

and it is obviously designed to defeat the measure, despite the fact that it passed the second reading stage. I assume that if this amendment is passed then clauses 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 will also be defeated. We would then be left with a piece of paper containing just a few words. Possibly even the long title would be amended. Therefore, in the interest of the legislation, I think it is worth while taking some time off in order to prepare a case which may be better presented with some forethought to the Committee tomorrow afternoon.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not mind if you report progress.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Thank you.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I felt we should obtain a decision; but in deference to my leader I will move to report progress. I can see the logic in his submission.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Chief Secretary).

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Assembly Personnel

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper: Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting that in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to lapsed Bills, adopted by both Houses, the Legislative Council resume consideration of the following Bills:—

Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.

Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill.

Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Bill.

Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.

Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill.

The Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that a Governor's Message has been received for the—

Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill, and the

Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I move—

That the Assembly's message be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (4): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

2. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), read a first time.

3. Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Repeal Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Transport), read a first time.

4. Marketing of Linseed Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), read a first time.

House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 17th November, 1971

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

BILLS (11): MESSAGES

Appropriations

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills:—

1. Environmental Protection Bill.

2. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.

3. Loan Bill.

4. Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund).

5. Appropriation Bill (General Loan Fund).

6. Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill.

7. Parliamentary Commissioner Bill.

8. Poseidon Nickel Agreement Bill.

9. Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

10. State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment Bill.

11. Marketing of Linseed Act Amendment Bill.

UNIVERSITY OF W.A. AND W.A.I.T.

Students, and Quota Restrictions: Petition

MR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [4.38 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition, which is addressed as follows:—

To the Honourable Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the residents of the State of Western Australia respectfully sheweth that:

The University of Western Australia and the Western Australian Institute of Technology are seeking advance information on the probable numbers of students enrolling in the first year of a course in 1972; and that the imposition of quota restrictions may result.

We, the petitioners, therefore humbly pray that:

A Western Australian student who qualifies for entry to the University of Western Australia or the Western Australian Institute of Technology by passing at the normal entrance examinations for such institutions shall be excluded from taking a place in any of the said institutions by reason of the imposition of any quota restrictions which may be applied; provided that no places in the quota are filled by foreign students to the detriment and exclusion of any Western Australian student.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have signed the petition to certify that it conforms to the rules of the House. There are 142 signatures on the petition.

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Tabling

THE SPEAKER: I have for tabling the Auditor-General's report on the Public Accounts for the year ended the 30th June, 1971.

QUESTIONS (50): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION

Boarding-away-from-home Allowance

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that all funds allocated for special boarding-away-from-home allowances have been allocated?
- (2) If "Yes" does this mean that eligible applicants are now being refused help purely on the grounds that their applications were handled later than some others?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No further allocations are being made against the special fund which is to be superseded in 1972 by a general increase in living-away-from-home allowances.
- (2) The primary purpose of the grants was to assist those students who would be prevented by financial problems from enrolling at the beginning of the school year.

2. EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Trade: Effect of Britain's Entry

Mr. GAYFER, to the Premier:

Will he make a statement to the House on the effects to Western Australian trade of England joining the E.E.C. and the resultant import restrictions imposed by that community?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The agricultural industries likely to be most severely affected by the United Kingdom entry into the E.E.C. are dairying, canned fruit, dried fruit, apples and pears, and the sugar industry. Sales of soft wheat are also likely to be reduced. Sales of coarse grains and meats may not be seriously reduced as the E.E.C. is itself a major importer of meats and animal feedstuffs. However, the opportunities for growth in exports would be curtailed. Imports of Australian wool should not be affected by the United Kingdom entry.

Because of the pattern of agricultural production in Western Australia, the State will not experience the direct reduction in market outlets that sectors of agriculture in other States will be faced with.

Beef is in short supply on world markets at the present time. Both the United Kingdom and the E.E.C. have been major importers. There is little prospect of the existing E.E.C. countries being in a position to supply British requirements; in fact the E.E.C. seems likely to continue to be a major importer of beef.

