All these functions, which are regarded as matters relating to labour and industry, are now under the one department. It is true they are not all housed in the same area, but it is hoped that before the year is out the majority of the sections of the Department of Labour will be housed together; if not completely together, then at least in two buildings very close to this place. We have the Industrial Commission and the weights and measures section at Vapech House, and there will be available another building of the same design, now being constructed not far from Vapech House. It is proposed to move the Department of Labour proper into that building, and probably other subsections of the department will also be moved into it. So, physically, the department will be a closer organisation, and will be much more easily supervised.

In the field of the inspection of machinery, an engineer (Mr. Doug May) has been appointed Chief Inspector of Machinery, and his responsibilities may be extended to undertaking other aspects of labour and industrial problems which are related to machinery, weights and measures, scaffolding, and the like.

Mr. May: Last year you mentioned that some consideration would be given to the licensing of front-end loaders, bulldozers, scrapers, etc. That has not been done.

Mr. O'NEIL: Initially some consideration was given to the certification of the people who operate these machines, but after further study it was considered that at this point of time it would be almost impracticable to do so. We could have a situation where a contractor has one front-end loader, or some such machinery, and for some reason his operator is not available. He may be absent from work as a result of sickness. If the contractor does not have another certified operator to operate the machine, then some difficulty will be occasioned. Ultimately the proposal was not proceeded with.

Mr. May: I was thinking more in terms of the iron ore industry. Some of the operators of these machines up north are not licensed.

Mr. O'NEIL: What might be an advantage in the north might be a disadvantage to the small contract operator. It was decided not to proceed with this proposal. I must point out that the proposal has been considered, but on reflection it was decided that it would not be proceeded with.

Mr. Williams: Will you deal with the question of the inspectors and their interpretations of the Act.

Mr. O'NEIL: I undertake to endeavour to have something done about this matter. There is always the problem of the clash of personalities arising from the action of inspectors. It has occurred in the Police Department and in the field of factories and shops inspections. Wherever a person is clothed with some authority to inspect or to advise there is, on occasions, invariably the problem of personality conflict.

I do believe it is important for these officers to be brought together for the purpose of discussing problems they have experienced, to find ways to deal with them. In the State Housing Commission it is the regular practice to bring the country agents to the city every year for a two or three-day course. I refer to collectors and the like. They are brought together to be given briefing and instruction courses. It could well be that in the field of machinery inspection and factories and shops inspection a similar procedure could be adopted. I thank the member for Bunbury for his comments, and I think that covers pretty well all the remarks I wish to make. I now commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. LEWIS (Moore—Minister for Education) [4.56 p.m.] I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 30th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.57 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 30th September, 1969

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

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

SUBDIVISIONAL APPLICATIONS

Tabling of Report

The Hon. F. R. WHITE asked the Minister for Local Government:

Would he table the report of the committee appointed by him in June, 1968, for the purpose of streamlining procedures in connection with subdivisional applications?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

I am quite prepared to make a copy of the report available for tabling, and particularly for record purposes.

The report was tabled.

QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

1. TOWN PLANNING

Advice from Public Health Department

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Town Planning:

Further to my question on Tuesday, the 2nd September, 1969, would the Minister advise what factors would influence him in deciding to uphold an appeal against the Town Planning Board's refusal to give permission for development either for its own reasons or on advice from another Government department?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

This is a hypothetical question which cannot be answered as such. Every appeal is treated separately and dealt with on its merits in accordance with information supplied and, if necessary, personal inspection.

2. STOCK SALES

Prices Received for Mutton

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister obtain the following information and inform the House:—

(a) what were the average prices received by primary producers at metropolitan sale yards in Western Australia during the years 1930 to 1969 inclusive for—

(i) wether mutton; and

(ii) ewe mutton;

(b) would any information be available to the Minister on price trends during a similar period in other States of the Commonwealth?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) 1930 to 1941.

There is no price series available which distinguishes between wether mutton and ewe mutton in this period.

The average wholesale price of "mutton" in the Midland markets in these years is shown below.

Year	Wholesale price of Mutton Cents per lb.
1930	3.5
1931	2.6
1932	2.5
1933	2.3
1934	2.9
1935	2.5
1936	3.2
1937	n.a.
1938	3.4
1939	3.5
1940	3.8
1941	3.8

1942 to 1948.

No satisfactory price series covering this period is available.

1949 to 1969.

	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)
1949	n.a.	n.a.
1950	9.2	8.5
1951	11.3	10.2
1952	8.3	6.8
1953	11.0	8.6
1954	12.3	9.8
1955	9.8	8.2
1956	11.5	10.4
1957	10.0	8.5
1958	8.1	6.7
1959	7.1	6.0
1960	8.5	7.7
1961	8.7	8.2
1962	8.7	8.0
1963	10.1	9.1
1964	13.5	12.9
1965	11.0	10.6
1966	11.9	10.9
1967	10.2	9.3
1968	6.4	5.9
1969(c)	7.5	7.1

(a) Wether and/or maiden ewe, 40-50 lb., export quality.

(b) Ewes, 40 lb., export quality.

(c) Average for January to June.

Prices are per lb. estimated dressed weight. Exclusive of skin values.

Source: 1930 to 1941—Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. 1949 to 1969—Australian Meat Board.

(b) Average annual price of Mutton at Principal Markets. Cents per lb.

	Sydney		Melbourne		Brisbane		Adelaide	
	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)
1949	5·6	4·5	5·4	4·0	7·5	6·5	6·4	4·4
1950	8·1	7·2	8·3	7·0	10·4	9·1	9·2	7·4
1951	11·7	10·6	11·4	9·6	12·3	11·1	12·7	10·5
1952	8·5	7·5	7·9	6·3	11·7	10·5	8·1	6·3
1953	7·9	6·8	8·5	7·0	10·8	9·9	7·9	5·8
1954	8·7	7·5	8·3	7·0	12·7	11·4	9·8	7·8
1955	9·4	8·1	9·2	8·1	11·2	9·7	9·4	7·7
1956	11·2	10·0	11·5	10·1	11·9	10·3	10·8	9·4
1957	9·2	7·6	9·2	7·5	10·8	9·0	9·0	8·2
1958	7·5	6·2	6·7	6·4	9·6	8·7	7·7	n.q.
1959	7·5	6·4	7·7	6·9	9·2	7·9	6·5	n.q.
1960	9·0	7·7	9·2	8·7	8·7	7·8	10·4	n.q.
1961	8·5	7·5	8·7	8·4	9·4	8·2	9·2	8·2
1962	7·9	7·0	7·7	7·2	10·2	8·7	7·5	6·1
1963	8·9	8·0	8·9	8·7	10·8	9·3	10·2	8·6
1964	10·4	9·5	11·2	10·5	10·1	9·0	12·1	10·8
1965	10·8	9·8	10·9	10·7	11·0	9·9	12·3	11·0
1966	11·6	10·6	12·0	11·9	12·6	11·8	12·7	12·1
1967	11·1	10·1	11·3	11·0	11·1	10·2	11·8	11·6
1968	9·1	8·1	9·9	9·7	8·9	8·8	11·9	11·1
1969 (c)	8·7	7·9	10·0	9·8	8·9	8·0	11·2	10·9

Note.—Information prior to 1949 not available.

(a) Wether and/or maiden ewe, 40-50 lb., export quality.

(b) Ewes, 40 lb. export quality.

(c) Average for January to June.

Prices are per lb. estimated dressed weight. Exclusive of skin values.

Source: Australian Meat Board.

3. QUARANTINE MEASURES

Disposal of Ships' Garbage

The Hon. N. McNEILL asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it correct that the Commonwealth Government has agreed to the installation of incinerators at certain Western Australian ports for the treatment of ships' garbage, as a further improvement in quarantine measures?

(2) If so, at which ports will these incinerators be provided?

(3) When is it anticipated the installation will be completed at each of the ports concerned?

(4) Have the conditions relating to—

(a) installation;

(b) maintenance and operation;

been mutually agreed upon between the Commonwealth and State Governments?

(5) If the answer to (4) is "No", what are the main features yet to be resolved?

(6) Does the Government agree that the present methods of disposal of ships' garbage represent a serious potential health hazard, particularly to livestock in Western Australia, by giving opportunity for the introduction of exotic diseases?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Geraldton, Fremantle, Bunbury, Albany, Esperance, Port Hedland.

(3) No specific dates can be given.

(4) (a) and (b) Yes.

(5) Answered by No. (4).

(6) In past years the method of disposal of ships' garbage has been considered reasonable, but with the increase in the number of ships arriving in Western Australia it is now considered advisable to install incinerators.

4. TRAFFIC

Sodium Fluorescent Lighting on Crosswalks

The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the reply to my question on the 18th June, 1969, concerning the installation of sodium fluorescent lighting on metropolitan highway crosswalks, that all equipment is now to hand and the installation contract is expected to be issued shortly, will the Minister advise what the present position in this matter is?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

This special lighting has been installed and is in operation on all crosswalks in Stirling Highway,

Canning Highway, Great Eastern Highway to Midland, and on three crosswalks on Great Northern Highway.

