very important occasion, because this railway terminal has a great impact on the transport system of the State.

In the Kwinana area we find there is a linking of the railway lines from Kewdale to Kwinana, and from Jarrahdale to Kwinana; and plans for various marshalling yards have been adopted. These will be extensive yards.

I will touch briefly on the various types of developments that have taken place. The future harbour developments to cater for container and general cargoes are noteworthy. The Minister for Works and I seem to have got off to a bad start. He has been giving me information which in my opinion tended to be wrong. I do not say he gave that information deliberately, but in respect of a number of items he gave information which related to facts that are described in various pieces of literature. I was misinformed.

One item on which I sought information related to the check of the developments by the Environmental Protection Authority. I thought such a check would have been made automatically, but apparently this is not being done.

I also refer to future harbour development. According to the booklet, the Fremantle Port Authority stated that it thought development would include wharves, and would spread to the eastern coast of Garden Island for the provision of other facilities. That is what I understood was to take place. When I asked the question concerning an investigation, I thought the reply was passing strange. The booklet to which I am referring was published during the term of the present Government.



Mr. Taylor: Has the honourable member checked the booklet which came out during the term of the previous Government? That is the booklet I used.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am not saying that what is published in the booklet is other than what happened. I am saying that whoever compiled the answer to my question for the Minister did not observe what was published in the booklet. For a long time I understood that the development of the Cockburn area was to include the east coast of Garden Island. I think the Minister might have also understood that to be the position.

Mr. Taylor: The plans which were drawn up in 1966 have been used.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is something which the Fremantle Port Authority projected into the future. The committee did not delve into this matter because it was so far in the future. However, I think the Fremantle Port Authority did give consideration to it, and the thoughts of that authority have been included in the Kwinana booklet. I do not say that the idea has been approved by the Government; this is futuristic conjecture on the part of the Fremantle Port Authority. It was pointed out that the east coast of Garden Island was to be used for the provision of facilities.

The next point is the establishment of a naval base. This was considered back in 1911 and, I suppose, it was considered well before that time also. It has been stated that the construction of a naval base has been under consideration for more than 100 years. It is interesting to note that in 1914 the estimate for the cost of the base was \$9,000,000. That is the same amount as is involved in the construction of the causeway. So it can be seen that this planning has been going on for a long time.

I am mentioning these facts briefly to show that there has been concern in the past. We know that back in 1867 Rockingham was the busiest port in Western Australia. We also know that in 1957 an application to proceed with the naval base was refused. Approval was granted on the 8th October, 1969, for development to proceed.

It is visualised that the whole zone will employ 80,000 people. I do not know the exact figure of employment at the present time, but it is nothing like 80,000. The census for 1966 showed a figure of 30,000 and it seems unbelievable to me that there could be such a difference.

The Cockburn Sound area, with its advantages, is possibly the greatest asset which this State has. For that reason it is of the utmost importance not only to those who will make up the future population of 200,000 people, but to every man, woman and child in Western Australia. It is also important to the Commonwealth.

I will touch briefly on the corridor plan because it will embrace the whole of the zone. We still do not know whether the corridor plan will be implemented because there is now talk of directional network planning. However, for the time being I am not moving away from the idea of corridor planning. Even directional planning would have to fit in with the development of the Cockburn Sound area.

It has been stated that the intention is to rationalise residential and industrial activities without detriment to each other. Basically that is the purpose of my motion so that we do not suffer any disadvantage as a result of moves we may make now. We are moving from the speculation stage into the stage of reality, and this is the time for detailed planning to ensure that future moves are in the right direction. The 1966 census showed that 30,000 people were living in the area, and by 1989 it is expected that 249,000 people will live in the zone. It is difficult to visualise such a population but that is the estimate of the planners. The figure of 90,000 for the Cockburn area might frighten the member for the district.

Mr. Taylor: The honourable member is practically quoting from my maiden speech. I made the same point in emphasising the importance of the region we represent.

Mr. RUSHTON: A population of 45,000 is visualised for the Kwinana new town area, which we know will spread.

Mr. Taylor: It will be the central section of Western Australia.

Mr. RUSHTON: The estimated population of Rockingham and Safety Bay is 50,000 people. It is also visualised that the Kwinana industrial area will cover 6,000 acres, and with Robb Jetty, Spearwood, Jandakot, and the Cockburn Cement Works a total of more than 9,000 acres. Those figures emphasise the importance of the area.

This gives me the opportunity to mention a matter which is of some concern. It was recently announced that an area north of Alcoa would be set aside for housing because the land was unsuitable for industry. It was projected that the development would house approximately 15,000 people. However, the land is immediately north of the Alcoa refinery and directly in the path of the prevailing winds. The Minister for Development and Decentralisation did answer a question from me by saying that every precaution would be taken, but how much better it would be if this sort of thing was prevented, and we did not have to be concerned to the same extent.

Of course, it is necessary to take every precaution but it is projected that there will be a steelworks in the area in future years.

Mr. Williams: That is the steelworks which the Minister said would go somewhere else.

Mr. RUSHTON: I thought it was to be established in this general area because of the availability of labour, and I have not heard anything to the contrary. If the Minister for Development and Decentralisation considers that it will go somewhere else we would like to know about it.

Mr. Graham: The member for Bunbury is upset. I was doing my utmost to get an industry established in a country centre, instead of at Kwinana. He has never got over the fact that I endeavoured to bring that about.

Mr. Williams: It was because of the economic factor, right from the start.

Mr. RUSHTON: To my mind there is a plan to establish a steelworks in the general area by 1978. Such a project will generate a tremendous need for employees. I should imagine that would be included in the estimate of a work force of 80,000 people, and that is why I am stressing the point and asking the Government to reconsider establishing a housing area to accommodate 15,000 people immediately north of Alcoa. That is one of the reasons for the introduction of my motion.

I cannot accept, even with modern technology, that pollution will be prevented. I cannot see the advantage of constructing a housing settlement in that area. As a matter of fact, there has been reference to the fact that the Environmental Protection Authority has not looked at this matter. It has been stated that the Rural and Industries Bank might look into the problem at some future time. I thought this investigation would have been automatic.

I would like to comment briefly on the Premier's announcement of the plan for the development of Cockburn Sound. Of course, the plan embraces the whole area. We have an excellent opportunity to examine the findings of the committee and make our own assessment and determination regarding future development. In fact, it is essential that this should be done. The report which has been presented is a continuation of what was taking place in the time of the previous Government. I am not sure of the exact date in February of last year, but the request for further negotiations could have been made in the closing days of the administration of the previous Government.

The committee got down to business in March, 1971. As a matter of fact, I have memories of the previous plan being publicised because it was at the time when I stood for the by-election which was held on the 8th May, 1965. About three weeks before the election there was a premature disclosure that this sort of development

would take place. It was impressed on my mind because the Labor Party published the plan in its paper and it included the development of Cockburn Sound. Members can imagine my feelings, especially when it is remembered that the plan had not been approved. The release certainly had some reaction throughout my electorate but, fortunately for me, the Rockingham people were very reasonable—and still are—and saw it in the way it was presented.

The 1966 projection was, in brief, that there would be a development in the Mangles Bay area related to the construction of a causeway, container berths in mid-stream, and wharves on Garden Island. At that time it was considered that there would be development in the way of wharves along the east coast of Garden Island.

We now know that for expedience, or for economic reasons, there has been a very big change in the plan because it is now projected that the wharves which would have been constructed in mid-stream have been brought back to the shoreline at Point Peron, where it is planned three berths will be constructed.

The figures have been explained to me by the Minister for Works but there is a reasonable doubt in my mind concerning the reclamation of 100 acres which is to take place in the Mangles Bay area and the reservation of 100 acres at Point Peron for auxiliary services. Realising that a parallel causeway would have to be constructed, it seems to me that the thinking is not quite realistic in this regard. We could be faced with the same situation as our present Premier has frequently referred to in relation to the decision on the reclamation of part of the Swan River for the Mitchell Freeway.

I understand the Premier said if he had his time again he would dig the sand out and that he wished he had not made the decision. I am taking this opportunity to press for reconsideration of the Cockburn Sound project. It must be looked into by people who can assess all the facts and judge how it will affect us in the future. Later on I will explain to the House how I think it will react against us in the future. Perhaps it will be difficult to do the reclamation but it would be economic to do it.

What does the future hold? We have a back-up of 100 acres for this facility to occupy, and from the research I have undertaken and the information I have been able to obtain this seems to be very limited. I do not think it is attractive economically to develop stages 2 and 3, and it is obvious that the development will continue along the coast towards Kwinana beach in a pincer movement.

If that is what the future holds, the Government should advise us and the public accordingly. Let us be realistic about

what the future holds for this area. Many changes will take place. I was shattered to know we were to have wharves at Point Peron. It might be said to me, "You knew there could be an establishment for shipbuilding and maintenance around there." That is true. I knew the shire had objected and tried to have the establishment situated elsewhere. The shire hoped this area would be available for small craft, yachts, etc.

These are matters which should be investigated. There is a tremendous quantity of data but many details are missing. A working party set about making recommendations, in regard to this development, and it gave reasons for its recommendations. The first reason related to the Clarence shipbuilding yard, which is in a confined area towards Woodman Point. The recommendation was that shipbuilding should be consolidated. Recommendations were also made regarding transport. Recommendation No. 2 is—

- (a) That consideration be given to the political possibility of conjoint agreement between the State and the Commonwealth for the development of common dock yard facilities on the south-east tip of Garden Island.
- (b) That pending the outcome of such considerations, the State should ask the Commonwealth to keep its detailed planning of Garden Island sufficiently fluid that a dock yard could be incorporated in the position suggested should both parties reach agreement on the broad issues involved.

This brings up a very vital issue. I think it is generally agreed it would be desirable to have in the future a private dockyard facility for servicing ships. It has been planned and worked for, and I hope it will be investigated because it is up in the air at the moment.

I understand from statements made by the Premier in relation to changes in the area that certain understandings existed with the Commonwealth. When I attended the Standing Committee on Public Works inquiry regarding the naval facility and its development, it was explained that in fact there had been no agreements in regard to the resiting of the shipbuilding and maintenance yard. It appears that in some of its plans the Navy had shown a similar facility in Careening Bay. It seems rather strange that the Government said, "This will do us. We will change the proposals for the corner of Mangles Bay and write it up as if it were going over here." But at this point of time no consideration has been given to where it will be sited.

The SPEAKER: There is too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSHTON: A conjoint facility could be established. No mention has been made of the future of Rockingham beach. I will have something to say about that shortly.

I now come to the development of the ship-berthing facilities at Kwinana beach. I spoke to the member for Avon about the Co-operative Bulk Handling facility there. When we were debating the Pacminex alumina refinery agreement, it was mentioned that it was intended to make provision in the agreement for the loading of alumina at the Co-operative Bulk Handling installation. It was very disturbing to learn that alumina, which is a very fine dust, would be loaded in the same area as our first-class wheat is loaded. C.B.H. had entered into arrangements to provide an 11-acre buffer zone, but this will not be very effective when a north-west wind is blowing.

It was the intention of the previous Government to stockpile alumina to the north of Kwinana beach. A reserve was prepared and the alumina was to be loaded from the CSBP Jetty. I cannot accept the reasoning of the committee in this regard. The committee said it would be better to move into the southern section of the Kwinana beach area because it would be easier, more economical, development could take place in due course, and there were only 200 houses. The committee said it would be advantageous to the State to have this stockpiling and development at the southern end because it would not be necessary to purchase the properties and it was hoped in due course the residential area and the Crown land could be combined; it would be a very cheap project for the State.