Mutton and lamb exports to the United Kingdom are now faced with additional levies. These duties will be a further barrier to meat exporters.

Forests. Timber trade with Great Britain is confined to sleeper and crossing timbers for British railways and British underground. All indications so

far show there will be no noticeable effect on current level of trade at least for the next few years.

The feeling is that there could be more use of British railways in the transport of goods to Europe and hence more maintenance on such railways. It is expected that British import duties and restrictions could rise slowly.

On Britain's entry into the E.E.C. the trade preference on Australia's apples and pears will cease, and an E.E.C. duty of approximately 8% will be imposed. Additionally, there is the possibility that improved methods of cold storage of the European apple crop may eventually eliminate the southern hemisphere trade advantage in fresh fruits.

Currently the apple industry is in difficulties with a 24% increase in freight rates and restricted shipping space to European markets. This will make exports barely remunerative in the 1972 season. Moves to offset this disadvantage to Australian growers are being investigated but prospects are not favourable in the long term.

3. TORNAFIELD MEDIC SEED

Payments from Pool

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to my questions on Thursday, 7th October, 1971, on notice and without notice, and concerning the Tornafield Medic Pool of 1969—

- (1) As each variety of clover or medic marketed by the Grain Pool has been separately accounted and the Tornafield of 1969 has been sold, and there is a balance of undistributed funds of \$4,000 being held by the Grain Pool, why has this \$4,000 not been distributed to the participants of the Tornafield Pool of 1969?
- (2) When are these moneys to be distributed?
- (3) Is the Tornafield Medic Pool subject to a Treasury guarantee?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The Government guarantee was related to the whole small seeds pool covering all varieties and species as a unit. The pool is still in debit.

- (2) Further distribution is dependent on the pool coming into credit.
- (3) There is no separate Treasury guarantee for the Tornafield Medic Pool which is included in the overall small seeds pool.

4. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Diagnostic Centre

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he or the Government consider that the Royal Perth Hospital is already large enough for the site on which it stands?
- (2) What effect will the new emergency centre have on bed occupancy at the hospital?
- (3) What is the site of the proposed new \$9 million diagnostic centre at Royal Perth Hospital?
- (4) How many beds will the centre provide?
- (5) What proportion of these beds, if any, will be used for treatment purposes?
- (6) What is the expected effect that the centre will have on bed occupancy at Royal Perth Hospital proper?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The improved diagnostic, therapeutic and out-patient facilities will—
 - (a) enable more patients to be treated on an out-patient basis and thereby relieve pressure on beds;
 - (b) make available improved and speedier treatment for in-patients.
- (3) The area bounded on three sides by Moore Street, Lord Street, and Wellington Street and on the fourth side by the State Electricity Commission power station.
- (4) The diagnostic centre has not yet been planned. Government approval to begin planning was given on the 5th October, 1971. Feasibility studies have been carried out which show that no beds will be contained in the first stage of the diagnostic centre. However, space will be released in the main hospital block and this will be converted to ward areas containing approximately 180 beds.
- (5) All of them.
- (6) Answered by (2).

5. BENTLEY HOSPITAL

X-ray Clinic

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) When the Bentley Hospital X-ray clinic is working to full capacity and is not able to cope with emergency X-rays, where is the nearest X-ray clinic to the hospital?
- (2) Has he any plans for the future to ease the work load in the hospital's X-ray laboratory?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Emergency X-rays are carried out at the Bentley Hospital when required. In the event of an emergency other examinations are deferred.

There are extensive X-ray clinics at the Royal Perth Hospital and in the rooms of private radiologists in Perth—six miles from the Bentley Hospital.

- (2) Action is being taken to enable the Bentley Hospital X-ray Department to more equitably handle a greater load.

6. PRINCESS MARGARET HOSPITAL

Admittance Fee: Hospital Benefits

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is either Commonwealth or fund benefit available under the National Health Scheme where children are admitted to the Princess Margaret Hospital and are charged an admittance fee of \$2 and in some cases \$2.50?
- (2) If not, are there any avenues whereby the admittance fees are recoverable?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No. The Commonwealth Government has been approached by State Ministers of Health regarding this matter, but without success.