The necessary equipment has been installed for lighting of crosswalks on the Armadale Road through to Gosnells, and it is expected that this lighting will be commissioned within a week.

With regard to Lord Street and Guildford Road, poles and luminaires are being erected and it is expected that the lights will be commissioned on all crosswalks within two weeks.

Similar progress is reported in respect to a further pedestrian crossing on Great Northern Highway and the pedestrian crossing at Perth College.

5. EXPORT MUTTON

Investigation for Minimum Price

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Will the Minister advise the House if any examination has been made of the possibility of the Department of Agriculture preparing a case to present to the Commonwealth Government and the Australian Meat Board to institute a minimum price for boned out mutton for export?

(2) If not, will the Minister have an examination made of the possible effects that such a guaranteed price would have on the badly depressed prices received by producers for this type of sheep in Western Australia?

(3) Is there any comparison available of prices received by producers in other States for this type of sheep at present?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) and (2) The minimum price that can be paid for boned out mutton is dependent on the price that can be obtained on export markets, and as this varies it is not possible to determine a fixed price for sheep suited to this purpose.

(3) The average price of mutton at the principal markets for the last complete year available (1968) is:—

	Wether (a)	Ewe (b)
Perth	6.4	5.9
Sydney	9.1	8.1
Melbourne	9.9	9.7
Brisbane	8.9	8.8
Adelaide	11.9	11.1

(a) Wether and/or maiden ewe, 40-50 lb., export quality.

(b) Ewes, 40 lb., export quality.

Prices are per lb. estimated dressed weight. Exclusive of skin values.

Source: Australian Meat Board.

6. TOWN PLANNING

Advice from Public Health Department

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Health:

(1) As replies to questions asked in the Legislative Assembly on the 1st and 9th October, 1968, indicated that the Public Health Department neither carried out tests, nor instructed the local authority to do so, in order to determine the suitability of the soil for large numbers of septic tanks in the Lynwood-Ferndale area, how was the Department able to offer advice as to the ability of the particular soil to support this development?

(2) If the Town Planning Board issues a permit for development of an area, contrary to the advice of the Public Health Department, could the latter prevent the development by refusing to sanction the installation of part of the buildings, namely, the septic tanks?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) From information obtained from the Metropolitan Water Board, geophysical survey maps and from the local authority, followed by an inspection of the area in question.

(2) Yes, if the local authority by-laws require bacteriolytic treatment of sewage.

7. *This question was postponed.*

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Metropolitan Market Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

2. Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and passed.

CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Child Welfare) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 4 amended—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: During the second reading stage of the Bill I said I would have a look at the amendments which were proposed and suggested by members. The amendments which appear on the notice paper are in line with the requests, and they have been drawn by the Parliamentary Draftsman. They seem to fit the situation. Therefore, I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 25 and 26—Delete the words "which may reasonably be suspected to have resulted" and substitute the words "apparently resulting."

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The next amendment deals with the definition of a public place where street trading takes place. The amendment is to delete the words "includes a vessel, vehicle, room, field or any other" and to substitute the words "means any." The definition will then provide that a public place means any place whatsoever to which the public for the time being have or are permitted to have access whether on payment or otherwise. Accordingly, I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 30 and 31—Delete the passage "includes a vessel, vehicle, room, field or any other" and substitute the words "means any."

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 29 amended—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The amendment on the notice paper was recommended by Mr. Medcalf. It will rephrase the paragraph into definite headings instead of running on as it does in the clause at present. The draftsman had a look at the amendment in the Bill and has redrafted it, although I think the wording of the amendment on the notice paper is almost identical with the proposal in the Bill. The amendment will not change the meaning of the paragraph; it will simply break it up and provide for an additional paragraph. I move an amendment—

Page 3, lines 22 to 34—Delete the passage commencing with the paragraph designation "(b)" down to and including the word "therein" and substitute the following:—

(b) by deleting the words "and when" in line 4 and substituting the passage "(2) When"

(c) by inserting after the word "remand" in line 8 the words "or when any child is apprehended and charged with the commission of any offence whatsoever, pending the hearing of proceedings against him for the offence charged or during any adjournment thereof or during any period of remand" .

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I support the amendment. I have read it through and it is exactly in line with my proposal. I think it will greatly clarify the understanding of the clause when it is read by people who have to read it in the future.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 35—Insert the following passage:—

"(d) by adding the following subsections" .

This amendment is consequential upon the last one.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 6: Section 34A amended—

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: In this clause it says that where a court imposes sentences of imprisonment on a child aged 14 years or more, it shall not, if it orders one or more of those sentences to be served cumulatively with any of the sentences imposed by it on that occasion, order that the child serve a total of more than three months' imprisonment if the child is under the age of 16 years, or six months' imprisonment if the child is aged 16 years or more. I do not quite understand what is meant by this, and I would like the Minister to explain it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Under section 34A of the Act, a court cannot impose a sentence of more than three months on a child under the age of 16, or six months on a child under the age of 18. This applies to any one particular charge. As it is now, if a cumulative sentence is imposed a child could be imprisoned for more than three months or six months if he is under the age of 16 or 18 respectively. The amendment is to ensure that a court cannot, under any circumstances, imprison a child for more than those periods. It will ensure that a court can do no more than was anticipated in the first place.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I quite agree.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Fisheries and Fauna) [4.58 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. President, it is obvious from recent comments and letters to the Press that there is some misunderstanding about the different responsibilities of the authorities controlling the various types of reserves in this State. The Department of Fisheries and Fauna has the responsibility for the conservation of wild life in Western Australia. There are a number of reasons which make such conservation desirable. One reason is the desirability of keeping a reservoir of the natural fauna in as natural a state as possible for the purpose of scientific study.

Reserves of the type set aside for this purpose demand a minimum of public intrusion. A good example of such reserves would be those dedicated to the conservation of the short-necked tortoise. Such reserves are not designed—and probably never will be—to be the sorts of areas in which one would expect people to be able to picnic or wander. Reserves for this latter purpose are generally vested in and controlled by the National Parks Board or a local authority.

To some extent another such reserve would be the areas set aside for the preservation of the noisy scrub bird, particularly at this very critical stage of its history. It might be of interest to members if I recount to the House the latest information regarding this bird. We are not sure how many pairs of this bird exist, but it is believed the number is probably somewhere around 40. These birds are territory holders and a couple of new territories have been taken up. However, an interesting feature is that this year the birds are failing to nest. They commenced to nest once, ceased, and then started again.

It appears that the trigger mechanism for their sexual activity is the rising of the water level to the surface of the ground and, when this happens, they feed in a slightly different way. Then they commence to nest and to mate. The water level rose once and they commenced to nest and then, when the level fell they stopped nesting. The ground water rose again to the surface and they commenced the cycle once more. This was followed by a further dry spell, and again they stopped.

Therefore, it would appear that no more than two or three pairs will nest and mate this year, but we do not believe this will reduce the flock to any marked extent. Incidentally, this information was given to me by Mr. Robinson who, at present, is conducting recording experiments at the reserve. The signs and the calls of the birds are currently being put on tape with a very complex type of recording equipment.

I mention this to show the wide range of activities coming within the scope of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna in fauna conservation, and to some extent this is reflected in the Bill. The main proposals of the measure are—

(1) To enlarge the definition of "fauna."

(2) To widen the purposes for which research may be undertaken.

(3) To allow for the rationalised cropping and sale of surplus kangaroos on sanctuaries and the crediting of the net proceeds to the Fauna Conservation Trust Fund.

(4) To simplify procedures for the opening and closing of seasons.

(5) To allow more flexible and effective control over the kangaroo pet-meat trade and to authorise royalty on carcases as well as on skins.

(6) To extend the authority of full-time wardens and courts to deal with difficult field situations.

(7) To authorise regulations to give more effective protection to sanctuaries and for the implementation of these amendments.

Most of the amendments are only aimed, basically, at making this legislation more effective and updating it in the light of new trends or recently discovered needs.

After the first few clauses of the Bill there are, however, a few proposals which are more radical and introduce new principles or outlooks. Therefore, I will deal with them serially. To give a proper explanation of the Bill it is necessary to deal in some degree of detail with the clauses of the measure. I know that in second readings one should deal in the wide scope, and with principles. However, I suppose if one were to do this completely one could, in fact, overcome the problem by saying that the principle of this Bill is to conserve fauna. This, I am sure, would be quite unsatisfactory to everybody. Under the circumstances, therefore, members will, I hope, excuse me if I refer to the specific purpose of specific amendments at this time.

For example, clause 3 is to amend section 6 as regards the definition of "fauna." Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this clause are merely to clarify the situation relating to exotics and I will comment further on them later.

The proposed new subsection (2) represents more of a major change in that it proposes that we should care not only for wild life with backbones but also for the invertebrates. This reflects the more enlightened trend of considering the scientific value of our fauna as well as the emotional aspect. In the past we seem to

have considered those animals with backbones as having a better right to live than those without this feature. As they are said to have a more highly organised nervous system, vertebrates are presumed to have a greater capacity to experience pain and are, perhaps, therefore entitled to protection from unnecessary suffering.