Let us look at the human factor. Provision must be made for the people who will be affected. I have made suggestions in this regard. Some time ago the Government was requested to provide land in Rockingham for an aged persons' village, and many of the people at present living in the 200 houses that will be demolished have made inquiries as to when this project will begin. I urge the Government to give this matter urgent consideration.

On many occasions the member for Cockburn has been with me when people in the area have pleaded to be moved out as soon as possible. I think the Minister for Works said the plan had been approved in principle, but when the Fremantle Port Authority moves into the southern portion of Kwinana beach these houses will be completely surrounded. The beach recreation reserve will disappear.

Mr. Graham: You would not know that under this plan, compared with the previous plan, not another foot of beach has been taken from the people.

Mr. RUSHTON: I asked the Minister for Works about it and he said, "Look at your plan." I asked a simple question and the answer he gave was, "Look at the plan." Perhaps the Minister for Town Planning could show me on the plan what the changes are. The plan shows the new site for the Fremantle Port Authority premises and mentions the water line, C.B.H., and so on. If the Minister can satisfy me that these developments will not take place, I will be very happy. I asked a series of questions of the Minister for Works in the hope that he would state quite frankly that the recreation reserve would remain.

When the previous Government provided this recreation reserve members on the other side said, "Why not have it further back and provide a large recreation reserve?" Let us be reasonable: it is not a bad suggestion. I do not want the recreation reserve to disappear. This is another matter which should be fully investigated because we cannot continue encroaching upon it.

Mr. Taylor: There is not much left to do anything with, anyway.

Mr. RUSHTON: When the present Government came into power it made the statement, "We will preserve the beach." I will say something about Point Peron later on.

Mr. Graham: You will not get to first base on that one.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not want to be antagonistic. I am seeking support. I would like to know what the future is for the people in the Kwinana beach area. I urge that every step be taken to enable them to move. Surely the Government can say to the Minister for Lands, "Make this decision quickly and let these people get out of this situation." I am willing to look into this matter with the member for Cockburn and I would like him to give me the assurance that these beaches will not be lost for recreation purposes. I remember very vividly some of the early statements made by the Tonkin Government when it came into power. It said, "We will preserve those beaches." In stage 1, three wharves are to be built. This is great old preservation!

I will be happy to read through the report during the recess and try to have this point clarified. The Government has said an "A"-class reserve will be declared in this area; but how lonely and isolated it will be! It is a happy spot at the present time but it will be surrounded. These matters should be clearly understood. In the future, people will have to understand that an "A"-class reserve means nothing. A small "A"-class reserve set in the middle of a Fremantle Port Authority development means nothing.

I consider this matter should be researched in full and another opinion should be sought. Surely we should seek another opinion in matters of this magnitude. Everything that happens in this area is vital for the future.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. RUSHTON: Before the tea suspension I was commenting upon the report presented by the Premier's committee for the development of the Cockburn Sound-Kwinana area as it relates to the rationalisation of waterfront development in Cockburn Sound in 1972.

Some doubt was expressed as to the use to which this land in the Kwinana beach area was to be put. I can see why this is confusing and how it can be taken in different ways. If one casts one's mind back to the decision taken in 1968, one finds that the intention was that basically the area north of Kwinana was to be developed intensively for shipping and industry, and the area south of Kwinana was to be used for shipping—and I refer now to the long finger jetties, because the land backing was reserved for "A"-class reserves and recreation purposes and it went back to the Rockingham road. The committee has researched this issue and in its report it has come to two certain conclusions. In the main the committee believes that the previous proposition is no longer valid and it is now making suggested changes. When one reads the report one finds that it relates to the area in question. In fact it is somewhat confusing because in the past the proposition was always referred to the Rockingham road. I mention this to remove any doubt. The report states—

With the exception of recognised and designated "A" Class Reserves and designated Recreation Reserves all the land bounded on the north by the C.S.B.P. Works, on the east by the Kwinana Coast Railway, on the south by C.B.H., and on the west by the Ocean be ultimately given over to the Fremantle Port Authority for port operational purposes, or to public utility requirements.

On reading this part of the report one can see now that what was to take place on the beach front was somewhat ambiguous. It does, however, indicate that the area will be retained.

When I asked the Minister for Works a question on this matter he referred me back to the plan which, incidentally, is not at all clear, and I think it would be an advantage if in a few days the Minister could clear up this point and tell us what his intention is. When one considers this aspect of the Fremantle port development one would imagine that such development would extend right through the area.

I emphasise the point that these changes are taking place and when one refers to the reports in question one appreciates that big changes are to be made. There is little doubt that the concept of the past is now to be changed. One can accept these changes, but I now want to prove that we should start immediately and have a full investigation of the master plan for this area. The investigation should be made of all the adjacent areas that are to be affected; we should not merely investigate the port development. The working party has made certain comments and recommendations and the report indicates that there is a need for various jetties in this area. The reasons given for this are as follows:—

- (i) The anticipated population increase in the Perth Metropolitan Region of more than 1,000,000 by the year 2000.

The prophets predict figures in excess of this. To continue—

- (ii) The extent of the emerging mineral extractive and treatment processes centred on Perth.
- (iii) The known and anticipated demand for bulk shipment.
- (iv) The limited residual area of both water frontage and land backing at Point Peron predicated by Commonwealth demands.
- (v) The absence of any other suitable alternative for bulk cargo shipping elsewhere on Cockburn Sound.

This is one of the reasons for my having moved the motion—to have these points investigated. To continue—

- (vi) The immediate necessity for at least one grain berth and one alumina berth.

Recommendation No 11 crystallises all this and says—

The essential need to be recognised of planning the Kwinana Waterfront between the C.S.B.P. Fertiliser Works and the Township area of Rockingham for the initial development of five overseas bulk cargo jetty berths, with ultimate development of a further two such berths to a total of seven.

This merely carries on what has been done in the past. There has, however, been a change of concept and this is readily recognised. The committee has gone into great detail regarding the acquisition of the storage facilities for bulk cargo in the beach area and the suggestion made concerns me greatly. I would like to touch on it briefly. The committee talks about this area and the necessity to minimise the amount to be found by the Government and suggests that the cost be spread over many years.

This, of course, greatly concerns the people living in the area, because if the cost is spread over many years it could

mean that the bulk storage zone will be spread over the road and into the residential area which will mean that the people in that area will be adversely affected.

I stress the necessity for early purchase of the properties involved. One way to achieve this end—and this would be most helpful—would be for the Government, through the Minister for Lands, to grant the request made by the Shire of Rockingham to permit the land asked for to be used for a village for elderly citizens. This is a most worthy cause and would greatly help the people concerned. With the assistance they would receive from the Commonwealth they would have sufficient money to help them establish themselves in such a village.

The member for Avon was concerned about the future of the Co-operative Bulk Handling establishment and he will therefore be interested in a comment made in the report when it refers to the loading of alumina. The report states—

In this respect the Alcoa plant at Coogee comes in for a great deal of public criticism on the grounds of atmospheric pollution during ship loading, so that it must be expected that daily transfer of bulk alumina cargoes from rail to storage bins at Kwinana would also invite much more criticism if it is abruptly superimposed on an existing residential complex.

This supports my move for a full investigation. The comment to which I have referred is contradictory because it will mean the alumina being shipped from a more sensitive area. The homes in question should be paid for now. The member for Cockburn and I have supported this proposition for a long time. Those concerned will need to be phased out and the necessary conditions should be written into the arrangements that are likely to be made.

In answer to a question the Minister for Works said that land acquisition would cost an estimated \$2,500,000. The report shows, however, that it will be \$3,500,000. Such an amount will not be easy to find even by a Government which talks in millions.

We must give far more detailed thought to the entire matter and show plainly what can be done to help the people get out of the area involved.

Reference is also made in the report to many other matters, such as the South Coogee shipyards and the necessity to consolidate the existing shipbuilding site. The report mentions the rezoning of the area from industrial to urban. I do feel that this whole matter should be rethought, because it could inhibit one of our greatest industrial establishments; apart from which I cannot see that there will be a very happy future for the people who will have to live in that situation, and in the

interests of the quality of living that they should enjoy I trust that this complex will be placed in another area.

This is a further reason that members should support my motion. The passenger transport system to Rockingham was also mentioned; it is part of the big move forward. One important aspect is the need to provide for the port in industrial services and the committee lists the items in question as follows:—

Container Terminals  
Container Cleaning  
Cold Stores  
Engineering and Electrical Workshops  
Wire Splicers  
Foundries  
Pallet Manufacture (and etc.)

There is a recommendation to the effect that this needs to be given consideration now; that it should not be left for a long time—the decision should be made now.

There is no actual nomination of the land in this report and accordingly I suggest that this also provides a reason for supporting my suggestion that the whole matter must be rethought and considered now, because of the considerable and extensive facilities that must be provided but which are not provided for by the land available now.

If consideration is given to this aspect immediately the people concerned will be able to accept their commitments and develop their areas as they think they should be developed; they should not have all these problems superimposed on them at a later date, thus inhibiting them in their planning.

These points are very necessary to the whole concept of development and they should be considered now in the master plan. The Minister for Works will no doubt be pleased when I refer to the great amount of information he presented to me yesterday. I do this because it represents a further facet of the entire presentation of the case.

Numerous reports have been prepared for consideration by the Fremantle Port Authority by Environmental Resources (Australia) Pty. Ltd. There is a tremendous amount of data available but unfortunately I have not been able to study this in detail in the limited time that has been available to me. I do, however, have information provided in the report of June, 1971, concerning the effect of industrial waste being discharged into Cockburn Sound.

I will cite a few brief comments which are relative to the issue before us. I have referred to the people who are to live in this area, and I have touched on its industrial future; but this aspect of the report

briefly relates to how important the sound itself is, and I have not yet mentioned it. The introduction to the report states—

This report is based on evidence obtained during a study of the ecosystem of Cockburn Sound which was made on behalf of the Fremantle Port Authority during 1970-1971. The investigation was made to establish the biological base line for a future ecological monitoring programme because the Authority recognised the growing need to retain maximum benefit from a multi purpose use of the Sound and its immediate environs for . . .

It then gives an indication of the considerations to which the Fremantle Port Authority is directing its attention. Briefly, this is the list—

(a) Development as a viable port facility.

Obviously, without a satisfactory Cockburn Sound we cannot have a viable port for very long. Continuing—

(b) Increased industrial use of both the foreshore and near-shore zones.

(c) Increased recreational use by an expanding general public for:—

- (1) Sunbathing.
- (2) Swimming.
- (3) Sailing.
- (4) Water ski-ing.
- (5) Skin Diving.
- (6) Sport fishing.
- (7) General aesthetic relaxation.

From those brief words we can get an indication that the Fremantle Port Authority is conscious of its obligation and is setting out to ensure the future of this area generally from its point of view—although I am submitting that we should look at it in a broader sense—and that it is very conscious indeed of what the viability of Cockburn Sound means to the authority.

In this report there is also a heading "General Conclusions and Discussion". I would like to quote some of these conclusions for the information of members. They read as follows:—

If Cockburn Sound is to be used for recreational purposes in addition to its requirement as an industrial complex and harbour facility, then:—

(a) Present and future industry will have to install treatment facilities for waste recovery before effluent is voided to the Sound.

(b) Studies will need to be made as to the degree of treatment required and the possible relocation of some outfall sites.