- (2) No.

7. NATIONAL PARKS, AND FLORA AND FAUNA RESERVES

Area

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What percentage of Western Australia is devoted to national parks?
- (2) What is the percentage of Western Australia devoted to flora and fauna reserves?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) .57%.

(2) 2.04%.

8. BRIDGE OVER SWAN RIVER

Causeway: Traffic Congestion

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the Government's intention towards construction of another bridge across the Swan River to give traffic relief on the Causeway?
- (2) When and where will this new bridge be constructed?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) It is intended to construct another bridge north of the Causeway.
- (2) Design of the bridge to cross from Burswood Island to a point just south of the gasworks is proceeding, but no date for its construction can be given at present.

9.

CAUSEWAY

Traffic Flow

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

- (1) What are the comparative traffic counts for the Causeway as at 1965, 1968 and the latest count?
- (2) Will the department vary the use of the inside lanes for peak a.m. and p.m. periods to give improved traffic flow and relief to the travelling public using the Causeway?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1)

	A.M. Peak		P.M. Peak	
	To Perth	From Perth	To Perth	From Perth
1965	3,621	1,945	2,150	3,890
1968	4,465	2,085	2,520	4,138
1971	4,028	2,492	2,767	4,231

- (2) The department is currently investigating possible means of improving the traffic flow at both Causeway rotaries which are now at capacity during peak periods. Such improvement is a prerequisite to consideration of the feasibility of reversible 4/2 operation on the Causeway.

10. INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Students' Council Funds: Use for Bail

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Would he supply information as to what amount of money and in how many individual cases have

the funds of the student council of the Western Australian Institute of Technology been used for bailing out offenders whose offence resulted in connection with draft resistance and/or demonstrations?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I do not have access to this information and suggest that the Member directs his inquiry to the organisation concerned.

11. UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Guild of Undergraduates' Funds: Use for Bail

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Would he supply information as to what amount of money and in how many individual cases have the funds of the guild of undergraduates of the W. A. University been used for bailing out offenders whose offence resulted in connection with draft resistance and/or demonstrations?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I do not have access to this information and suggest that the Member directs his inquiry to the organisation concerned.

12. DRIVERS' LICENSES

Suspension: Demerit Points

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

How many drivers' licenses have been suspended each full year starting with the day of coming into force of the demerit point system on account only of losing sufficient points for mandatory suspension of license?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

1st July, 1969 to 30th June, 1970
15.

1st July, 1970 to 30th June, 1971
56.

13. COCKBURN SOUND

Discharge of Heated Water

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Is heated water being returned to Cockburn Sound?
- (2) What is the average temperature of such water and how does this temperature compare with the normal temperature experienced in the Sound.
- (3) How much such heated water is discharged hourly or daily?

- (4) What effect is this practice likely to have upon the Sound?
- (5) What research evidence is adduced to support the answer to (4)?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1) Yes.

(2)

Industry	Volume Million Gallons Per Hour	Temperature Elevation Deg. Cent.
C.S.B.P.	1	14.5
B.P. refinery	4	12
A.I.S.	0.5	5
S.E.C. Kwinana	8	8
S.E.C. South Fremantle	6	2

The average base temperature of water in Cockburn Sound is 20°C.

(3) Answered by (2).

(4) No deleterious effect.

(5) Report after investigation by consultants specialising in environmental research engaged by the port authority.

14. COCKBURN SOUND

Discharge of Gypsum

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Is there any commercial use for the gypsum which is being deposited in Cockburn Sound?
- (2) If "Yes" why is it not being used?
- (3) Are any other waste substances being emptied through the pipe which conducts the gypsum?
- (4) Is there any research evidence to show the effect of the discharge of the gypsum upon—
 - (a) plant life;
 - (b) animal life;
 - (c) alkalinity of the sea water;
 - (d) the degree of dispersion or otherwise of the gypsum?
- (5) When the pipe was broken where was the gypsum deposited, and by whose permission?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Yes.