This amendment does not aim at preventing people from swatting flies or mosquitos, or anything stupid like that, but we do seek the right to be concerned with ensuring the persistence of some invertebrates which are of great scientific interest and rarity—such as a freshwater crustacean of the *lepidurus* group that occurs in the temporary swamps on the short-necked tortoise reserve. We may want to be able to undertake research on this and similar animals and their relationships with the environment, and to take whatever measures are necessary to assist their survival for the long-term benefit of mankind.

To return to the first amendment, which is to the definition of "fauna," it was considered that introduced animals gone wild came within this definition. However, we have legal advice which considers that horses gone wild are not fauna. What we want to do is to clarify the law, where necessary, by first declaring certain species in certain parts of the State to be fauna so that we will be able to declare them to be not protected, if this is desired, as it certainly would be in the case of agricultural pests such as donkeys, goats, and pigs gone wild. Contrarywise, there is at least one area from which we have had several applications to create a reserve for the protection of wild horses. They do not do any damage in this area and are something of an attraction. If the local people desire this to be done, it would seem reasonable that the necessary power to do so should be in the Act.

Clause 4 amends section 12. This amendment needs little comment. The existing wording gives the Western Australian Wild Life Authority a mandate to undertake research approved by the Minister. It seems to me that while we are making amendments we should ensure that the Minister himself is authorised to direct that a particular item of research be undertaken. The need for exercising ministerial responsibility in this regard has not so far arisen, but it might be as well to be prepared, especially remembering—

(a) that the authority is limited in its responsibilities, by and large, to the control and management of sanctuaries; and

(b) fauna affect fish and other organisms in the environment of little, if any, statutory interest to the authority.

Clause 5 is to amend section 12D. The two proposals relative to this section intend—

(a) to allow the authority to prepare management schemes in respect of lands owned by it, but which are not sanctuaries; and

(b) to widen the purposes or objects of management schemes to ensure that a sufficiently broad approach is authorised and taken, if necessary.

In respect of (a), we need to remember that some benevolent persons may give or bequeath land to the authority under such terms that it may not be a "sanctuary" within the strict legal meaning of that word. One such person has already promised to do this, while a number of others have made inquiries in regard to it.

I take this opportunity to advise members that two farmers have already made gifts of land previously owned by them in fee simple, and a third is in the process of doing so, while others have sold or exchanged land needed for conservation on terms which I can only describe as generous. Members will also be aware that either last year or the year before, when this Act was before Parliament, a provision was placed in it authorising the department to institute a duck shooter's license which, incidentally, will be coming into force, I think, later this year. The money from these licenses is to be credited to the Conservation Trust Fund. From this fund we hope—and this hope was expressed at the time the legislation was before Parliament—to be able to purchase swampy areas and retain them in a swampy condition in order to preserve the water fowl of this State. These areas will be added to those which I have been discussing.

Clause 6 simply amends a previous miswording in section 12E. The word "firstly" will be replaced by the word "secondly."

Clause 7 contains a series of amendments to section 14 to allow the Minister to declare open or closed seasons by notice published in the *Government Gazette*. The Act as it stands requires that this be done by proclamation, which has inbuilt delays which could prevent urgent action being taken in time for it to be useful. Not only is the issuing of the proclamation and its gazettal likely to take a long time to be finalised but, sometimes, it prevents the Minister from making public the intention to open or close a season as soon as a decision is reached.

Modern transport and technology make possible the rapid exploitation of any situation and our administrative machinery should be able to keep pace with these rapid changes if it is to cope.

Clause 8 amends section 15. It is a regrettable fact that from time to time, and in certain localities, the common

brush-tailed possum becomes too common and something of a pest to householders and orchardists, while in most areas it remains rare or in low numbers. While something of a problem now this does illustrate the advantage of a closed season. Many years ago possums did reach alarmingly low numbers. Fears were expressed that they might reach the point of extinction and, at that time, they were completely protected.

The possum has a very valuable fur. If we were to have an open season on them too many could be taken too quickly, and from farms or other land where they were causing little or no damage. We feel, therefore, that this special case calls for special treatment, and this amendment provides the opportunity to set up machinery which, on the one hand, will allow the abatement of the nuisance without, on the other, giving unscrupulous persons the opportunity to take and sell possums purely for profit. Only today I was asked about this matter by a fellow who had just had his finger bitten by a possum while he was extracting it from the back of his stove.

The amendment provides—

(a) that the possums, if any, may be taken only by a person licensed especially for that purpose; and

(b) that the net proceeds must be credited to the Conservation Trust Fund.

This is a new departure—it is not new in other areas of the world, but it is new here: I refer to the proposal to crop a specific creature which, at some time, is becoming a nuisance in some areas. The proposition is that it should be cropped but, at the same time, this should not be done on a commercial basis.

Many people who have taken an interest in rabbits and various other animals about the country will know of the constant argument about non-commercialisation. It is considered that this is perhaps the best method of handling the problem. I sincerely hope that it is a proposal that appeals to members.

Clause 9 contains an amendment to paragraph (c) of subsection (2) of section 17. Members of the Wild Life Authority, and conservationists in general, together with farmers and most others who have thought about it, believe that we have enough pests without running the risk of introducing others. This amendment merely seeks to make it even more unlikely that we will run such a risk.

In the Eastern States and New Zealand—which are the only areas from which birds may be imported into Western Australia—there are certain species of caged birds, such as finches and quail, and other fauna, which may become pests if introduced and accidently liberated. We want to be able to ensure that before their introduction is permitted—if it is—the species is a harmless one and, if not, that there are sufficient safeguards to prevent its deliberate or accidental acclimatisation. This country has suffered enough from animals brought in for one reason or another and being let loose to acclimatise under our conditions.

Clause 10 amends subsection (3) of section 17C. The two subparagraphs of the amendment propose that there should be two additional sources for receipts for the Fauna Conservation Trust Fund. The first is consequential upon the amendment to section 15 and provides for the crediting of net proceeds from the controlled sale of possum skins. The second will allow the authority to sell any surplus kangaroos removed from sanctuaries or land under its control in accordance with the previously approved management scheme, and to credit the net proceeds to the fund.

Kangaroos, like most other animals, will tend to increase if not held in check by natural or artificial means. It is anticipated that on some sanctuaries where the kangaroos' natural controls—that is, dingoes and eagles—have vanished, or been reduced, kangaroo numbers will need reducing from time to time. The authority and the department is building up the necessary knowledge and professional and technical staff to detect when and where thinning out is necessary. If some kangaroos have to be taken to protect their environment, it seems fair and fitting that the surplus should be sold for the financial benefit of conservation generally.

This is a principle which is generally accepted worldwide. I saw it in operation earlier this year in Kruger Park where cropping of stock to sizeable proportions is done on a controlled basis; and it seems a very sensible way to manage it. Strangely enough, purists in the natural field tend to favour natural death. They claim that if animals overstock and it can be so designed that these animals are allowed to die off through starvation, cold, or the young being taken by predators, this is preferable. The reason, they claim, is that the weaker of the species are thereby killed. Under a cropping programme it is not always the weakest which are taken.

However, this is fairly impracticable. It requires immense areas of land and also a hard-hearted or well-trained attitude, and cropping is therefore the method most generally used.

Section 18 of the Act is amended by clause 11. The Act already provides that royalties may be levied on the skins of fauna that are taken for sale. The amendment proposes that royalties may also be charged on the carcases of kangaroos if a rate is prescribed. It also proposes that if the skin is removed and sold

separately, a royalty may be charged on both the skin and the carcase of a kangaroo.

The amendment has been so worded to allow us to distinguish between kangaroos taken in different parts of the State or for different purposes. Those taken in accordance with a management scheme, for example, might be exempted from royalty as the proceeds will be credited to the trust fund.

Clause 12 is to amend section 19 to correct an oversight when the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee was replaced by the Wild Life Authority. Members will recall the discussion in this House about the name of the committee, and the amendment to call it the Wild Life Authority was moved by Mr. McNeill, if my memory serves me right.

Clause 13 contains amendments to section 20 to facilitate the enforcement work of wardens in outback areas. They are—

(a) to allow the release of fauna that the warden reasonably suspects were illegally taken; and

(b) to empower a warden to direct the driver of a vehicle to take it to the nearest police station.

The circumstances under which the warden may do these things are set out clearly in the Bill and members will readily appreciate the reasons for them.

As some members may wonder how the warden may decide that such fauna should be released, I would remind them that the person in possession of the fauna should have in his possession either a license to authorise their taking or a license to authorise his keeping of them. If he is unable to produce any license, and is not known by the warden to have such a license, and cannot give a satisfactory reason for his having the fauna, it would seem logical for the warden to release them if, in the circumstances, it seems desirable. His inability to care for or feed the fauna if they were seized would be a good reason for considering such action to be desirable. On the other hand, the fauna might be sick or starving and the action the warden should take would depend on the circumstances.