- (c) Basic considerations of the hydrology and geomorphology of the area will need to be assessed on factual data before further land is alienated for industrial and urban development along the foreshore zone.

That is a recommendation from this very comprehensive report. Briefly, this is just another form of emphasis of what we should consider when we think of the future of this area as a grand concept.

Turning now to a more detailed consideration of the issue, I have listed certain items, the first of which deals with the future of towns like Rockingham. I mention Rockingham because it is in the forefront when giving consideration to this area. Also, of course, the towns of Calista, Medina, and others have to be considered. I have indicated that growth is anticipated in these areas and therefore the future of the people in these towns is bound up in the statements I have made as to what is likely to happen. Therefore any future activities are important not only to Rockingham but also to all the other communities in the vicinity. This is another reason that we must have this investigation with a view to evolving a master plan; it will ensure that the future of all these people is protected.

Having mentioned that Rockingham and the areas in the immediate vicinity are tied up with everything that is done in Cockburn Sound—although Rockingham will be the area that will be affected the most—I would now like to touch on the future of Point Peron. On the 28th October, 1971, the Premier made a grand announcement of his intentions in regard to the future of the lessees on the Point Peron Reserve. All members are aware that the Premier, over the years, has obtained tremendous political mileage from the announcements he has made about Point Peron. He has said that the people who hold leases at Point Peron will have them extended for 21 years. This of course is disregarding the complete objection by the local authority which deplores this action, and it is contrary to the recommendations of the M.R.P.A.

In this report which I have before me the Premier also goes on to say that those bodies that have not renewed their leases in the way that they should must expect their current leases to expire on the 31st October, 1972. It is interesting to see what effect this announcement will have on those who hold leases at present but who are unable to renew them. What amazes me is what one can obtain by way of answers to questions, and what one can achieve by way of inquiry. I might mention that the recommendations in regard to Point Peron were made by a man who is not even connected with an organisation that holds a lease on the Point Peron Reserve.

It is also interesting to learn the names of the organisations that will continue to hold leases, and the names of those who will have their leases terminated as a result of the arrangements made by the Premier. Many people have said that what the Premier has done is in return for the good political mileage he has received. This is rather a sad situation when we realise how the circumstances affect the local community, and how his decision will affect the general recreation facilities available for all the people living in the area.

The organisations which will benefit from the consideration that has been shown to them by the Premier because they have sufficient funds to develop their blocks are as follows:—

National Fitness Camp  
Education Department Camp  
War Blinded Ex-Servicemen  
Caledonian Pipe Band  
Royal Perth Hospital  
Engineers Social Club  
Apex  
Postal Institute  
L. & S. Recreation Centre  
Waterside Workers Federation  
Sister Kate's Homes  
Seamen's Union  
Point Peron Aquatic Youth and Family Association  
Swan Brewery Social Club  
East Fremantle Football Social Club  
Federation of Police and Citizens Youth Clubs  
Boans Sporting and Social Club  
Churches of Christ

The bodies that will have their leases terminated are—

Church of England Boys Society  
Methodist Missions  
Young Christian Workers  
Methodist Young Peoples Department  
Guild of Undergraduates  
East Perth Football Social Club  
Apostolic Church  
Air Force Association  
Baptist Union  
Architectural Students Association.  
Australian Broadcasting Commission  
Social Club

One can realise the seriousness of this decision, because there are many deserving bodies that do not have their names on the list of those that have had their leases renewed; they happen to be welfare organisations and do not have sufficient money to develop the blocks. The clubs and organisations that have won the day are to have their leases extended until 1993 and this in an area which the M.R.P.A. says should be made available to the general public.

What has brought this situation to a head has been the erection of the three wharves at Point Peron, but the shire is trying to remedy the situation. I led a deputation to the Minister to put forward

our views and he presented our case to Cabinet, which rejected it. I have put forward another request to the Minister that he meet another deputation, but to date he has not had time to answer it. When we consider all the political mileage the Premier has gained from the statements he has made concerning Point Peron, one must reflect on the promises he made. One was that he would have the sewerage plant at Point Peron shifted, but we have now reached the stage where we have been told that another site cannot be found for it which, I suppose, we must accept when one considers all the aspects associated with the problem.

It is regrettable that this area has been the subject of such controversy and it only emphasises again the need for the whole area to be investigated by an expert and independent body to ascertain what should be done. I believe that if the Government has not renewed the leases and has not gone too far it should stay its hand until the whole position is resolved. So much for Point Peron.

The next matter I want to refer to is the future of the beaches. This has been raised before and, once again, the Premier made promises as to their total preservation. Industry has already encroached as far as Hymus Street. This is something that a change in concept has brought about and is another reason, even at this late hour, for my advocating that we should hold a full inquiry to ensure that everything is done to preserve, protect, and develop the beaches in the Rockingham area to provide recreation and a way of life that everyone desires. It is obvious that an inquiry is needed now. It is easy to see that the wharf development will continue to extend to the north, and even though one accepts that Rockingham will change in the future we should know what the future holds for the people residing in the area.

There is a great need to hold an inquiry because of the industrial residues that will be generated in the Kwinana industrial complex and because of the need to move to other areas the people who are occupying 200 homes that will be resumed. The Government needs to move very quickly to attend to the needs of these people and the holding of an immediate inquiry will give consideration to their future.

We have been given an undertaking that in the future there is the prospect of a steelmill being established in 1978. That, in itself, will be a big step forward and will reflect on economic conditions throughout the State, because greater employment will be generated from the establishment of such a mill. Therefore, to my mind, the provisions for industry generally need to be carefully studied and dovetailed with all the activities that will take place in this area in the future. The efforts required to be made should be

streamlined in order to bring about maximum benefit not only to the people of the State but to Australia as a whole.

I now wish to deal with the Fremantle Port Authority and its port installations. Surveys have been made which indicate that the site recommended is in fact the best that can be obtained, but we have seen earlier submissions by the Fremantle Port Authority that this site could have been in another place. I feel that the views of an independent specialist should be obtained to consider all these aspects. For instance it could well be that the placement of stage 1 of the harbour installations in the position suggested could mean that the viability of the whole port would be inhibited. This is an aspect that should be studied now.

I have had confusing answers to questions that I have asked in regard to the Environmental Protection Authority and the investigation that it made. I think we need more than this. I think we need the services of a specialist in this field who could make an independent report. Whilst it has been explained to me and to other members what the position is in principle, now is the time when it should be investigated thoroughly and reported upon. It would indeed be a sad loss if this area was inhibited through a wrong decision and because of economic expediency the effectiveness of the whole area was reduced, thus jeopardising its grand future, which is what we are looking forward to.

I am not referring to the environmental aspect only; I am thinking of the whole concept. I am thinking of the area in terms of shipping needs and the conservation of all those things that need to be considered in such a scheme.

I now come to the question of naval facilities. In regard to this aspect I am disappointed with the performance of the Government. I think every member has the right to expect that the Government should state clearly what its views are in regard to this facility. I have asked questions about it that have not been answered. I think we can get far better results. I decry the thought that there is an attempt by the Government to take political advantage of this naval base.

When the Prime Minister was in America it was suggested that other nations would use the base, and the Premier was reported as having said he had not been consulted on the issue. This was not very promising for the future. I have taken a keen interest in Garden Island and I believe a fully-developed naval facility should be established there. Having visited the H.M.A.S. *Melbourne* recently at the invitation of the Navy, I am more than ever convinced that we should not compromise regarding what can be achieved.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking.



Mr. RUSHTON: The State Government had a grand opportunity to draw up a plan in accordance with its desires and to co-ordinate its industrial development in the area. The Fremantle Port Authority had indicated it was desirous of utilising Garden Island. However, the State Government departmental officers who made submissions to the Commonwealth Standing Committee emphasised that they believe the Commonwealth Government should be responsible for looking after Garden Island. Our officers made recommendations concerning the protection of flora and fauna, and they also requested that a large area of the beach be available to the public. However, the officers were unable to say how the beach could be retained for the public. This decision was left to the Commonwealth.

I believe this would have been a grand opportunity—and this is the basis of my urgency regarding the motion—for the State Government with the Commonwealth to consider in detail the best way to utilise the area for the public without inhibiting the naval facility. However, this was not done because provision is not being made for ship maintenance facilities in the area. Apparently the Commonwealth has included in its plans provision for facilities of this nature, and the State Government has merely made the bold statement that the facilities are to be provided by the Commonwealth. The answer I received to a question indicated that this was a Commonwealth decision; but the Commonwealth has made no decision. When I listened to the submissions at the inquiry, it was clearly indicated that the Commonwealth had given no consideration at all to the matter. This, in itself, is very worrying.

I hope that even at this late hour the Premier will state emphatically where the State Government stands in relation to the naval facilities. We cannot be halfhearted about this aspect if we expect to participate in all the other advantages which will be made available. The Government must decide how we can cater for industry and shipping.

The Fremantle Port Authority is gravely concerned about this aspect. We are all involved because the viability of the sound must first of all be considered, and without a close joint relationship with the Commonwealth nothing much will be achieved. This will be the case also if we play politics in considering all the issues at stake. As I said earlier, the attempts made to shoot the Prime Minister down when he was in America does not give a very good impression.

A thorough research into all aspects involving Cockburn Sound has been made by the Commonwealth. This is a distinct advantage to us. I agree with the remarks made by the Deputy Premier when he was referred to the Kwinana committee being

augmented for research and the making of recommendations involving the Kwinana area. A few more personnel have been included on the committee, and while I commend the Deputy Premier for his efforts in this regard, I must say that it is not the answer we are seeking in the motion.

I am urging that a master plan be established for the whole region, not a piecemeal plan. The research must be carried out on a grand scale and in such a manner as to ensure that progress will be continuous. We must not be faced with the necessity to abandon one scheme and start all over again on a fresh one. We must ensure at the very beginning that our concept is right. We must establish the background to all the issues so that we do not get caught in the future. We do not want decisions to be made and then find we are in trouble, as was the case with regard to the freeway when difficulty was experienced with resumptions. Any plan for Cockburn Sound must be implemented without any hitches because the area is tremendously important to the industry of the State and it will play a big role.

I come now to paragraph (h) of my motion which reads—

- (h) provision for a major commercial dry dock, ship survey, building and repair facilities jointly with or independent of Navy facilities;

An important issue is at stake. The following article appeared in *The West Australian* of the 16th March this year:—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, has said that the W.A. Government is making representations to the Commonwealth in relation to Cockburn Sound development, but he has not revealed the nature of them.

According to the submission made to the Standing Committee, no such statement was made. No communication had been made regarding the dry dock facilities and so on. The suggestion was a surprise to the committee. This is another very good reason for supporting a full inquiry and investigation by an independent qualified source. All aspects of our State's future must be fully considered.

The last paragraph of my motion is "Transport facilities." Obviously if adequate transport facilities are not available the development of the whole area will be jeopardised. A plan has already been devised for a railway line through to Mangles Bay, but it is obvious this must be designed in greater detail. The railway marshalling yards have been developed and planned to a certain degree but again these, too, must be upgraded. Adequate passenger transport services must be established. Transport could be one of the major developments in the area and must be carefully considered in order that no holdup occurs.

So, I seek the support of the Government and members generally for my motion. I hope that in the presentation of my speech I have given sufficient information on the serious issues involved to enable members to realise the subject must not be taken lightly or dealt with piecemeal. The whole concept has been changed with the establishment of the naval facilities. Further research is necessary.