(4) The Fremantle Port Authority has commissioned a study by Environmental Resources of Australia Pty. Ltd. on the ecology of the sound. The study is proceeding. It would be understood that in the absence of an obvious deterioration in the environment, any study designed to pinpoint ecological change and its cause would have to be spread over a number of years.

(5) The Kwinana Shire Council rubbish dump with the permission of the shire.

15. ABATTOIRS

Location of New Establishment

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With reference to the report in *The West Australian*, 19th October, "Site Proposed for Abattoir", would he please advise the House the exact location of the site referred to and its relationship to the site set aside by the Brand Government south of Medina?
- (2) If the sites are different, what are the reasons for the change and what are the benefits of the new location over the site previously selected?
- (3) Are there any immediate prospects of the site being put to use?
- (4) How much of the site referred to in the 19th October press report is private land and Crown land?
- (5) If the new site is substantially different to the old site, what is to be the fate of the area previously selected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The site is in the south-west quadrant of the intersection of Balddivis Road and the Kwinana-Mundijong railway. It is the site chosen by the previous Government.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No. Firm proposals for development of the site have not been received from private industry.
- (4) 245 acres of Crown land and 175 acres of private land.
- (5) Not applicable.

16. SHIPPING

Joint Project with South Australia and Israel

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Western Australian Government considering a project for joining with South Australia and Israel in a shipping line to service Asian and other overseas markets as announced by A.C.T.U. President, R. J. Hawke, and South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, in *The West Australian*, 18th October, 1971?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what progress has been made in the studies and negotiations;
 - (b) what are the general lines of the proposal, and what would be the respective roles of State Shipping Service, Western Australia, South Australia and Israel;

- (c) would only Australian-maned ships be involved;
- (d) what additional fleet is envisaged and what types of ships are planned;
- (e) would the Darwin service be included?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) No official approach has been made to the Government on the proposal outlined in *The West Australian*.

17. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Increased Charges: Caustic-chlorine Industry

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Will the increases in the prices to be charged for electricity by S.E.C. from 1st November, 1971, project themselves into any price being negotiated for power for a potential caustic/chlorine industry, or will the Government adhere to any previous power figures used for these negotiations?
- (2) If the increases are to be reflected in the power price under negotiation, will the increased figures be crucial in the negotiations?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. Graham) replied:

- (1) No. The Government will adhere to the power figure that has been used in negotiations.
- (2) Answered by (1).

18. ABATTOIRS

Proposals for New Establishments

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) What stage has been reached in the Government's consideration of the Trades and Labor Council and the United Farmers and Graziers Association abattoirs proposals and which proposals were reported in *The West Australian*, 21st October, 1971 to have been discussed by T.L.C. and U.F.G.A. representatives 20th October, 1971, with the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and the Minister for Agriculture?
- (2) What other abattoirs proposals are currently under consideration by the Department of Development and Decentralisation and/or the Department of Agriculture and what stages have been reached in consideration of these proposals as distinct from the T.L.C. and U.F.G.A. proposals?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. Graham) replied:

- (1) The Department of Development has not yet completed its investigations into the project.
- (2) An abattoir to be located between the townships of Pinjarra and North Dandalup. This proposal is also at the investigation stage.

19. EFFLUENT DISPOSAL PLANT

Investigation

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Has he studied the New Zealand effluent disposal plant referred to in *The West Australian* 6th May, 1971, under the heading "W.A. Interest in Effluent Plant"?
- (2) If so, what opinions have been formed about the economic and technical efficiency of the process and plant?
- (3) If not, will he arrange for some studies to be made and a statement released following such studies?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. Graham) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) It is understood that full details of the process have not been released and furthermore that the process has not, as yet, proved completely successful.
- (3) The development of the process and its potential for application in Western Australia will be watched.