In the case of proposed new subsections (2a) and (2b) of section 20, the power sought for the wardens is chiefly required in respect of crocodile poaching, but it may also be required in the conservation of kangaroos.

The Johnstone freshwater crocodile has been legally protected in this State since 1962, and in the Northern Territory since 1964. The reasons for this protection were, firstly, that this relatively harmless species was really vulnerable to complete extinction in that it could be wiped out of its pools by the indiscriminate use of nets; and, secondly, studies elsewhere in the world have shown that crocodiles play an important role in maintaining conditions suitable for the maintenance of good stocks of prime eating fish, like barramundi. If crocodiles were netted out, the populations of "rubbish" fish would increase enormously and the numbers of prime fish drop as a consequence, as, of course, the rubbish fish eat the better fish.

These crocodiles are also of considerable scientific interest, but are largely unstudied due to lack of funds. The purposes behind protecting them were, therefore, to prevent the decimation of their numbers—as had occurred in the Territory under uncontrolled conditions—not only to keep the animals themselves for various reasons, but also to conserve the barramundi by keeping the natural balance in the inland waters.

Members will have noticed in the newspaper last week reference made to a Dr. Bustard. In conjunction with the Australian National University, the Department of Fisheries and Fauna of Western Australia arranged for Dr. Bustard to do some studies in the Kimberley area on saltwater and freshwater crocodiles. It is hoped that the information gained by Dr. Bustard will be of great value to the department in its future work.

Since protection was introduced, however, our wardens and police officers, and their counterparts in the Northern Territory, have found it extremely difficult to stop the poaching of this species, carried on principally by shooters from the Eastern States. While we can control our own residents, the Queensland-based operators, for example, are exceedingly difficult to apprehend. Crocodile shooters are very mobile and the areas they have to work in are so large. Queensland has remained the "odd-man-out," as it were, and has refused to co-operate. Under its legislation crocodiles are not "fauna" and are not subject to any conservation or protection measures. It is just an "open slather" there.

Until recently Queensland steadily resisted requests to co-operate on the ground that it still has plenty of crocodiles left. If this were so, I think it would be reasonable to expect that its shooters would be encouraged to operate legally in their own areas. But it is a fact that some choose to leave the plentiful supplies allegedly and legally available there and make round trips of the order of 3,000 miles to poach in Western Australia. All through Western Australia and the Northern Territory they run the risk of having all the crocodile skins seized, but neither this nor the enormous distances deter them. They have been apprehended and have had their skins and salt and boats seized and confiscated, but they come back for more.

Queensland has been aware for years of this illegal trade, but has adopted the attitude that it is up to us to stop it. This amendment will, it is hoped, make the

control in Western Australia better than it was. I believe, and I have told my colleague in Brisbane so, that it is in the long-term interest of conservation and crocodile shooting as an industry that the taking of crocodiles, both saltwater and freshwater, should be fully controlled. I am glad to say that in the last few days my Queensland colleague has intimated that, next year, he will seek an amendment to allow his Department of Primary Industries, which administers the Queensland Fauna Conservation Act, to give close supervision to the harvesting of Johnstone crocodiles. For the information of members I will read the letter recently received from the Queensland Minister. He says—

> I refer to your letter of 5th August, 1969, concerning control of the taking of crocodiles and would advise that I have given this matter a lot more consideration.
>
> I must confess that I am not fully convinced of the need for close harvesting supervision. Nevertheless, I will concede that such supervision does not provide an onerous burden on the department.
>
> As our legislation stands at present, there is no means by which this action can be taken immediately. Briefly, our Fauna Conservation Act covers birds and mammals only. I am prepared however to seek an amendment to the Act for this purpose.
>
> You will realise that submission of any fauna legislation to Parliament is to invite controversy.

The introduction of any Bill invites that, to some extent. To continue—

> As a revision of the Act presently being undertaken should be ready within a few months, provision for the inclusion of the Johnstone crocodile will be made as part of this general revision which it is expected will be submitted to first session of the House in 1970.

This is good news, as far as it goes, but do not let us think it will solve all our problems in crocodile conservation. There will still be poaching and the need for the amendment we are seeking here to allow wardens to arrest a vehicle and require its driver to take it to the nearest police station. If he absconds, or refuses to comply, we propose that he should be guilty of an offence with a maximum penalty of $200. It must be remembered crocodile skins are selling at between $2 and $3 an inch—the inch being measured around the crocodile at its widest part. An eight-foot crocodile is worth about $60.

Clause 14 is to amend section 25. The need for this amendment will be readily apparent. The department has had difficulties in the past, particularly with people like crocodile shooters, but even with one or two otherwise reputable firms. This has largely been straightened out by refusing or threatening to refuse to renew the particular license, but the amendment is still needed to cope more quickly with any future situations should they arise.

Clause 15 amends section 27. Wardens are empowered under section 20 of the Act to seize fauna, weapons, and other things used in the commission of an offence. Section 27 provides that a court may, on conviction, order the forfeiture of these things, with the exception of vehicles or aircraft.

We have had the experience of crocodile shooters abandoning a dinghy, skins, salt, nets, and so on when they have heard the warden's vehicle approaching. These things were duly seized and a notice of finding posted in accordance with section 27A. The dinghy was of little value and was apparently "written off" by the poachers and not claimed. Subsequently the offenders were identified and prosecuted and the court, apparently erroneously, ordered the confiscation of the dinghy to the Crown, and it was sold. The amendment aims to authorise this action in any future case. We can, I think, safely assume that any vehicle or vessel abandoned would have an extremely low value —an old trailer or canoe, or that sort of thing; and, in any case, it will, of course, be in the hands of the court.

Clause 16 is to amend section 28. Additional regulatory powers are being sought, firstly, to allow for the better protection of the environment of sanctuaries, and, secondly, to allow the introduction of a system for better control over the marketing of kangaroos by the use of tags.

When I brought forward the 1967 amendments which included fairly wide authority to make regulations for the control and management of wildlife sanctuaries, I said that there was nothing in them that one would not expect to find in by-laws controlling city parks or gardens. Somehow we overlooked the powers now sought which are also, I think, ones which are self-evidently necessary.

Since the Act was previously amended we have had the experience of finding that persons unknown had broken up slabs of granite under which certain kinds of lizards shelter. Two research programmes have been seriously affected by this activity—perhaps largely through the ignorance of the persons responsible—and it is desirable that the environment be protected and this protection publicised.

Members here will have seen large granite outcroppings and Mr. Lavery will recall having seen these at Tuttaning this year. Because of weather action, the top slabs will shale off, leaving a thin gap between the rock and the shale, and this space is the natural habitat for varieties of lizards which are very interesting from

a scientific point of view. This is the sort of shale slabs referred to. These people will drive their vehicles on these types of out-cropping, cracking the slabs to pieces.

I mentioned tags a moment ago. A local manufacturer has experimented with plastic self-sealing tags—a sample of which I have in my hand—and these are being tested through the co-operation of the pet-food industry. They seem likely to satisfy our needs which are basically to be able to relate any skin or carcase being marketed to the authority under which the animal was destroyed. Tags will also be the basis for collecting vital statistics and for determining whether any royalty due has been paid. It will therefore be seen to be necessary that we should be able to—

(a) prevent the misuse of official tags; and

(b) prohibit the manufacture, use, or distribution of counterfeit tags which could be used to upset the system.

The tags are self-sealing and I have two in my possession. I will seal one, for the benefit of members, and leave the other unsealed. They clip around, poke through the skin or carcase, and seal up. Once they are put together, it is necessary, literally, to smash them to get them apart. They are very simple and inexpensive. I hope members will test the one which I have closed and I will leave the other out so that members may look at it. I will put both on the Table of the House.

Finally, additional authority is required and is sought to provide for the collection of royalties. No firm decision has been reached as to the amount of royalty, if any, to be charged, but we are thinking at the moment that it ought to be about 20c a carcase on all kangaroos. This would probably gross between $40,000 and $60,000 a year. One must remember that the industry is itself grossing something in the order of $500,000 to $750,000 annually from a resource which is owned and managed by the Crown, without any real cost to the industry. I think 20c is little enough. The proceeds of the royalty will necessarily be credited to revenue, not to the trust fund, but it should at least offset the costs which proper management of the industry will require. The department has taken on expert professional and technical staff to assist the Wild Life Authority to advise what priorities should be allotted and what steps should be taken to conserve our valuable and unique wildlife resources. The measures in this Bill include the first long-term recommendations of the authority and I commend them to members.

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

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Prisons Act Amendment Bill.
2. Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

EXMOUTH GULF SOLAR SALT INDUSTRY AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.35 p.m.]: This is the sixth agreement dealing with companies which are registered and approved to produce and export salt which has been presented to the Parliament of this State.

Three of these companies are already exporting salt. I should like to speak in terms of north-west entities which are already in operation. Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd., near Useless Inlet, will be exporting 300,000 tons this year. Leslie Salt Co., which is based at Port Hedland, will be well on the way this year towards its initial target of 1,000,000 tons. The objective at Dampier is 1,000,000 tons per annum, and the company will commence producing for export in 1971. Also, Texada Mines Pty. Ltd. expects to reach 1,500,000 tons of salt, as a by-product of its activities, which will be exported through Cape Cuvier.