To summarise my reasons for seeking support for my motion, it is essential the very best use and placement of our natural and man-made resources be achieved to ensure that quality living conditions are provided for the large population which will be dependent on local work, housing, recreation, industry, and services, and because population in turn will contribute tremendously to the well-being of our State and the Commonwealth as a whole. I commend the motion to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

## RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

### *Guidelines: Motion*

MR. REID (Blackwood) [8.10 p.m.]: I move—

- (1) That the Minister for Agriculture take immediate action to give greater flexibility of funds between debt reconstruction and farm build-up.
- (2) That the Minister should give immediate approval for funds from rural reconstruction to be made available to sons of farmers for assistance to purchase family properties.
- (3) That the Minister instruct the rural reconstruction authority to use more realistic product valuations when assessing farm viability.
- (4) That rejected applicants be reconsidered under the suggested improved guidelines.

In discussing rural reconstruction we must consider the events which are responsible for the present position. Undoubtedly, what occurred in the 1960s led to a steadily declining or deteriorating situation in agriculture, resulting in a number of protest meetings in the late 1960s, culminating in a big one at Perry Lakes Stadium.

The position was that farmers were asking for low-interest long-term loans—nothing more and nothing less. They were asking for recognition of a very worrying and deteriorating situation. It is most important that we recognise this fact and realise the motives behind the establishment of the Rural Reconstruction Authority. During the 1960s farmers engaged in a fair amount of agitation. However, the passage of time has revealed the justification for their actions.

I was somewhat concerned to hear the member for Fremantle refer to the farmers' complaints as the "cockies' lament." The following appears on page 391 of *Hansard* for the 29th March, this year:—

In returning to the subject of farmers, I do not want to offend them, but I get a little sick of the "cockies' lament." I listened to a rendering of it the other evening by the Leader of the Country Party. Our Government has been in office for only a short time and yet thousands of dollars have been spent in country areas to help local authorities. A special fund has been created for that purpose and the Government is doing the best it can.

I interjected at that stage to say that Commonwealth money was being spent. However, the point is that the grizzling farmers responsible for the "cockies' lament" were justified in their complaints because they were going through a period when their troubles should have been recognised.

To me the lament, without any shadow of doubt, is that the conditions were not recognised because they are responsible for the lack of confidence in the economy today, not only in Western Australia, but throughout Australia as a whole. It has been proved in the past that when agriculture is "sick" or is "sickening" the economy of the nation as a whole is seriously affected. I suppose it was very difficult to accept that the situation was as serious as it really was, but we must do so.

Returning to the developments leading to the establishment of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme, the primary producers in Australia regard the scheme as a lifeboat in their long-term plan for stability of purpose and operations. When discussing rural reconstruction, it is important that this point be remembered. No further schemes are available to salvage the industry or cater for its reconstruction. We must therefore accept that this is a last-ditch endeavour to support the rural situation.

I urge as many farmers as possible who think they need assistance to make application for rural reconstruction loans. I know the scheme has received much publicity but I think in its early stages the farmers had certain fears and there was a certain amount of stigma attached to those who applied for loans. Farmers feared that if they were turned down by the authority perhaps they would be labelled as hopeless cases by their bankers and receive no further assistance. The stigma was perhaps natural enough and farmers felt that if they again made application and were rejected they would be regarded by their fellow farmers as beyond all hope. I am glad this image has diminished somewhat and now the approach towards rural reconstruction is much better and more open-minded. Farmers

generally see it as a means of supporting their operations and something which will give them breathing space in which to consolidate. The description "lifeboat operation" is quite apt, because a lifeboat holds someone up and keeps him afloat until further assistance comes along.

I would like to make one comment which supports the farmers' effect on the economy. I quote from the second page of the *Bank of New South Wales Review* of March, 1972, which states—

Although the tone of the wool market was stronger after the resumption of auctions in January, the still unsatisfactory returns from wool have dominated the rural scene and have contributed to the current hesitation in business activity. The serious plight of wool has brought into question the economic future of large tracts of sheep grazing land where it is not feasible to switch to meat production or marketable crops.

This is an important aspect of rural reconstruction and is one of the points we must keep in mind. Primarily the scheme was brought to fruition to assist the wool industry and, of course, all other aspects of agriculture. I emphasise that the wool industry was the primary reason for its introduction.

The split-up between debt reconstruction and farm build-up moneys is an element which is causing more than its fair share of confusion to bank managers, politicians, and all other members of the community who are concerned with rural reconstruction. There is a need for the Minister clearly to indicate exactly how the funds are distributed and how much flexibility he will allow. I think this need is highlighted by various statements we have seen recently in the Press. I shall mention some of them because they illustrate the point I am trying to make. *The West Australian* of the 6th April, 1972, carries an article under the heading, "\$56m. in Rural Aid in 1972-73." It is a report on a meeting of the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Agriculture held in Sydney on the 5th April. It says, in part—

The meeting agreed to maintain the provision under which half the funds will be used for farm consolidation and half for debt reconstruction.

[At previous meetings the States sought to amend the formula so that more money could be made available for debt reconstruction.]

In *The West Australian* of the 17th April, which was last Monday, there appeared an editorial under the heading, "Farm finance." It says, in part—

The general objective of a 50-50 split will be maintained but the States may now use build-up money for debt reconstruction as long as all reasonable build-up propositions are approved.

Without doubt, considerable confusion exists in this field. What is meant by certain articles which we read in the newspapers and certain statements made by the Minister? The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair) has been quoted as holding views along the lines I have read out, but he does not say that funds will be available for debt reconstruction. It is the responsibility of the States which operate the scheme to clear up this point.

One of the tasks of the Rural Reconstruction Authority is to enter into negotiations and clearly to assess how a person's position rests at the time he makes application. Perhaps the pressure of work has been too heavy or perhaps the authority's staff is simply not large enough, but I do not believe thorough examinations have been undertaken.

We hear many conflicting reports of people making application to the authority, being rejected, and returning to their bank managers who, initially, had advised them to make application to the authority. In short, these farmers are being given the run around. I would like to mention the example of a person who made application to the Rural Reconstruction Authority for assistance on the 29th December last. He received advice on the 22nd February, by way of a letter which I shall read to the House. It says—

Your property is not heavily committed and the finance you are seeking should be obtainable from normal sources which, of course, would include the Commonwealth Development Bank.

This man went to his private bank in the first place but was refused assistance. He has gone to considerable expense to submit an application for a rural reconstruction loan, because these applications are costly to fill in. He has now been refused assistance by the Rural Reconstruction Authority and advised to approach the normal banking channels for finance, including the Commonwealth Development Bank. On the 13th April he received advice from the Commonwealth Development Bank saying—

We have given your request for finance careful consideration but regret we are unable to provide the assistance requested.

This man has now asked me what he is to do next. He has been down the whole line, as it were.

This is something which is certainly confusing bank managers in country areas and, naturally, most farmers heed their advice. The bank managers do not really know what is happening and this position is most unsatisfactory.

The costs of the administration of the scheme are a State responsibility. I strongly suggest that more staff should

be employed by the authority so that applications will be dealt with more speedily, effectively, and efficiently. The backlog of applications at the commencement of the scheme may have prompted quicker rejection of applications which were more complex and detailed and, perhaps, readier acceptance of applications which were more clear-cut in detail.

The number of rejections that we have witnessed and the number of applicants who have been successful when they have reapplied clearly demonstrates that not enough investigation is undertaken in the initial survey. I immediately ask: What happens to rejected applicants who become despondent and do not reapply? From the questions I asked in the House yesterday I ascertained that only 355 out of 1,155 applicants have been successful. This means that 800 farmers have been rejected. We cannot divorce this from the Rural Reconstruction Scheme as clearly it is a part of it. After all, the scheme has been undertaken as a lifeboat operation and farmers clearly look to it as their last chance. I hasten to add that it is not a handout but a loan on longer terms and at a lower interest rate which has to be repaid. What will happen to the 800 farmers who have been rejected out of the 1,155 who applied? This, in itself, is a serious human problem of considerable magnitude.

In his policy speech last year the Premier said—

I pledge my Party to face up to all farmers' problems, especially debt problems.

Mr. Brown: And he has done a good job, too.

Mr. REID: What has he done?

Mr. Brown: You are only talking from supposition.

Mr. REID: What has he done?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The honourable member knows very well what has been done.

Mr. W. G. Young: A question is asked, but no answer is given.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The honourable member knows what has been done if he will be honest.

Mr. REID: I do not know.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Rubbish!

Mr. REID: What has been done?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The Minister for Agriculture will answer you in due course, make no mistake about that.

Mr. Court: We will be agog to hear.

Mr. REID: The Premier also said in his policy speech—

We propose to endeavour to institute a form of payment from the Treasury to the farmer to bring his nett income

to the stated minimum. In this way, farmers with no real alternatives—

I interpolate here to say that the 800 farmers whose applications have been rejected fall into this category. He continued—

—would not be forced to leave their farms or endure income-shrinking poverty.

What has the Government done?

Mr. Rushton: Nothing.

Mr. Nalder: Many farmers have had to walk off their farms.

Mr. REID: I say nothing has been done.

Mr. Lewis: This is only the second year of the Government's term of office!

Mr. REID: The Premier has pledged his party to face up to all farmers' problems, especially debt problems.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What would be the total sum involved with the 800 farmers? Secondly, there must be regard for the special loans that have been made over the last two years.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The member for Blackwood would not know.

Mr. REID: I have all the details of the Rural Reconstruction Authority up to date and I will deal with them in a moment. I have figures which indicate the amount that has been approved, the amount budgeted, and the amount paid out, which is somewhat alarming in its smallness at this time. I do not have the figures to enable me to know what would be the total sum involved with the 800 farmers whose applications were rejected. We must remember that, with odd exceptions, a farmer would not apply to the Rural Reconstruction Authority unless he were very worried about the situation. I am sure the Minister for Agriculture would agree with me that a large percentage of the 800 applicants were in need of help or they would not have applied.

Mr. H. D. Evans: One of the criteria of eligibility is that no other source of finance is available.

Mr. REID: That is right. The man to whom I have referred particularly went to his bank and was refused finance.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Of the 800 rejected applicants not one could be made viable. Are you advocating that no matter what the circumstances a farmer is in, he should be kept in operation?

Mr. REID: Of course I am not.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This is the implication.

Mr. REID: The point I am making is that the man in question has not received assistance from his bank, the Commonwealth Development Bank, or the authority. He has told me how much he owes.

This farmer was walking down the street some years ago and the bank manager came out and said, "Money is fairly free now. Would you like a loan to clear that block I knocked you back on last year?" The farmer accepted the small loan for this purpose. Just recently the bank manager saw him again and said, "Come inside. We want that loan cleared up in three years."

Mr. Hartrey: It is a wonder he did not say three days.

Mr. REID: The point I am making is: While things are rosy in the garden everything is okay. However, as soon as things are not so rosy the banks want the money back straight away. There is a loss of confidence.

A farmer will go to his bank manager and say, "I need some debt reconstruction." When the bank manager turns him down, he goes to the Rural Reconstruction Authority, and it costs him something like \$60 to fill in the form and then he is knocked back.

Mr. Bickerton: Your argument should be against the bank manager.

Mr. REID: No, my argument is that the Rural Reconstruction Authority told him to apply to his normal source of finance. He applied to his own bank and also to the Commonwealth Development Bank.