20. HOMOSEXUALITY

Legalising

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Attorney-General:

Will legislation be introduced in this session of Parliament to legalise private homosexual acts between consenting adults?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

No.

21. HEALTH

Bush Fly Control

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

- (1) Has an investigation been made recently of the bush fly situation in the State?
- (2) If so, can he say whether there exists any possibility of control in the near future?
- (3) If "No" to (1) will he take steps to investigate the situation?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Some years ago State Health Ministers requested the Commonwealth Government to organise an appropriate research project, because—
 - (a) the bush-fly nuisance is a national problem;
 - (b) not enough was known about its breeding habits and life-cycle to apply effective control measures;
 - (c) the C.S.I.R.O. was considered to be the agency best equipped to undertake the scientific research involved.

It was envisaged at the time that the project would take several years. The request was acceded to by the Commonwealth Government and officers of the C.S.I.R.O. have published several scientific papers on this matter in recent years. The last information available is that the establishment of African dung beetles offered reasonable prospects of control.

It is understood that studies are continuing and reports as to further progress will be sought.

22. HAMPTON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Prevocational Centre

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it intended that a prevocational centre will be built at the Hampton Senior High School?
- (2) What criteria are required before such a centre is built?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No decision has been made with respect to the provision of a prevocational centre at Hampton Senior High School.
- (2) No specific criteria are applied, but general accommodation needs and the requirements of an area in terms of educational courses are considered.

23. HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolments

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many fourth and fifth year students, at present attending Governor Stirling Senior High School, would otherwise be obliged to attend Eastern Hills High School if that school were a senior high school?

- (2) What are the present enrolment figures for the high schools of Eastern Hills and Bullsbrook?
- (3) What is the anticipated number of students who will attend Governor Stirling Senior High School in 1972?
- (4) Would he provide a list of the schools and the number of students enrolled at the respective schools which at present have a higher number of students than the anticipated enrolment for Governor Stirling in 1972?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) There are no boundaries between senior high schools for upper school students. Students may elect to undertake fourth and fifth year studies at the senior high school of their choice. In 1970, 35 students from Eastern Hills elected to enrol in 4th year at Governor Stirling Senior High School while 27 elected to do so in 1971.
- (2) Eastern Hills High School 395. Bullsbrook Junior High School 152 (Secondary), 362 (Primary).
- (3) 1,498 students.
- (4) Mt. Lawley Senior High School—1,515 students.

24. SWANLEIGH HOSTEL STUDENTS

High School Attendance

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Would he advise whether students resident at Swanleigh Hostel attend Hampton High School or Governor Stirling Senior High School?
- (2) Which is the closer school to Swanleigh Hostel, and what is the difference in road mileage?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Hampton High School.
- (2) Governor Stirling Senior High School.
The difference in road distance is 4½ miles.

25.

PUBLIC WORKS

Deferment or Cancellation

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Which planned items of the Public Works programme have been deferred or cancelled during the last eight months?
- (2) For which of the items of work deferred or cancelled had—
 - (a) tenders been called;
 - (b) tenders been called, specifications altered, and contractor or contractors been requested to quote?

- (3) Have the builders and contractors been compensated for their out-of-pocket expenses?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Perth medical centre—public health laboratories (north).
Perth medical centre—psychiatric unit and cafeteria.
Perth medical centre—nurses' quarters.
Perth police headquarters.
Leonora police station and quarters.
Tambellup police station and quarters.
Kulin police station and quarters.
Koorana child welfare day care centre.
Bandyup women's prison—extensions.
Byford inebriates institution.
Kalgoorlie courthouse.
Bunbury courthouse.
Wanneroo fauna research station.
Kalgoorlie mines department offices.
Meekatharra mines department offices.
Port Hedland mines department offices.
Bentley vehicle inspection centre.
O'Connor vehicle inspection centre.
Mandurah courthouse additions.
Kondinin police station and courthouse.
Bridgetown agricultural department store.
Esperance lands department office.
Government chemical laboratories workshop and rubbish area.
New high school at Moora.
Camballin primary school additions.
- (2) (a) Perth medical centre—public health laboratories (north).
Perth medical centre—psychiatric unit and cafeteria.
Perth police headquarters.
Bandyup women's prison—extensions.
Kondinin police station and courthouse.
Esperance lands department office.
Camballin primary school—additions.
(b) Moora new high school.
- (3) No.