The agreement which is before the House is a ratifying one and concerns Exmouth Salt Pty. Ltd. The objective is 1,500,000 tons of salt and the company already has marketing links with a well-known Japanese company. A closer analysis of what the companies are doing and of what the agreements provide for gives the indication that, by 1975, the production of Western Australian salt for export may exceed 10,000,000 tons.

On the surface, this is a truly remarkable figure for a commodity of this kind. I consider the world demand for salt for industrial purposes is remarkable as it has grown manyfold within two or three decades. Japan has had a great deal to do with the stimulus in the use of salt.

When we consider that any one of the companies which is now operating will be handling 3,000 tons of salt each day in each year, it is an indication of how big the industry in this State will be.

The figures of world production are worth more than passing comment. In 1955, 67,000,000 tons of salt were produced in the world. In 1961 the figure was 83,000,000 tons, and in 1964 this rose to 93,500,000 tons. Indeed, in the last recorded year the figure was very close to 115,000,000 tons. The United States of America is the world's greatest producer, with China second, and Russia third.

America produces salt in 17 States and there are 57 companies in operation, 11 of which produce more than 1,000,000 tons a year each. I think it is interesting, too, to observe that 64 per cent. of the total American production is used in chemical manufacture and for industrial purposes within the United States. I have extracted these figures from last year's *Mineral Report of the United States.*

Obviously salt is a commodity which is very easy to split up electronically. When so treated, it is also very interesting and indeed remarkable to note the wide variety of commodities and miscellaneous products both for industry and for human consumption which come from such treatment.

The Minister in his speech emphasised the necessity for cheap power in connection with the splitting up of sodium chloride in its natural state. I think he mentioned the figure of .6c per kilowatt, which, of course, is extremely cheap power. Whether this can have a relationship with the gas fields which are not very far away from this project, and other north-west projects, is something for the future. The manufacturing capacity within Western Australia is one of the unknowns of the future, but fortunately we are likely to have the availability of power in that region.

I thought the Minister approached the subject of the agreement quite realistically. He acknowledged that very many difficulties face the company, which does not have the geographical advantages of some of the other companies which are already operating. Some of the companies are only a mile or two away from deep-water facilities through which they export and they have other advantages in that fairly substantial towns are located nearby. I refer particularly to the Leslie Salt Co.

Some members do not have the same opportunity as north-west members to see what is happening near Port Hedland. It is quite a remarkable sight to see the harvesting of salt within three miles of Port Hedland. Large machines harvest the salt at a rate of four tons per minute and it is loaded into trucks and conveyed to the stockpile where it is ready for export.

It is not only the natural geographic situation which is so important, but it is also important that Western Australia is served with low, marshy, salt country right on the coast in very many places. This type of country has a clay bottom which is almost impervious to any sort of moisture.

Many great advantages are accruing to Western Australia through the use of what was formerly worthless country. If one couples the fact of impervious beds which are easy to prepare with an evaporation rate per annum which exceeds 120 inches, it will be seen that the opportunity is there and is being taken to use assets which have been obviously latent.

The Minister pointed out that the company has faced financial difficulties. Its first objective was to have a solely owned Western Australian entity, but this objective had to be put aside because of the large amount of capital involved. On a relative basis it may seem that the amount of capital is not much when compared with the amount necessary to establish iron ore development. However, after all, $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 of capital is a very large amount, whoever may be supplying the money. The company expects its costs to approach $3,000,000 before it has the capacity to produce 500,000 tons of salt a year with that expenditure.

The same sort of conditions are within this agreement as are to be found in former agreements affecting salt and, indeed, many other types of agreements which have come before the House in recent years. One condition in the agreement is that the financial capacity has to be proven to the Government; the company has to prove that it is able to complete the works to a state of production. Another condition is that satisfactory contracts of sale must be proved. The company has further responsibilities which concern roads, harbour facilities, and housing. As I have said, similar conditions are contained in agreements made with other companies.

Other conditions are not stipulated in the agreement because of the company's geographic position. It is not adjacent to an established port and does not have the responsibility to establish a port of the same type and size—indeed, the enormity—as Dampier. However, the conditions which apply are clearly and rigidly stated in the agreement, and I have no doubt they will have to be honoured.

On the financial side it is important to note that the company has been able to interest a very powerful British ally in the firm of William Baird Mining Company of England. I suppose many members in this Chamber would at all times welcome the association of more British capital in industries that can and will be developed by money coming in from overseas.

There will be some Japanese money in the venture, and the amount now expected from a Western Australian source exceeds 20 per cent., or is not less than 20 per cent. If members can visualise a map of Western Australia, this comparatively isolated region is only a little way round the corner from the North West Cape. It is between the North West Cape and

Onslow and, indeed, is just out of the Lower North Province. I hope it will give some stimulus and hope to that little town of Onslow, which has had to overcome so many vicissitudes from cyclones and other disasters in recent years.

On page 13 of the agreement I note that arrangements have been made for the same royalty to be charged to this company, in spite of its disadvantages, as is being charged to other companies. It is obvious that this company will face many more difficulties than any of the other companies that have entered into agreements with the Government; but I suppose the standard has been set and it has been considered preferable, where necessary, to make other allowances and conditions to such a company rather than to vary the amount to be charged in royalty.

In paragraph 13, on page 13 of the agreement, it will be found that the company is obliged to pay a royalty of 5c a ton for the first 500,000 tons in any year; 6.25c a ton on the second 500,000 tons; and 7.5c a ton on all tonnages in excess of 1,000,000 tons in any year. The tonnages are to be ascertained at a place called Burnside, which is likely to be a point of access to the sea.

Many members, no doubt, have had a serious look at many of these agreements. I know that more than one member has studied them. The other evening I was interested to hear Mr. Ferry refer to some of the clauses in the schedule to the agreement on the wood chipping project. If one were to compare the Wood Chipping Industry Agreement Bill with the legislation dealing with the Mount Goldsworthy Iron Company and the Leslie Salt Co. there would be such similarities as to make one wonder which Bill one was reading.

If members have in their hands this Bill dealing with the establishment and carrying on of a solar salt industry at Exmouth Gulf they will find that these are the marginal notes—

Stamp duty exemption.
Determination by Company.
Expiration of Agreement.
Relevant Law.
Notices.
Continuance of Agreement.
Force Majeure.
Variation.
Arbitration.
Assignment.
Labour Conditions.
Rating.
Upgrading of Roads.
No discriminatory taxes or charges.
Restrictions on resumption,

and so on. However, I am not reading from the Exmouth Gulf Solar Salt Industry Agreement Bill; I am reading from another Bill relating to a salt company.

I make the point that we now have presented to us, session by session, agreements which suit many purposes, many circumstances, and many industries. They are, I think, comparable with model by-laws and they are simply adopted for the specific purpose to which the new agreement is to be applied. There can be no harm in that provided that, in the one or half a dozen cases, such agreements are to be found workable and applicable. However, there are some features of this type of legislation which have been criticised by me over the years—particularly the waiving of provisions in other Statutes—and perhaps I would be negligent if I did not refer to them again. This is something I do not like to see in any law, but for the purpose of my analysis of this Bill it is so much like flogging a dead horse that it is worth only a passing mention.

I think it must be obvious that I am anxious to see as many industries as possible established in our north-west, but I am very concerned that, in some ways, the rights of other industries may be overlooked. I refer in particular to the many clashes that have taken place between mining companies and pastoralists. I deliberately draw attention to this very important matter. I have here three telegrams which have been sent to my colleague, the member for Pilbara, from pastoral interests. They are all addressed to him. The first one reads—

> Re Exmouth salt Bill am concerned that Bill proposes no protection to adjacent pastoral leases for improvements to water stock fencing pastoral roads stop company ingress road has not MRD approved grids with bitumen approaches or protection on road for stock regards . . . Don Forrest.

Mr. Forrest is a person of great responsibility and is well known to many members of this Chamber.

The next telegram is from Koordarrie, a station outpost, and it reads as follows:—

> Object especially to clauses 3 7 10 16 18 20 as being barefaced betrayal of our pastoral rights and leases one lease allotted 1968 now to be transmitted to entire production site without reference or compensation . . . McGrath.

The third one, from the shire clerk at Onslow, reads—

> Exmouth Salt Agreement Bill received Council has no Council comment however Bill does not give protection to present pastoral leases . . . Shire Clerk.

My attitude to that comment and the sentiments expressed in those telegrams is that we must not overlook the responsibility the Crown has to an established

industry despite its enthusiasm and anxiety to promote and establish new industries.

One important angle of this matter has been put forward by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association to a Minister of the Crown. Two years ago that association sought a conference with the Minister for Lands in an endeavour to have protective legislation introduced to define the rights and the plans of mining companies operating on pastoral leases. Surely that is reasonable! The association wanted to discuss the difficulties that are being experienced. May I elaborate on that? The day has not long gone when the humble prospector, travelling by horse and cart, by camel and buggy, or on foot, went through many pastoral stations in this State, always with the knowledge and sanction of the owner or the manager of the pastoral property.