Mr. Hartrey: My argument is that the bank will lend you an umbrella when the sun shines and want it back when it rains.

Mr. REID: That is very good—that was the sentence I was looking for.

Mr. Williams: The member for Boulder-Dundas is always helpful.

Mr. REID: There is need for a much closer examination of claims by the Rural Reconstruction Authority. This is the main objective from the Commonwealth's viewpoint. However, the authority says that the applicant must investigate all avenues for obtaining finance—banks, finance houses, or any other source which the farmer can use.

After the farmer has been knocked back again, he relodges his application. Nothing has changed. If we look at the statistics, the chances of a farmer being successful on a reapplication are the same as those of a person first applying for assistance—about one in three. This is a worrying aspect because of the very points I referred to earlier in the debate—the fear of being labelled as a no-hoper and the necessity to make a last-ditch bid for assistance, in this case to the Rural Reconstruction Authority. The farmer may also feel he runs the risk of being left with a stigma and he will put his tail down and not reapply. Of course he should have the courage of his convictions and dig in and fight, and eventually he may be accepted. This is a wrong attitude.

If a farmer makes an application for assistance the application should be thoroughly and completely investigated before it is rejected.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Are you implying this is not done now?

Mr. REID: I am saying there is not sufficient investigation.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Some applications have been revised five times, and certainly a considerable number four times. This has involved the authority in a tremendous amount of work. The method of assessing applications is certainly not as you would suggest. You are casting a slur on a most efficient and dedicated group.

Mr. REID: I am not casting a slur.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Yes, you are.

Mr. REID: I am saying that the staff of the Rural Reconstruction Authority should be used efficiently to enable further investigations to be made. I realise the members of the authority are responsible gentlemen.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is the main difficulty? What is the hold-up in dealing with matters where security is involved?

Mr. REID: The whole purpose of this debate is to give the Minister an opportunity to make a statement on the situation. The members on this side of the House have been trying for many months to determine the workings of the Rural Reconstruction Authority. If the Minister deigns to speak to this motion, he has a wonderful opportunity clearly to state the position. This is not an attack on the Rural Reconstruction Authority.

Mr. Bickerton: The whole purpose of this motion is to make political kudos out of a national calamity.

Mr. Court: He is entitled to credit if he is doing a good job.

Mr. REID: Not everyone does as the Minister would do. I have been concerned from the very inception of the Rural Reconstruction Authority. The members of my party are concerned that everything possible is not being done. We realise this is our chance to rebuild the agricultural industry of Australia. The Minister for Housing can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. Bickerton: He has already done that.

Mr. Nalder: He is running true to form.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. REID: I hope the Minister in his speech will also clear up the confusion over interest charges. I would like to quote from the back of an application form where it says—

The interest rate to be charged will be flexible and may be varied within the duration of the loan between 4 and 6½ per cent. The maximum repayment period will be 20 years.

In answer to a question I asked yesterday, the Minister said that debt reconstruction was lent out at 4 per cent. Are the words on the application form correct, or is my interpretation at fault? If the interest rate to be charged is to be flexible and range between 4 and 6½ per cent., how can it average 4 per cent.?

These are some of the questions we are asked as members of Parliament. What is the interest rate charged? We have not as yet received a direction from the Minister. In reply to the question he states that the interest rate is 4 per cent.

We also know from the Commonwealth direction that it is a prerequisite of the scheme that the interest shall be 4 per cent. for debt reconstruction but it can average between 2 and 6 per cent. I would say that quite obviously there is a mistake in the wording on the application form. One cannot have a varying interest rate between 4 and 6½ per cent. and still average 4 per cent. This is another point which needs clarification by the Minister.

Looking at the situation of the available funds, we find that of the \$100,000,000 allocated from the Commonwealth to all States, Western Australia's share was \$14,630,000. From this we can easily work out that Western Australia is to receive 14.63 per cent. of the total. Also, \$400,000 or thereabouts of the farmers' debt adjustment fund was to be added to the scheme. Hence assistance to Western Australia is to total \$15,030,000. On the 5th April, as reported in the Press, the Commonwealth made further advances to the States to the tune of \$15,000,000 and \$3,000,000. This is a total of \$18,000,000 to allow some carry-on finance to States heavily committed for the 1972-73 season. Western Australia's share of this total works out at about \$2,200,000 at 14.63 per cent. If we add that to the \$15,030,000 we have a total of \$17,230,000.

I am sure all members of this House will welcome the release of the information that the Commonwealth and the States agreed that the initial fund of \$100,000,000—actually \$118,000,000—be allocated over a two-year period rather than a four-year period.

Let us look at the position of the allocations in Western Australia as at the 31st March. We have approved \$6,600,000 for debt reconstruction and \$1,600,000 for farm build-up. This is a tremendous difference. The actual advances at this time are \$2,200,000. The total approval is \$8,200,000, and \$2,200,000 has been paid out.

The points I made earlier are still valid. I say there is a need to speed up the process of handing over this money once it is approved. I know there are various necessary legalities; nevertheless the whole process is too slow. The advance rate is 400 per cent. behind the approval rate.

It is the State's responsibility to administer the scheme. Perhaps we need a larger staff on the authority in Western Australia. I have proved that for various reasons the administrative staff should be increased.

The budget advance to Western Australia for the 1971-72 season is \$6,900,000. By banking practice this begins to look a little unhealthy as we have already approved payment of \$8,200,000. However, we must realise that the Commonwealth made an additional grant of \$2,200,000 to Western Australia. Our budget plus the advance gives us a total of \$9,100,000 for this year. We have already committed \$8,200,000 to the end of the March quarter. We are now left with \$900,000 for the last three months. There is concern in the country districts that the money is running out. On a 50-50 basis, the money for debt reconstruction has run out a long while ago.

On Tuesday, the 18th April, the Leader of the Country Party asked the Minister for Agriculture the following question:—

Is it correct that Western Australia has already spent approximately 50% of the available funds for debt reconstruction?

And the answer was "No." This answer is confusing. Perhaps we have spent 51 per cent. or 49 per cent. of the available funds. The Leader of the Country Party asked a valid question which clearly illustrates the fears in the community that we are running out of money for debt reconstruction.

Returning to our budget of \$900,000 for the remaining three months of the financial year, we must also face the fact that we have only \$8,100,000 for the year 1972-73, and I believe the Commonwealth has laid down strict instructions that the States must adhere to their budgetary submissions.

These are the facts, and one can understand that a farmer does not feel very optimistic in seeking an advance for debt reconstruction. Indeed, some of the bank managers now tell the farmers, "See if you can switch your claim around to farm build-up as you would have a better chance." Whether or not this is true I do not know. I am not in a position to know, but the situation is certainly very worrying, and needs clarification by the Minister.

I would like to move on to the second part of my motion which reads—

That the Minister should give immediate approval for funds from rural reconstruction to be made available to sons of farmers for assistance to purchase family properties.

This is an issue which deserves considerable discussion.

An area which is most important and should be considered is that in the past the scheme has precluded those who, I think, are in most need of assistance; namely, the sons of farmers. It is an area of concern that sons of farmers are precluded from assistance for farm build-up to purchase family properties under the Rural Reconstruction Scheme.

If we cast our minds back over the century and examine the history of farm schemes in Western Australia we find that some have been successful, but unfortunately there have been more failures than successes. First of all there was the Group Settlement Scheme which was introduced after World War I. I am sure this scheme was conceived with the right motives and intent; but it placed process workers from the Midlands of England straight into the karri forests of Manjimup in the south-west. The Minister would know better than I do, because probably he had more of these people in his area, that the fallout or mortality rate was tremendous. The intention of the scheme was good and it was desirable in an effort to develop the farmlands of Western Australia; but the actual application of the scheme failed. That is a point we must remember when we consider the present scheme.

The next scheme was the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. Perhaps not as great a percentage failed in this case, but certainly a greater percentage failed than would normally be expected. If anything I think this proves conclusively that those who are in the occupation concerned—whatever it may be; in this case it is farming—are the ones who should receive the most help. They are experienced and they have the greatest chance of success.

The Rural Reconstruction Scheme precludes the sons of farmers from obtaining loans to buy their fathers' properties. I think this is highlighted in a paper by Mr. John W. Longworth of the University of Queensland, presented to the annual conference of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society in February. I would like to quote from page 14 of that paper where he says—

In this connection there is an aspect of the Commonwealth Rural Reconstruction Scheme which deserves urgent review. The state authorities administering the scheme are in a position to require the inter-generational transfer of control as a prerequisite for providing assistance. However, they are not prepared to lend money at concessional rates of interest to facilitate this transfer. In other words, a son cannot borrow money for a farm build-up scheme if that scheme entails buying land from his father. In terms of both equity and efficiency it would frequently be in the interests

of everyone to allow the older man to withdraw his capital and retire with dignity.

I believe that is one of the reasons we are in danger of losing from the land today the farming skills of tomorrow. Quite clearly these cases fall into two categories. In the first category we have the father and son or sons of a growing family, gradually reaching maturity. The farm is a one-unit viable farm. The son wishes to marry and as he has no access to funds a decision must be made as to who shall stay on the farm. The father is probably advancing in years and would like to retire and live in a town, taking a back seat and helping out occasionally. However, he finds that his son has no access to sufficient funds to enable the father to move off the farm and be supported.

As a result of some paper valuations the father is precluded from drawing any age pension. So often we find the most unfortunate situation of the son deciding that he will leave the land because the choice is between the father and the boy. So the father who would like to retire finds that he must carry on. The son moves to the city in order to obtain another job, because the job opportunities are in the city. Where can one get a job in country areas today? It is becoming increasingly hard. The city is getting bigger and bigger; seven out of 10 people live in the city so the employment opportunities must be greater.

Mr. Jones: It has been like that for some time, has it not?

Mr. REID: I am not saying it has not; but it is getting worse and the situation is serious with regard to the agricultural outlook of the future. I do not think there is any need for us to try to create incentives to help this trend. The member for Collie probably would recognise that point. I feel we should do everything in our power to alleviate this position because it could affect the successful operation of the scheme.

Surely in the workings of the scheme we should be able to ensure that the father and the son receive a fair deal. This would make for a successful scheme and it would also alleviate a tremendous amount of hardship, sorrow, and anguish. For how long have farmers cried out for access to long-term, low-interest rates? These are necessary in the inter-generational changing of hands of farming land and property.

The second category is, perhaps, the result of a decision made some years ago when the rural horizons were a little brighter than they are now. I refer to those cases where the son undertakes to buy out the father. We must remember that in most cases in old age the only equity farmers have is their property. Let us assume that the son is half way towards paying his father for the farm so

that the father may live comfortably and the son is working hard to support both himself and his father. This is where the squeeze has caught farmers because often the son has been prepared to have a go and borrow when things are fairly stable—and, also, under the guidance of qualified officers—and suddenly he finds things have turned sour in the agricultural field.

The son still has his commitments, and he still must support his father who is living in the town. Yet the son is unable, because of the criteria laid down, to qualify for assistance. Suddenly he cannot manage to continue to pay his father. We are precluding him from assistance for farm build-up or debt reconstruction. I say these cases need urgent review.

I would like to discuss parts (3) and (4) of my motion together. We find that we have a fluctuating agricultural scene—or price commodity might be a better description. Only recently the movement in the price of wool clearly demonstrated the tremendous fluctuation in prices for commodities produced to which those in the farming community are subjected. I think this could be one of the reasons that many farm management services were not as successful as they might have been, or did not continue for as long as they might have done. From time immemorial we have been trying to work out budgets for farming. Not only does one run the gauntlet of price fluctuation, but also the gauntlet of nature. One has only to have a fire or a hail storm—which occurred almost within a matter of days of each other only recently—to ruin a farm property, let alone a farming budget, financially.