However, the horse-and-cart day is a bygone day because, in modern-day mining development, a pastoralist endeavouring to muster valuable stock on a property could find that when he arrives at his mustering point there is almost a settlement of jeeps and mining equipment of the most modern kind. This is the modern way of prospecting; the modern way of investigating. Then, of course, I think it is wrong to say—as was said in another place recently—that the department collects only about $1,000,000 a year in pastoral lease rents and as they do not cover the cost of administration the pastoralists get a very good deal.

I do not hold with that contention at all. We have two separate industries, each of which is very important. The pastoral industry has been the foundation of the population of the north prior to mining development of recent years, and it will continue to be an industry of a permanent nature in places, perhaps, where some forms of mining may have disappeared. I notice, too, that it was said it is inherent in these pastoral leases that other developments of a more permanent nature, and other industry which is more economically concentrated, will come along and have precedence, subject, of course, to the rules being observed.

It is all very well for a Minister to say that—and it was said by a Minister—but I can see it is very important to examine closely the disabilities, if there are such, which arise as a result of two Acts of Parliament applying to the operations of one section of the industry. We do not want any such disabilities to occur, either in confusion of action or in any misunderstandings which may develop, because I think the pastoral lessees require much more protection statutorily than they now have. The reason is simple; it is that a person may enter a pastoral lease without the permission of a warden, because, under the Mining Act a pastoral lease is described as Crown land. It is an entirely different matter when it is a freehold property, but for the purposes of the Mining Act a pastoral lease is Crown land.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And for other purposes, too.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, that is correct. I am merely trying to illustrate how important it is not to have a cleavage between the administration of one Act and another, or to prejudice the people who are involved because of certain weaknesses brought about by not expressly stating where their rights lie. The Mining Act overrides the Land Act in more than one particular, and where Crown land is subject to the provisions of the Mining Act, the people who have occupied it—in some cases for 80 years or more—are extremely concerned about the way they are being treated in some instances. Many pastoralists have found that some mining operators are most considerate in advising that they intend to enter a pastoral property, but other operators have left fences down and gates open, and such actions have been very prejudicial to the pastoralists.

Whilst I am anxious to see mining development fostered in every way possible, I think we should merge the two interests rather than isolate them, especially as the pastoral industry is still, and will continue to be, of great importance to this State. I think we could examine the Statutes in both instances to see whether it is necessary to amend them so that proper and effective notice will be given at the time of the proposed entry of a pastoral property and so that the people who are now aggrieved will have some opportunity to know where they stand. I am hoping that will happen, and I will have faith that this matter will be looked at. I ask the Minister for Mines in particular to see whether a more compassionate approach can be made, not only in the provisions of the Mining Act, but also in their application. It would be inopportune to weary the House or delay it much longer on that aspect.

I hope the company concerned will meet with profitable results, though I am conscious of the fact it is not in the same advantageous position as other companies which are already established. If it does have difficulty in getting off the ground—to use a colloquialism—I hope that every Government assistance possible and necessary will help the company achieve its end.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [6.1 p.m.]: I am naturally very pleased with the forthright but common-sense manner in which Mr. Wise has addressed himself to this Bill which, of course, involves an agreement with the company concerned. I think I will have time before the tea suspension to make one or two comments on the matters raised by Mr. Wise.

First of all let me say that I am conscious of the fact that there is often a conflict of interests between people carrying out mining operations and the holders of land, whether it be Crown land or private land. We have heard something of this in this House, and not so long ago I received a deputation, introduced to me by Mr. White, on the subject of private land.

I have visited some of these pastoral properties myself—those where mining operations are taking place—and I have talked to some of the pastoralists, so I have some idea of the difficulties they are facing.

I have, however, always said to the mining companies that co-operation is the spirit in which they should conduct their operations wherever they might be; that they should not go onto a property without letting the occupier know they are there. To a large extent I think the mining companies fulfil this function. It is, of course, not possible for them to keep their eyes on all their employees and subcontractors for every minute of the day and night, and we will always find the odd fellow who will have a wash in the pastoralist's tank or his sheep trough. On one occasion a pastoralist said to me that he did not mind this so long as soap was not used, because that made the water unpalatable.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Without the soap they would put more body in it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That depends on how often the man washes.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: If they were long-haired hippies they would not be using soap.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is now getting me into deep water. My colleague, the Minister for Lands, and I co-operate on all mining activities—he with his portfolio of lands and I in my desire to see our mineral assets developed for the benefit of the country. That puts the whole thing in a nutshell.

I do realise, however, that this cannot be done at the cost and inconvenience of many people, so we should endeavour, as far as possible, to watch this sort of thing. Mr. Bovell and I are concurrently conferring on this very point.

The land to which Mr. Wise refers is Crown land; it is Crown land within the meaning of the Land Act and within the meaning of the Mining Act. The application which the Mining Act has to the Land Act is purely to distinguish the land on which the Minister for Mines may allow people to prospect and subsequently carry out mining operations.

The part of the agreement which deals with the production site states—

> As soon as conveniently may be after the coming into operation of the ratifying Act and the signification by the Minister of his being satisfied . . .

It then goes on to say that an area of 30,000 acres will be made available as the production site. What other purpose has this land usefully served until the year 1969? It is an area of waste country. The ground surrounding it may not be useless but these salt areas are usually practically useless tracts of land. Let us take, for example, Lake McLeod on which the Texada company is developing its proposition. It is a huge area of salt lake which until 1968 was entirely useless for any purpose whatsoever.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: And it was cursed by all and sundry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Fortunately with its knowledge and ability to treat this type of country, and to extract mineral from it, the company is turning it into a very productive area, not in an agricultural sense but for the purposes of mining.

Values in the north have changed very substantially in every way in the past 10 years because fortunately that area has had a tremendous boost as a result of the quantity of minerals spread over a wide stretch of the north-west.

The growth and fillip given to the north by mining development have indeed meant a great deal to Western Australia. Only this afternoon I heard the Premier say that one of the substantial benefits the people of the State and the nation itself will derive from this ordinary little agreement, with its royalty rate—which is set incidentally as a standard royalty from which we cannot very well depart, although one company may have an advantage over another—will come from the fruits of such an agreement. Western Australia is making tremendous contributions to the overall national income of Australia and the Federal Government in particular is getting a fine return in the way of company tax as a result of these various projects.

All I can say at the moment is that I am conscious that the pastoralist is there; he was not always there first, but nevertheless he has certain rights within his pastoral lease and, if he is being disturbed, I am sure other benefits will come his way as a result of such disturbance.

I think Mr. Wise referred to clauses 3, 7, 10, 16, 18, and 20. I am not in any way being critical of the man who sent the telegram in question, but I would point out that clause 3 of the agreement says that the State shall ratify the Bill. That seems to be a fairly logical clause.

Clause 7 of the agreement states that the company can build an airstrip. Surely if that is done it would be to the advantage of the pastoral property in question.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Clause 7 deals with water supplies.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There may be a distinct advantage in somebody being able to develop a water supply in the area. Clause 10 of the agreement says that the State shall give to the company machinery and tailings leases, and such other leases, licenses, reserves, etc., applicable under the Mining Act. These conditions are already in the Mining Act and have been granted from time to time.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think the objection was to subclause (2).

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There may well be some quite reasonable objections to some of these aspects, but by and large the amount of country which the pastoralist holds, when compared with the amount of land alienated for the purpose of this agreement, is relatively large.

Mr. Wise asked me by way of interjection whether I could give him some information as to the variability of the salt content in these various operations. By way of explanation I would say that generally producers using the solar salt system treat seawater under a system of fractional crystallisation. By this means unwanted chemicals are crystallised out until there remains what is called a super latent liquid, or bittern, usually containing some potash.

Most operatives take in seawater, the chemical content of which in the overall varies but little. Accordingly, it is not practical to reply to Mr. Wise's query as to salt content and chemical variation, by referring purely to chemical analysis. Indeed, little chemical analysis is called for until a prospective purchaser sets his own standards. The operative then meets these standards through the process of fractional crystallisation.

It may be of interest to mention that Leslie Salt and Shark Bay operate on seawater. Neither Exmouth nor Dampier have yet got going but they intend to use seawater also.

However, at the moment Exmouth is experimenting by pumping ground water, which is very saline and almost to saturation point. From the results of its experimentation to date the company does not expect to be able to get sufficient quantity of this saline groundwater to meet full production requirements. Texada pumps from ground supplies on Lake McLeod and does not intend to use seawater at all at any stage.

Incidentally, the project at Useless Loop is in the category of drawing on the back waters of the ocean which have been subject to some initial evaporation, producing a denser liquid.

At Lake Lefroy, of course, the company will harvest the natural salt. This operation is taking place in the district which Mr. Stubbs represents. As to the variability in the salt content, and the chemical variation, this is best answered by indicating at this point that the Japanese buy 96 to 97 per cent. pure salt. This product includes about 25 per cent. water, the balance being made up of odd chemicals existing in minute quantities.

So the position is that industrial salt has impurities as compared with table salt, and the extent of these impurities in the finished product is governed by the purchaser who will put an upper limit on them in his purchasing specifications.

I think that generally answers the points raised by Mr. Wise. The honourable member has given obvious support to the Bill. Perhaps I should say that the Bill, in relation to certain of its clauses, is in the normal pattern of these agreements. Mr. Wise referred to some of the marginal notes of the agreement and mentioned such things as *force majeure*, variation, and so on. This sort of thing, however, is fairly standard practice in all agreements. The basis of each agreement has a separate objective no matter what type of agreement it might be.

I often wonder at the number of agreements being presented to Parliament which clearly set out the responsibility of Parliament and the benefit derived by the people of the State, particularly as these relate to the obligations of the companies entering into such agreements with the Government and the obligations of the State to the companies as its part of the agreement.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

In Committee, etc.

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

JOINT STANDING ORDERS

Council's Amendments: Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had concurred in the Council's resolution.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [7.35 p.m.]: First of all I would like to refer to an interjection I made when the Minister was delivering his second reading speech. I can assure the Minister that my interjection was quite involuntary. Perhaps as a result of many years in the

teaching profession my custom is to correct an error when it is made. I assure him that I meant no disrespect whatsoever in the matter, and I let the matter rest at that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The matter has now been closed. I did think that I was the student on that occasion!

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I support the Bill, but I wish to make a number of comments on it. Originally the architects, while awaiting the constitution of the main board, were to some extent governed by a provisional board. It was a little surprising to find constant references to the provisional board in the original Bill. Most of them have been removed but, as I proceed to deal with this Bill in general terms, I will show that in many clauses amendments are being made because of the connection of the relevant sections of the Act with the activities or duties of the provisional board. That has occurred in clause 3 of the Bill, and section 5 of the Act is to be amended by deleting the words, "The term includes the provisional Board." The board is to be referred to as the Architects Board.

The constitution of the board is to be altered by the addition of one extra member, to increase the number from nine to 10 members. The additional member is to be nominated by the Western Australian Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. This additional member will hold office for 12 months only, and his appointment does not in any way interfere with the principle of having one of the appointed members and two of the elected members retiring each year, although they are eligible for re-election. I think that the appointment of this additional member to the board is a very wise move. This makes it simpler to get together a group of six members to hear charges of, for example, misconduct; whereas previously it was quite difficult to get together the statutory number to hear charges, in a board with only nine members. These people give their services in a voluntary capacity and it cannot be expected that they are always available when meetings take place.

In clause 7 there is again a reference to the provisional board; and in clause 8 also there is a further reference. These terms in the Act are redundant.

The main point I wish to speak on is to be found in clause 9. An amendment was moved in another place by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Graham), but it received fairly short shrift from the Minister. Now it is proposed to move a similar amendment in this House, and in this connection I could quote as verification what the Minister said in his second reading speech. He said that an amendment would be introduced on exactly the same lines as that proposed in another place, and that this amendment would tidy things up considerably.

The point is this: Quite a number of students of architecture had undertaken their courses some years ago. Provision was made in the Act that after completing the examinations they had to have not less than four years' experience of working as an architect. The Bill proposes to alter the period from four years to six years. It does not require much imagination to realise what the extra two years will mean to a person who started off with the idea that he would qualify in a certain time, and who had made his plans accordingly. To give an example, he might have the intention of getting married as soon as he qualifies. If such a student has to delay the marriage for a couple of years, because of the provision in the Bill before us, a real hardship would be imposed.

There is the possibility that an architectural student planned to become a partner in a firm of architects after he had completed his time. With a delay of two years, more particularly at a time like the present, he could miss a good opportunity. From that and many other points of view it would be wise to retain the four-year provision in the case of students who commenced their studies when that was the period of qualification. Although the proposed amendment does not appear on the notice paper, I suppose that it will in due course before the Bill reaches the Committee stage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have an amendment along the lines indicated, and I will have it placed on the notice paper this evening.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I knew it would be. I draw the following matter to the attention of the Minister, and it might be rectified by the Clerk: In section 18 there is reference in two instances to "five guineas." By clause 12 it is proposed to substitute "twenty dollars" for "five guineas." Apart altogether from the change in currency, it was said that because of rising costs the proposed increase from the equivalent of $10.50 to $20 was a legitimate one.

However, when we turn to section 19 of the Act we find that the fee for the insertion of a degree or qualification on the register is 10s. I would have thought that when an amendment is being made to increase the annual subscription fee from $10.50 to $20, an amendment would be made to alter the fee of 10s. to either $1 or $2. Whilst I do not want to impose any additional charge on budding architects to have their qualifications registered, to be consistent with the amendment proposed to section 18, my suggestion could be looked at.

The main clause in the Bill, clause 15, deals principally with misconduct. More power is to be given to the board to deal with such cases. I think this is a most desirable amendment. Where a body is charged with maintaining the high standards of the members of the profession, I always think that it should be given the greatest possible powers to discipline its members.

Clause 13 seeks to repeal sections 20 and 21 of the principal Act. These sections refer to people who have been wrongfully registered, who have given false information, and arising out of that have been registered as architects. Nothing will be lost by the repeal of those sections.

Clause 15 covers all kinds of unprofessonal practices and I would think in a profession such as this there are opportunities—I do not know whether I should use the word "opportunities" or "temptations"—sometimes for the architects to do things which are not ethical. Opportunity should be available for the board not only to discipline them but also to impose penalties which are in keeping with the offence.

Another reference I could make would be to the constitution of the Committee of Architectural Education. The composition of the committee will be much more obvious and one will not have to go searching to find the names of the people on the committee. One change will provide that one of the members of the committee will be a person nominated by the Institute of Technology. When the Architects Act was first introduced there was no Institute of Technology and as that particular educational institution provides for an architectural course it is only natural that it should have some say in the setting of standards.

The committee has two functions. One is to advise and submit to the Architects Board recommendations on matters which concern the education of the students. Every two years the committee has to review and report to the board on the standard that exists. I think this is absolutely necessary in a profession where changes are taking place annually because the architect of today may possibly vary immensely from the architect of tomorrow. The provision of a two-year review is very wise. The committee is faced with the responsibility of keeping up the standard, and making recommendations to the board to see that examinations are framed accordingly.

Clauses 19 and 20, again, relate to the provisional board and the sections of the Act are amended accordingly. A final clause removes the word "subsequent" which is also redundant because there are no subsequent meetings of the provisional board and the reference will now be to every meeting of the constitutional board.

I feel the Bill has a lot to recommend it, and we support it. I think the members of the board have a big responsibility to the community in the setting of standards. From time immemorial architects have set high standards. I know that in some of the older countries of the world architects are always referred to with pride, as are certain buildings. Most members would have heard of Sir Christopher Wren and St. Paul's Cathedral. We could go further back and refer to the standards set in Greece and Rome.

I have always been intrigued to see the amazing piece of architecture which greets one as one enters a certain harbour—the name would be known to everybody.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Sydney Harbour Bridge?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I am thinking of another structure. However, I feel that perhaps in another 15 to 20 years the people concerned will look back with pride on the piece of architecture to which I refer, because in many ways it is unique. I have watched the building grow and have admired it, and despite the expense I feel it is a wonderful symbol of what architects can do in the course of framing things of beauty.

I have pleasure in supporting the Bill and I am delighted to see that the Minister has taken note of the advocacy of one of my colleagues to preserve a measure of what I consider to be fairness to those people already engaged in the profession.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. Clive Griffiths.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [7.50 p.m.]: I rise to support, in general, the intent of the 25 clauses of the Bill now under consideration. However, I do question the desirability of three of the clauses involved. Those clauses are 5, 19, and 20.

Clause 5 of the Bill deals with the constitution of standing and occasional committees in a local authority. It may be of interest to members to know that for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1969, of the 144 local authorities throughout the State 89 had nine members or less on the council. Of those 89 local authorities five councils had five members; one council had six members; 37 councils had seven members; five councils had eight members; and 41 councils had nine members.

So it would appear that the majority of the local authorities have nine councillors or less. Like many other members

in this Chamber, I have had local government experience both as a councillor and as a president. When I entered local government I found that in my particular local authority the committee system, which clause five deals with, did not function at all well. The reason was that the local authority was carrying out the intent of sections 179 and 182 of the parent Act, with which clause 5 deals. The intent of the Act was that each committee would comprise less than half the total number of councillors. If the council had nine councillors then a committee would have four councillors or less. It is also stated that of those four councillors on the committee, if the council comprises nine members, one—the president of the council—is *ex officio*.

My council followed the intent of the legislation and this meant that there were three ordinary councillors plus the president on each of the committees. However, because of the president's involvement in public duties he was rarely able to attend committee meetings so the effective size of each committee was only three members.

The Act gives the council the authority to declare what a quorum of such a committee shall be, and generally local authorities state that a quorum shall be more than half of the committee. If there is an effective committee of three on a committee which is supposed to consist of four members, then the quorum would have to be three members. So if a committee was to operate efficiently those three members would have to be in attendance at every committee meeting if the president was absent.