Some doubt exists about product valuations in the activities of the Rural Reconstruction Authority. Surely the figure which would have been put on my wool clip last August, when wool was at its lowest ebb, would vary from the figure which would be put on it today. It must bear recognition that the price the authority would have put on it last August must be vastly different from that of today.

This also applies in the case of fruit. Last August we were in the depths of despair in regard to disposing of our crop. Now we find that we have, not every chance, but a good chance of receiving a return far in excess of that of last year, and perhaps approaching the returns of the years when fruit growing was a reasonably profitable exercise.

In this regard, I wonder at the authority's assessment. If an applicant was rejected by the authority last August, what would be his situation today? Unless he thinks he has a much better chance he will remain a rejected applicant. I feel this is a most important aspect in regard to assessing viability. It is indeed a most difficult task. We must also recognise

that members of the assessment committee of the authority were once members of farm advisory clubs.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking.

Mr. REID: A number of those former farm advisers are now dealing with decisions with which they were directly associated. I am not being unkind to these men because I know them and I know they are most capable; but perhaps the over-optimism of their advice of past years has changed now to over-pessimistic assessment. Just as their effect on the farming community was apparent in yesteryear, so could the pessimistic view they are adopting today be disastrous.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Are you philosophising idly, or have you some substance for your remarks?

Mr. REID: I would like the Minister to tell me what price the authority will use in the case of lamb, wool, and fruit, because I am confused. The members of the banking fraternity are also confused. In these hypothetical cases the increases are not known. The authority says, "You will receive \$3 for lambs"; or, "Wool will be worth 30c." I do not pretend to know whether those figures are correct; but I do ask the Minister to give us some guidelines in regard to viability. How can an applicant be accepted or rejected unless figures are obtained? If the figures are realistic today, what were they in August?

I have proved this with lambs I sold last season, which netted me \$5.50 on consignment, including the Australian Meat Board guarantee of 18.5c alongside ship. That guarantee is available to any lamb producer who wishes to consign. If the authority said, right across the board, "It will be \$3 for every lamb" I would have been rejected. That is why I think it is most important that the Minister lay down clear guidelines, and inform us whether the Rural Reconstruction Authority makes its own market valuations, or whether it works on the ability of the individual producer to achieve higher than average prices on the basis of past performance.

Before summing up my comments I would like to refer to a Press release which was issued after the meeting of the State and Commonwealth Ministers on the 5th April. It states—

It has been agreed unanimously by Ministers (State and Federal) that the general objectives in the agreement for 50% of funds to go to farm build-up will be maintained.

It is an understanding that, provided the States encourage farm build-up applications to the maximum extent possible and approve all eligible cases,



this will be accepted by the Commonwealth as the closest compliance with the general objectives that is practicable.

It seems to me that the Minister gave a clear delineation in that statement, and it was agreed to unanimously. We would like to know that the interests of the farmers who apply for rural reconstruction assistance are dealt with in the most efficient and effective way.

In summing up my comments I pose a number of questions. They are as follows:—

(1) Because of the involved details of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme and apparent contradictory statements being made on the flexibility of funds between debt reconstruction, and farm build-up, would the Minister clarify the whole situation regarding flexibility of funds, and also consider the availability of funds for the successful working of the scheme in the 1972-73 year?

(2) Would the Minister be prepared to make funds available for farm build-up to sons of farmers wishing to buy land from their fathers; or if he is not prepared to do this clearly indicate the guidelines that are adopted by the authority, and the circumstances under which this will be permissible?

(3) Is he aware that this present anomaly is seriously threatening the continuation of farming skills in the next generation of farmers? There is no need for me to elaborate on that point.

(4) Would he not agree that in most cases the most efficient and equitable way for the successful working of the scheme would be to give every possible assistance to a son who wished to buy his father out?

(5) With the complex and detailed information required for any rural reconstruction loan, would it not be possible to assure beyond any reasonable doubt that justice would be done in regard to the father, the son, and the State?

(6) Is he aware that many ageing farmers are caught financially on their farms who are unable to retire or qualify for the age pension?

(7) With the improved position in prices currently being offered for wool, lambs, beef and fruit, would it not be advisable for rejected applicants to re-apply for rural reconstruction loans, remembering that the success rate equals the new application rate of farmers who have not been rejected?

(8) When budgeting, does the Rural Reconstruction Authority work on the basis of prices received on past performance or do they themselves assess likely market values?

For some months members on this side of the House have been asking questions in an endeavour to obtain a better understanding of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme. I appreciate that this scheme is moving into a very complex field. Fortunately we find that as a result of the conference of the Ministers in Sydney there is now a need to telescope the scheme into a two-year period.

I have before me numerous newspaper cuttings showing that farmers are asking for \$300,000,000 to get this scheme going in the period mentioned. We understand that the percentage of the funds allocated to Western Australia will be reassessed. Previously it was 14.63 per cent., but I believe that in the new negotiations this percentage will be open for variation. It is important that we know exactly where we are going, and that all sections of the industry know the score and how the scheme is operating; thus enabling us to approach the future in agriculture with a degree of confidence to rebuild the rural industry for the future years.

**MR. H. D. EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [9.06 p.m.]: I am somewhat at a loss to understand the intention of the member for Blackwood, though I will not be as uncharitable in my remarks as my colleague has been. It would appear certain that the member for Blackwood is not as familiar with the terms of the agreement and the legislation as, perhaps, he should be.

The functions and the powers of the authority are autonomous. If he looks at section 15 of the Act he will find that the duties of the Rural Reconstruction Authority are very clearly stipulated. He will find that it is charged with carrying out the scheme within the determinations and the confines as laid down in the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. The honourable member should know this.

What I say at the outset is this: There is very little ministerial power when it comes to issuing a directive or something of that kind. I will have a little more to say on that point as I proceed in my contribution to the debate.

There are four aspects to the motion, and I feel some comment is merited on each. Indeed, I am rather pleased to have the opportunity to make these comments. The actual agreement or understanding between the States and Commonwealth was arrived at less than a month ago; and the full statement of the Minister for Primary Industry and the supporting statements gave a fair indication of the

generalised way in which the scheme has operated and is expected to operate, from the Commonwealth point of view.

Mr. Nalder: Is there any truth in the leading article published in *The West Australian*, because there is a slight variance in that article compared with the statement that was published?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Perhaps I had better clear up the two Press reports, so that members can judge which is the accurate one. There is a degree of flexibility within debt reconstruction and farm build-up under the scheme. The matter of apportionment of funds has been a source of concern ever since applications have been received and processed. It was obvious very early in the piece that the number of persons applying for debt reconstruction would be considerably greater than the number applying for farm build-up, and this has been borne out by the events. However, it can be expected that as time progresses the pendulum will swing to farm build-up.

Mr. Nalder: Has that been the experience in the other States?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I prefer to deal with Western Australia. The conditions in the other States are considerably different from those in this State. Each State has its own specific type of problem; for example, the grazing area of Queensland as opposed to the western districts of Victoria. Each presents a problem in its own way.

It has been shown in the last few months that the number of applicants for farm build-up finance in Western Australia has increased. It would be fairly reasonable to assume that the urgency of this type of application would stem from the need for debt reconstruction. However, the attitude taken by the Commonwealth is that this is a Rural Reconstruction Scheme, and in the long term the whole basis of rural reconstruction is through farm build-up.

Mr. Reid: You agree with that objective?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The initial agreement was made prior to my appointment as Minister. However, in respect of the apportionment of funds, Western Australia put up a very strong plea that the basis should not be 50-50 for debt reconstruction and for farm build-up. The suggestion initially was apportionment on the basis of 70-30. The Commonwealth has remained adamant, and in the circumstances the proportion of 50-50 has remained in the agreement with the understanding that although this is seen as a desirable objective it is very questionable that it can be achieved; and a certain latitude is to be extended.

Mr. Reid: Do you agree with that objective?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: There was no alternative. The actual approach of Western Australia was as I have indicated. This was put forward very firmly. However, it was rejected by the Commonwealth, and as a consequence we had no alternative but to accept the 50-50 provision as the objective; but it is qualified by the fact that provided all farm build-up schemes that can be accommodated are accommodated, the 50-50 provision may be varied.

Mr. Reid: What criterion would there be for debt reconstruction?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: If the honourable member were to use his good offices with his Federal counterparts, I would be very grateful and would give him my support. As far as Western Australia is concerned we would be more than happy to see a revision of the 50-50 provision; but the Commonwealth is adamant and it accepts the fact that we cannot achieve the 50-50 result. The condition is that we must make every endeavour to make that the goal, and that is where the situation rests. Personally I would prefer to see it as a fixed figure.

Mr. W. G. Young: Does this mean a certain amount of preference will be given to farm build-up as against debt reconstruction, if both types of applicants are viable in the long term?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It could go that way. If we reach the stage of exhausting the funds under the Commonwealth requirement perhaps we would not need to do that.

Mr. W. G. Young: Having expended almost \$7,000,000 as against \$1,700,000, this point must have been reached.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That is not so.

Mr. W. G. Young: About \$6,800,000 has been expended as against \$1,700,000. That is about 4 to 1, as a proportion. Debt reconstruction must have nearly run out.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Not to the 50-50 provision.

Mr. Reid: Yesterday you replied "No" to the Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That is in total. If the honourable member looks at the availability of funds to the State he will find that proportion has not yet been reached.

Mr. W. G. Young: Our share is \$6,800,000, and another \$1,000,000 added will make nearly \$8,000,000.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Looking at it in that regard, of the total sum available to the State the amount approved for debt reconstruction would not be in the proportion of 50-50.

Mr. Reid: Referring to your reply yesterday, is it correct that Western Australia has already spent 50 per cent of its funds on debt reconstruction? Your answer should have been "No."

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It has not spent 50 per cent. of its funds.

Mr. Reid: It has spent approximately 50 per cent. I do not think that was an accurate answer.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I will deal with the total budget and go through the figures in a moment.

Mr. Blaikie: At the meeting of the Commonwealth and State Ministers when you argued on the amount of funds to be made available for farm build-up, what was the point of view of the other States?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: In general, they would have preferred some other arrangements. Referring to part 2, it was not clear as to whether the mover of the motion was referring to a son who was growing up on the farm and, as a consequence, there was a viable situation but one which could not support both father and son. The question was clarified to some considerable degree and the member concerned instanced the two situations which could arise.

I can sympathise with him and I appreciate the problem which he sees. It is a very real one but in the terms of his motion he says the Minister should give immediate approval for funds to be released for that purpose. The point is that the Minister cannot give approval for such action as I said at the outset. I would comment that if the scheme was extended to include the situation outlined the funds which would have to be made available would be considerable. I know a difficulty exists but it is not regarded as a rural reconstruction situation under the terms of the agreement.

There are cases where a father and son relationship has been assisted, but those cases had to conform with the eligibility criterion under the agreement. Usually there is a partnership commitment and it revolves around the actual demonstrable partnership arrangement. The viability would depend on the son or the father being bought out. That is the whole essence of the situation; where there is a viable unit operating such a situation would not qualify.

Mr. Reid: But on whose qualification? This is a State matter.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is not; it is within the terms of the agreement. If the honourable member looks at the schedule at the back of the legislation he will find that this situation does not qualify. There is no provision for it within the agreement, and any use of Commonwealth funds outside the terms of the agreement can be determined by the Commonwealth to have been improperly used, and the State can be considered liable for them.

Mr. Reid: The State is charged with the responsibility of administering the scheme.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Within the confines of the agreement. If the honourable member looks at the agreement he will see that the criteria are laid down very clearly. It will be found that there is no provision for this situation within the criteria laid down by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Reid: I would like the Minister to quote that stipulation because I believe this is a State decision. It rests with the State as to whether or not assistance is to be given to farmers' sons.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I regret my information is considerably different from that of the honourable member. The terms of the agreement will not permit the type of situation mentioned being handled.

Mr. W. G. Young: Has an attempt been made to have this position corrected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: In this particular situation, not yet. It has been raised.

Mr. Reid: What has the Minister done to put forward this type of case? What has he done on behalf of the Western Australian farmers to overcome this anomaly?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: As the situation exists, nothing can be done unless the criterion is established. The criterion has to revolve around two points. The viability has to be established by the purchase of the farm by one partner or the other. That would come under farm build-up on debt reconstruction. One of the basic criteria is that there must be danger of loss of assets.

Mr. Reid: The point I want to make is that a great number of farmers' sons are being excluded. My investigations were not carried out lightly, as has been implied, and they reveal that this is a State responsibility.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: We are dealing with the Rural Reconstruction Scheme as it exists at the moment, and the situation outlined is outside the scope of the scheme. The case in point is somewhat similar to other special cases, and I can assure the honourable member that some of them are fairly distressing. I instance the case of migrants—generally English—coming out and buying properties at an inflated price. Soon after buying they have been subjected to wheat quotas which has left them in the position where they cannot generate enough income to meet interest requirements, and there is no way they can be made viable without keeping them in a loss situation.

Mr. W. G. Young: Would the Minister know whether, in the situation outlined, the son has to be a partner in the land or only a partner in the trading concern?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The honourable member would need to have a specific case examined. I cannot generalise.

Mr. W. G. Young: I thought the Minister might know whether or not it was laid down that the son had to be a partner in the land.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I could not answer that.

Mr. Reid: I still challenge the Minister's ruling on this.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is not my ruling.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Can the Minister quote where the ruling appears in the agreement?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: If the honourable member has a look at the agreement he will see the terms under which the funds are available.

Mr. Reid: We have been told, from a reliable source, that this is a State decision. I refer to the father and son relationship.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: There is a conflict with the information of which I am the recipient. This situation is not eligible for assistance under the agreement.

Mr. Reid: The Minister cannot say why, or where it appears?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The eligibility is stipulated clearly in the agreement and the case in question is outside the eligibility provision. There certainly is no scope for ministerial discretion.

Mr. Fletcher: Would that not be a fact in respect of all States?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The third part of the motion gives rise to two aspects, the first of which I have already referred to. The mover of the motion requests that the Minister instruct the Rural Reconstruction Authority to use more realistic product valuations when assessing farm viability. I would point out that this is completely outside the scope of the legislation and is not possible. As a consequence, the request must be rejected on this ground alone. I think it is a strong point of the legislation that this is not possible.

When the legislation was introduced it was clearly stated that it was the intention, after very careful consideration, that the authority must be autonomous. That was provided for. Where a group of people are selected for their particular expertise—chosen from various segments of the economic world—it would be rather dangerous, to say the least, to attempt to direct them in matters on which such a group would be considered to be an authority.

I would make the point that the authority does not simply discuss prices and make an arbitrary decision. The authority follows price trends very closely, and it takes advantage of all the assistance which is available to it along those lines. The difficulty of operating long-term rural

finance, which is not normal bank trading, has been foreshadowed by the member for Blackwood. I ask: What figures does one depend upon and just how does one establish what income can be expected over a period of time? It follows that there must be consultation with farm advisers, and this is a continuous process.

Mr. Blaikie: Would it not be better, in certain circumstances, for the authority to make farm inspections?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That does occur.

Mr. Blaikie: How often?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Whenever it is required. Under the Commonwealth-State agreement it is laid down that the authority must take cognisance of the forecasts and prognostications of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This is something which is required of the authority and I should point out that losses involved in this scheme, through unsound practice, are the responsibility of the State. The Commonwealth has indicated that compensation is available if the State makes a *bona fide* error, or circumstances of an abnormal nature occur which cause the State to suffer a loss in the operation of the scheme. In other words, if the bottom suddenly fell out of the market the indication from the Commonwealth is that compensatory payments are possible. This would depend upon the Commonwealth being satisfied that the State had used every good office and every care in operating the scheme.

Information is supplied to the Commonwealth fortnightly. The figures are available to the Commonwealth and they are subject to scrutiny. The figures enable the Commonwealth to compare the operation of the scheme in this State with that in the other States. It has been demonstrated, by comparison, that the Western Australian authority is more than square on all counts in its operations in this State.

The difficulty of viability, from week to week, is an inherent danger, and this is obviously recognised by each State. I will take the price of wool as an illustration to demonstrate the manner of operation of the authority. The average prices for wool, between September and March, were as follows:—

				c/k
September	1-2	....	....	70.02
September	8-9	....	....	61.14
September	23	....	....	61.17
September	29-30	....	....	66.10
October	6-7	....	....	58.34
October	20-21	....	....	60.72
November	3-4	....	....	63.53
November	10-11	....	....	68.09
November	17-18	....	....	62.78
December	1-2	....	....	63.34
December	8-9	....	....	69.83
December	15-16	....	....	67.05
January	12-13	....	....	66.86
January	19-20	....	....	77.02

February	2-3	....	....	78.63
February	23-24	....	....	76.91
March	1-2	....	....	84.88
March	15-16	....	....	75.00

Those are the average figures taken for the sales over that period. At the same time the average price used by the authority for that same period was 74c per kilogram, an average of 6c above the average sale price. I certainly hope the price of wool is maintained at better than this level. So it can be seen that if the matter had been brought up some months ago there would have been a case for the retention of the figures being used by the authority.

While the authority does have to make a decision this is the sort of approach which has been made. The authority has to estimate with oats, barley, cattle, and lambs, and every other situation which is likely to arise and provides farm income.

While I give this as an illustration, I think I have previously indicated that the standard used by the authority is not as rigid as has been intimated by the member for Blackwood. On several occasions I have issued an open invitation to members to discuss any point with the authority. The invitation has been availed of and it still stands. In regard to the instance mentioned, I do not think criticism can be levelled at the authority on this account.

The fourth point in the motion moved by the member for Blackwood is—

That rejected applicants be reconsidered under the suggested improved guidelines.

There are no improved guidelines. It would be very difficult to do what the member for Blackwood suggests, bearing in mind that we are in a reconstruction situation and must have full regard for the realities. It would be difficult to improve the guidelines. I point out, therefore, that wherever an applicant can show a changed situation for some reason or another—reduced expenses, reduction of liabilities, or enhanced prospects of income—he can submit another application. As I have said, some applicants have submitted four applications. It is not a matter of juggling figures around, as the honourable member would have us believe. It is a matter of trying to consider alternatives in some detail. These alternatives were examined by the authority.

Mr. Reid: But obviously the alternatives were not examined at the time.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The individual has some responsibility. Is the honourable member suggesting that every applicant should have every aspect of his situation worked out for him? That would be ludicrous in the extreme. The applicant has a responsibility; he must have it. He is applying for assistance. He has financial

advisers—stock agents, banks, and perhaps farm advisers—and if he has kept his books in a proper way up to income tax level, the application form does not ask for anything beyond that. With this information at his disposal he certainly has a problem but it is not insurmountable and it is not a responsibility that should be taken from him.

The applicant has to make the approach. He is the only person who knows his true situation, and if his application is rejected he should be able to submit another application on this basis.

Mr. Reid: And gamble another \$60 that this time he will hit the jackpot?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is not a gamble in that sense. It is a matter of his presenting his economic situation. If he cannot establish economic viability, the authority cannot help him. That is the situation.

I also point out that the State has an obligation in this matter. If funds are misused, the State must accept the fact that the Commonwealth will not meet them. The Commonwealth makes the final determination and the States must either conform or foot the bill. That is what it amounts to.

The member for Blackwood made some critical comments in regard to the availability of finance. I point out that the total sum outlaid at this stage is \$2,400,000. This is the figure I provided recently for the Leader of the Country Party, if I recall correctly. Some delay has occurred but it has been partly due to a bank-up. Hundreds of applications had been received before the authority was able to begin processing them, and the subsequent hold-up was caused by difficulty in dealing with securities. In the last month an experienced securities officer has been added to the staff of the authority and considerable progress has been made in the rate of approvals.

Mr. Reid: Is not that the point I made—that additional staff could be put on?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Additional staff has been put on in the last month in the form of a securities officer. Securities officers are rather difficult to obtain but we have been fortunate in obtaining the services of this man.

In financial matters of this type, all kinds of securities are handled and the authority is dealing over long distances with country legal officers. As a consequence, a delay of months can occur in the passage of securities through the appropriate Government offices. The delay partly rests with the applicants. They cannot be completely exonerated from responsibility.

Reference was made to the statement of the Minister for Primary Industry. I think one aspect has been clarified; that is, the

apportionment of the funds which are available. A further point made in that statement was—

The States will administer the scheme so that approvals will be programmed over the period up to the 30th June, 1973, within the limits of funds now allocated and specified carry-over to 1973-74.

It must be appreciated that at the initiation of this scheme there was no certainty as to the amounts that would be involved and the number of applications that would be received. There was no reliable indicator of the apportionment that would be determined. As a consequence, the arbitrary figure of 50-50 was set by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has therefore allowed a degree of flexibility, and for the year 1971-72 approval has been given for farm build-up to the order of \$2,300,000 and debt reconstruction to the order of \$7,200,000. There is, of course, a necessary carry-over into 1972-73 of \$30,000 and \$2,700,000 respectively for each of those items.

For 1972-73, it is a matter of estimating. There is no firm way to determine the number of applications, the amount, or the proportion that will be received for farm build-up and debt reconstruction. We can only make an estimate, and this has been done to the extent that it is thought farm build-up will account for \$5,200,000 and debt reconstruction \$2,100,000, making a total of \$7,300,000 in that year which will require a carry-over into 1973-74.

In effect, the Commonwealth has provided to the States the \$100,000,000 which was originally set aside for a four-year programme. That has been telescoped into a two-year period, and Western Australia will receive \$14,630,000 in the course of two years. There has been full written agreement with the Commonwealth in everything that has been done, and there has been close liaison between the officers operating the scheme in this State and the officers of the Department of Primary Industry, as well as officers in the other States. The officers have met and have been able to share their experience, from which they have derived great benefit. Experience showed that by 1973-74 there would be a carry-over of loans approved, and a further \$15,000,000 was made available, of which Western Australia received \$2,200,000, as mentioned in the statement made by Mr. Sinclair.

Mr. Reid: Is there not some danger of a hiatus developing?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: It is possible, but these are the funds the Commonwealth has provided, and these are the terms. As a matter of fact, there was some concern on the part of the Federal Treasurer about committing the Budget ahead for a further \$60,000,000, but the situation was such that

he agreed to do so. To commit another \$15,000,000 for a further year ahead was even more difficult. There is certainly the danger of a hiatus occurring, but agitation for additional funds for rural reconstruction has already begun. Articles have appeared in the Press and suggestions have been made as to the additional amount that will be required.