This, very often, is not possible in a voluntary organisation like local government, where the councillors have to earn their living, because quite often at the last moment they are detained and are prevented from attending committee meetings.

In the particular local authority with which I was associated very often the committee meetings did not have a quorum and the business could not be conducted efficiently. Due to the inefficiency of the committee arrangement the ordinary monthly meetings generally lasted from 12 to 17 hours which, in my opinion, did not lead to effective local government.

Clause 5 of the Bill intends to make it quite clear that the original intent of the Act shall be clearly defined so that committees shall be of a number which is less than half the number of councillors in the local authority, and that one of the members of the committee shall be the president or the mayor, who, section 182 states, is *ex officio* a member and chairman of all committees.

Section 182 of the Act states that the president or the mayor, as the case may be, may elect not to be chairman of a committee but there is no provision for him to declare that he does not elect to be a member of the committee. This, I feel, would be a desirable inclusion in the Act. When we deal with the clause in Committee I intend to introduce an amendment along those lines.

When I eventually became president of the council I decided that if the council was to operate efficiently the committee system would have to be altered. So I felt that I would bend the legislation a little to suit the local requirements and at the first council meeting following the annual election I did declare that I would, as president, be a member of only two committees, and with the remaining committees I would not be a member. I desired the council to elect a normal councillor to be a member of the committees in my place, and this was done. As a result, there were four effective members on the committees and from that time they functioned extremely well. Council meetings were reduced from an average of 12 to 17 hours duration to three to six hours.

To my way of thinking here was proof that the pragmatic approach was right in this particular instance. This bending of the Local Government Act to make the committee system operate effectively did work. As far as I understand it, the system still works.

Today I telephoned a number of local authorities in the West Province, which I represent, and much to my surprise and pleasure I found that at least four of those local authorities were operating the committee system along the lines that I had introduced in my own local authority. Those local authorities did not insist that the president or the mayor should be a member of every committee; they gave the president or the mayor the right to elect whether he would be a member of a committee. As a result, they operate efficiently.

Naturally, I am opposed to certain aspects of clause 5 which intends to restrict the number on the committee not only to less than half the number, but also to include the person who is a member *ex officio* and who is referred to in section 182.

Clause 19 is very desirable. Ever since my association with local government and Parliament I have endeavoured to get some relief in the payment of rates, as well as relief in the payment of vermin and noxious weeds taxes, by primary producers who have been affected by the rapid increase in land values in near urban areas, particularly within the metropolitan region.

Clause 19 sets out to supply some form of relief to primary producers who are affected by the very high land prices. In

paragraphs (b) and (c) there are interpretations of "farm land" and "urban farm land" which are similar to the interpretations in the Victorian legislation which, if I remember correctly, were introduced some two years ago. I have one query concerning the interpretations and the meaning of "farm land" as defined in paragraph (b), and that is that it refers to the fact that "farm land" means any single lot or portion of ratable property which is not less than five acres in area and which is wholly or mainly maintained or used for the time being for carrying on one or more of the following businesses or industries. Then it describes a number of primary industries.

I question the desirability of certain matters in this clause. One is that there is no statement concerning the zoning of the land which is to be defined as "farm land." I feel that farm land in this category should be zoned rural land and should not include land that has been zoned for another purpose, such as urban, industrial, and so forth. My reasons for wishing this farm land to be confined to rural land is that we find areas of rural land, particularly within the metropolitan area, can suddenly be rezoned to urban.

If the owners of this land have been carrying on a rural industry on the land, and wish to continue to carry on such industry, before rezoning takes place they have the right to appeal and to request that their land be left as rural land. However, we find that often, even though they have the opportunity, they do not appeal or request that their land be left as rural because they desire the benefits which accrue from the sudden automatic increase in value which their land receives if it is upgraded in zoning.

So I feel that a *bona fide* primary producer would be one who fights to retain the rural zoning of his land, and when this clause is dealt with in Committee I intend to introduce and endeavour to have passed an amendment along those lines.

In clause 20 at the bottom of page 11 of the Bill there is a paragraph which refers to the fact that ratable property which has increased in value due to its proximity to land which has been or is being developed for residential, commercial, industrial, and other urban uses, should be considered for classification as urban farm land. We find, particularly in the metropolitan region, a great deal of rural land which is close to land which is being developed or has been developed for each of those purposes. Therefore, the value of that rural land has increased appreciably and, as a result, the owners have to pay greatly increased rates.

However, in this clause there is no mention of land which has increased in value due to its proximity to land which has recently been rezoned from rural to a category of higher value; and I feel it is most essential that that particular classification of land should be included in this clause, because at the moment the paragraph refers only to land which has been developed or is being developed. It does not refer to land which it is intended to develop. Therefore, during the Committee stage I would like to see something done in this particular field to cover that item.

Apart from the three clauses I have mentioned, I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill. I commend him also for those three clauses subject to the point of view that I have put forward. I intend to support the measure.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [8.6 p.m.]: I thank members for their general support of the measure. I do not know that there is any need for me to say very much in reply to the second reading debate. Most of the matters raised can be dealt with in Committee. However, I would like to refer to two matters.

Firstly, Mr. Dolan has an amendment on the notice paper dealing with clause 19 which will throw the clause wide open. However, Mr. White wants to restrict the clause. One cannot have it both ways. I have already agreed, because of Government direction, that the area of five acres could be too large and should be reduced to 2½ acres. Some market gardens in the Spearwood area were reduced by division from 5 acres to 2½ acres as a result of a committee which I set up many years ago to decide this very question.

The very point that Mr. White raised is that we should tidy up this area and, perhaps, some others also. However, these gardens are in the middle of an area which is zoned urban, and we want them to remain that way as long as the owners are prepared to produce. There are many orchards, and maybe many poultry farms, within the zoned areas. Should those owners be denied the right of some reduction in the rate just because they are carrying on a very worth-while agricultural pursuit within a zoned area? I do not think we would be playing fair if we excluded them from the benefits which may accrue, and so I must disagree with Mr. White in this regard.

With regard to local authority committees, the problem raised would not apply except where a council with a small number of councillors operates committees. If a local authority has 11 or 13 councillors, and has a committee comprising four councillors, the problem would not arise, because the committee is less than half the number of councillors. The majority of councils with five and seven members —and even some with nine members—do not have any committees at all except a finance committee. All other matters are dealt with by the council as a whole.

However, what the honourable member mentioned has been the position with most local authorities which have more than 11 members. Unfortunately, some of them have broken the law by having a committee with a membership of just over half the number of councillors, and it is intended to stop this practice because the value of a committee will certainly decrease if it is made up of more than half the number of councillors. When a resolution of such a committee gets to the open council the decision has already been made and the council as a whole does not have an opportunity to disagree with a committee recommendation unless someone on the committee is prepared to buck the committee's decision. So the reason for this amendment is to ensure that a committee functions correctly and does not tend to take the place of the full council.

I would advise members that I have a further local Government Act Amendment Bill to bring forward this session. It will be introduced as soon as I can get a few things tidied up. It was ever thus with an Act of the nature of the Local Government Act.

I thank members for their support of the Bill. It is not my intention to deal with the Committee stage tonight, because amendments have been suggested and if they are placed on the notice paper all members will have an opportunity to consider them in their true light.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 8.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 30th September, 1969

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

QUESTIONS (16): ON NOTICE

1. TOWN PLANNING

Group Ownership Land Development

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Is he aware—

(a) that an organisation known as "Group Ownership Land Development" is developing or purporting to develop land in the Willetton area and elsewhere;

(b) that on the 6th September, 1969, the Canning Shire Council inserted in *The West Australian* an advertisement advising the public to seek advice from the shire before purchasing land from Group Ownership Land Development?

(2) Will he give full particulars of the development being undertaken by Group Ownership Land Development at Willetton?

(3) Will he state in detail the risks (if any) which the public must accept if at this time they contract to purchase land being part of the development being undertaken by Group Ownership Land Development at Willetton?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) (a) I have seen advertisements by Group Ownership Land Development offering for sale shares in an area of land at Willetton.

(b) Yes.

(2) I am informed by this organisation that no final plan can be submitted or implemented until the Canning Shire has completed its proposals for an overall scheme.

(3) There must always be an element of doubt about the financial return to be expected from buying land when planning schemes have not been finalised and subdivision has not been approved. In this case, the land is subject to development proposals by the Canning Shire, in which the location of many public facilities and amenities has yet to be decided on. It follows that no application for subdivision of this land has been submitted and that therefore the requirements of the Town Planning Board regarding the provision of school sites, drainage, sewerage, etc. have yet to be ascertained. Prospective purchasers of shares should understand that the area of land may be considerably reduced by deductions for school sites and open space, that no period can be stated within which development can begin, and that the economic potential of the land cannot therefore be accurately assessed at this stage. If they are in any doubt about the position they should seek information from the shire office, as suggested by the shire clerk.

2. PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES

Professional Division

Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

Is he prepared to have interim salary increases introduced, without delay, throughout the professional division of the Public Service, particularly to alleviate the