Mr. Nalder: Have you estimated a figure for Western Australia?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: We can only estimate what might reasonably be expected in the forthcoming year. Projection beyond that becomes rather speculative and does not enable a firm proposition to be put to the Federal Treasurer. We cannot anticipate funds for rural reconstruction at this point of time but, if the need were established, it would be very difficult for the Federal Government to deny them.

Mr. Nalder: At this stage you have made no further approach to the Commonwealth?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Discussions on the revision clause have taken place. A further review will be made at the end of next January but the officers will be meeting at intervals in the intervening period. That is the situation as it exists at the moment.

Mr. Reid: You must surely agree that under the budgeting situation we are in danger of having less in the next financial year than we had in this one, so the rejection rate must be affected or, to be successful, an application must have stronger criteria.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: How does the honourable member's wife manage with her budgeting if she has a set amount? Has he any further suggestions for overcoming the existing situation?

Mr. Reid: I want awareness of this situation. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I have explained the situation as it exists. When the revision is made at the beginning of next year I hope the Commonwealth will be prepared to consider some further commitment.

I appreciate the many aspects raised by the member for Blackwood, and I appreciate the concern he feels for the special cases he mentioned. Everybody is aware of these problems. Further assistance through the special loans, which have been increased this year, to enable crops to be planted could provide—and in some cases has provided—access to viability, so that advantage may be taken of rural reconstruction funds. It is hoped this further assistance will offset some of the special cases to which the honourable member referred and about which I am particularly concerned.

Mr. McPharlin: Before you conclude, you remarked just now about the time taken between the approval of finance and the completion of the legal documents. Could not there be some method applied whereby if the approval is given the money could be advanced without waiting for the legal processes?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I have queried this on several occasions. I have been assured that this cannot be done in normal practice. It is a matter of setting up the securities and the whole legal processing of the documents.

Mr. McPharlin: I asked that because it was done under the existing scheme in New South Wales, before this scheme came in by the financing authority taking a security charge over the land and assets of the farmer.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: That may be possible under the New South Wales legislation; I am not sufficiently familiar with it to say so. Of course, ancillary to this would be a degree of control over the affairs of the Government. I do not know how far this would go. However, I am hopeful that virtually all approvals will be out by the end of the financial year for the service of the additional securities financing.

Mr. Reid: I make one final point. The Premier said you would elaborate on the financial assistance your Government has provided to farmers since the last election.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The special loan made available last year has been increased this year, and the provision for drought relief has been continued. We have subsidised the meat industry by virtue of the underwriting of the losses at Midland. We have provided concessions to pastoralists by way of the removal of taxes—vermin tax and shire rates have been included in this. Those are the immediate forms of assistance I can recall offhand. I have pointed out that the special loan is regarded as risk capital. Last year in the order of 400 farmers were involved and something like \$600,000 was advanced. It is heartening to note that despite the most adverse season a very small percentage of that amount looks like being written off as a bad debt. It is certainly most encouraging; and that is one reason the amount was increased this year. Timber rights have been given to farmers, and subsidies for wool and wheat cartages have been increased.

Mr. Fletcher: Were not additional employment opportunities created in certain country areas?

Mr. W. G. Young: That was not for farmers; that was for local authorities.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I am somewhat at a loss as to how to conclude my remarks on this motion because it calls for the Minister to do certain things which are just not possible.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [9.49 p.m.]: I am very pleased indeed that the member for Blackwood brought this matter before the House otherwise we would not have had the opportunity to hear the Minister indicate the serious situation which has already developed, and which he admitted. We have been endeavouring to find out what is the situation, and we have had to wait for an opportunity such as this before the Minister was prepared to let us know.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have had every opportunity to make inquiries. You have been invited to make inquiries, and you have done so. Did you get a reply?

Mr. NALDER: We have made inquiries by asking questions in this House.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Did you write to the Commonwealth complaining about the rigidity of its attitude?

Mr. NALDER: That is not our responsibility; it is the responsibility of the Minister to look after the situation in this State.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Did you write to the Commonwealth complaining about the rigidity of the Commonwealth's attitude?

Mr. NALDER: This is a very interesting situation and the Minister is trying to crawl out of it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: He is asking a question. You are crawling out of answering it.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister stated in reply to an interjection tonight—and I would not have risen had it not been for his interjection—that he would hope we on this side of the House would use our influence with our counterparts in Canberra.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I said that if he had influence to adjust the proportioning, I would appreciate the member for Blackwood's doing so, and that I would support him.

Mr. NALDER: If that is the case, I think it is the Minister's responsibility to approach the Commonwealth as a result of the conference he attended in Canberra some weeks ago. The inference I drew from the answers to the questions I asked of the Minister yesterday is that everything in the garden is lovely and there is nothing to worry about.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The immediate future is secure and arranged fairly well. It is the long term which is not. If you are trying to imply that long-term financial arrangements—

Mr. NALDER: I am implying nothing. I am replying to the answers given by the Minister to questions asked in this House. The figures in his answers indicate that only \$1,500,000 is now left in the fund for debt reconstruction. So far 355 farmers have been allocated assistance amounting to

somewhere in the vicinity of \$6,820,000, which is an approximate average of \$23,000 each. That means approximately only a further 60 farmers can be successful in their applications before the scheme folds up.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The Commonwealth is prepared to allow an adjustment provided the objective is still 50 per cent. If it goes the other way, and provided it is done so that farm build-up is given every consideration and attention, the Commonwealth requirement will be met.

Mr. NALDER: When is the Commonwealth going to put its foot down and say, "Look, you cannot go any further"? I think the position is quite serious. I do not care what the Minister says; he has not convinced those on this side of the House that we will not be faced with a serious position in the very near future. Yet it is not quite 12 months since the scheme commenced and the authority has allocated \$6,820,000 to 355 farms on the basis of 50 per cent. for debt reconstruction and 50 per cent. for farm build-up.

Mr. H. D. Evans: And the Commonwealth made available additional funds in that shorter time as a result of the situation which was indicated by the applications.

Mr. NALDER: The situation will be most serious within the next two or three months if the same number of applications come in. Shortly the 50 per cent. figure will be reached.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr. NALDER: Does not the Minister think it is time right now to acquaint the Commonwealth of the position and to request—

Mr. H. D. Evans: The Commonwealth is already aware of the position and an officers' meeting will take place within this month.

Mr. NALDER: If the Minister is so confident about the matter there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is and has been under continual review.

Mr. NALDER: I can see the position worsening in the next two or three months. There must be many more applications for assistance to be received. The Minister will have to say, "We have spent the money and the Commonwealth will not agree to further finance being made available for farm debt reconstruction." The rest of the farmers will have to whistle.

Mr. H. D. Evans: No, that is not the case. The State will not spend more than the Commonwealth will permit.

Mr. NALDER: What will happen to the other applicants?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Once the 50 per cent. figure has been reached Commonwealth agreement will be obtained. It has been indicated in writing that funds will be granted to meet the circumstances; but the Commonwealth will not specify a particular percentage.

Mr. NALDER: It is obvious then that the Minister is quite happy and that our concern—

Mr. H. D. Evans: Just a moment. I did not say I was happy. The amount of finance available for rural reconstruction is insufficient.

Mr. NALDER: It is quite apparent that trying to obtain the information we want from the Minister is like trying to draw hens' teeth.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Not at all. You have had an open invitation to come to my office.

Mr. NALDER: It is terribly difficult to get information. The Minister is a closed book. He came back from Canberra and did not try to correct the statement made by the Commonwealth Minister, who said that the conference was in agreement. Now the Minister wants us to use our influence to try to get the Commonwealth to improve the situation we are now in.

Mr. Fletcher: Why don't you get onto the back of the Federal Leader of the Country Party?

Mr. Williams: Why don't you get off the back of the Commonwealth and do something as a State instead?

Mr. NALDER: In my view the position at this time is not a very happy one.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Well, you know the arrangement. Or do you? Do you understand it?

Mr. NALDER: It appears that the Minister is reasonably satisfied, and if that is the case we must sit and wait until the Minister is in a position to be able to indicate what the Commonwealth will do once the figure of 50 per cent. for farm debt reconstruction has been reached. If the Minister is not concerned any more than he has indicated to us, then he is reasonably satisfied that the Commonwealth will allow some assistance.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I can only be as satisfied as a Commonwealth undertaking permits me to be.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister is a responsible person and it appears he is quite satisfied in this situation. I have made my point. I believe the situation is serious and that an immediate approach should be made to the Commonwealth. The Minister says the approach has been made and the Commonwealth knows about the situation. However, I want to issue this warning tonight: Unless something is done very quickly to allay our concern arising



from the announcement and from what the Minister has said tonight I am afraid many farmers who should justifiably be granted assistance will not receive it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is your suggestion?

Mr. NALDER: I merely want the Minister's assurance.

Mr. H. D. Evans: No, go on. I have explained the situation to you. What is your suggestion?

Mr. NALDER: I only want the Minister's assurance that the position is under control. If he gives me that assurance I will resume my seat.

Mr. H. D. Evans: As far as it is possible to accept the Commonwealth undertaking, that is what we have done.

Mr. NALDER: Right. The Minister has given the assurance that as far as he is concerned everything is under control with regard to the Rural Reconstruction Scheme.

Mr. H. D. Evans: To the extent I have indicated with those figures.

Mr. NALDER: Very well. I will resume my seat.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Gayfer.

*House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th April, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### *Postponement*

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.34 p.m.]: I ask permission of the House to reply to questions following the afternoon tea suspension. I do not have all the replies to hand at this time.

The PRESIDENT: Permission granted.

### PAY-ROLL TAX

#### *Effect on Small Businessmen: Ministerial Statement*

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.35 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to make a statement in accordance with an undertaking I gave on the 22nd September last during the passage of the pay-roll tax legislation.

The PRESIDENT: There being no dissentient voice, permission is granted.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.36 p.m.]: I now present a report on the amount of tax paid by the small businessman, and its effects. The figures quoted in this report have been extracted from records maintained by the State Taxation Department and cover the period of the first four months' collections of the tax.

No guide was given during the debate as to what is regarded as a small businessman; therefore, some criteria had to be devised. Three categories have been selected, based on the number of employees engaged in a business. These are, up to 10; from 11 to 15; and from 16 to 20.

It could, of course, be argued that the last category is not really a small business. However, it has been included to give full information to the House.

It should be remembered that really small businessmen do not pay any pay-roll tax because their annual wage bills do not reach \$20,800 each. These comprise such enterprises as small shops, private carriers, garages, small servicing establishments, and the like.

I should also mention that in the figures for the categories which I have defined are included organisations which are not in the small business category. These are such cases as holding companies for other Western Australian companies which employ two or three highly-paid executives and a secretary, and small companies registered in this State but which are part of an Australia-wide organisation taking direction from the Eastern States. Also included is the type of organisation which forms a separate company each time a new branch is established but all these employers are subject to directions from one head office.

While the figures I am going to provide include the types of businesses I have just described, I wish to inform the House that they do not form a large proportion of the taxpayers paying relatively small amounts of pay-roll tax but they have been described to illustrate the difficulty in accurately defining and separating out what might be appropriately defined as a small businessman.

In the category of up to 10 employees there are 1,357 employers. These employers paid \$160,953 in the first four months of the collection of the tax. In the second category of 11-15 employees, there are 788 employers who paid \$242,709 over the same period. In the third category of 16-20 employees, there are 524 employers who paid \$245,136 in the four-month period.