26. PUBLIC WORKS

Education Buildings, and Government Guaranteed Projects

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the value of the 1971-72 education buildings programme?
- (2) Will he advise the progress with the programme expressed in value of portion completed—
 - (a) plans and specifications;
 - (b) tenders called;
 - (c) contracts allocated;
 - (d) work commenced?
- (3) Relating to the Premier's recent statement of a number of building projects being encouraged by Government guarantee, what are the projects and the extent of the guarantees?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) \$12,500,000 (excluding provisions for land acquisitions and furniture for increased enrolments).
- (2) (a) \$10,136,356.
(b) \$10,058,986.
(c) \$9,701,286.
(d) \$9,594,286.
- (3) Pemberton joinery works relating to a State Housing Commission contract at Esperance—\$30,000.
Manjimup Canning Co-operative Co. Ltd: New cannery—\$260,000.
Wyndham Meatworks Pty. Ltd.: Upgrading of facilities—\$600,000.
Other projects for which the issue of a guarantee is under consideration include:—
Southern Meatpackers Ltd:
New abattoirs at Katanning—\$800,000.
These figures were supplied to me by the Treasury.

27. EDUCATION

Free School Books

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Have arrangements been completed with the primary schools for the supply of free books and materials for pupils in terms of the Government's election promise?
- (2) What is the extent of the programme to commence in the 1972 school year, in particular—
 - (a) the books and materials to be supplied; and
 - (b) their value?
- (3) From where and by whom have the free supplies been manufactured and supplied?

- (4) Has a survey been conducted of the impact upon Western Australian employees and plant previously or at present involved in the supply and manufacture of local or export school supplies upon introduction of the Government's free scheme?
- (5) (a) If "Yes" to (4), will he advise the House the details;
(b) If "No" to (4), will he urgently initiate a survey showing for each planned stage of the Government's programme—
 - (i) decline of employees in the private sector;
 - (ii) increase of employees, plant and buildings in Government printers and associated industry;
 - (iii) loss of export trade to Western Australia?
- (6) Will he advise the House and myself the details when the survey is complete?
- (7) Has the Government obtained any items for free supply from overseas?
- (8) If so, will he list—
 - (a) the items;
 - (b) their place of origin;
 - (c) the value of the goods?
- (9) Were tenders called locally for these items prior to lodging orders overseas?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes, school selections have been received, orders have been placed and are in the process of being met.
- (2) (a) Reading books to all primary grades and atlases and dictionaries to all grade 4 pupils.
(b) Estimated value \$270,000.
- (3) The books and materials for stage 1 have been ordered through Australian publishers and distributors and are the normal supplies which were available prior to the introduction of the free text books scheme.
- (4) No.
- (5) (a) Not applicable.
(b) Such a survey would not serve any purpose for stage 1, to be introduced in 1972, as all books and materials will be purchased from existing commercial sources. The matter of a survey covering the effects of stages 2 and 3 will be considered.
- (6) This will depend on whether a survey is conducted.
- (7) All materials for 1972 will have been purchased from Australian publishers and distributors.

- (8) Not applicable.
- (9) Quotes were only called within Australia and no direct orders were lodged overseas.

28. ALBANY-BUNBURY HIGHWAYS JUNCTION

Relocation

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

Referring to my question on 22nd September, 1971, relating to up-grading of the junction of Albany and Bunbury highways, Armadale—

- (1) Is this intersection still held not to be particularly hazardous?
- (2) Have negotiations for acquisition of property and the relocation of the B.P. service station now been completed?
- (3) Have estimates for this work been completed and, if so, what is the cost?
- (4) When will this re-development of the junction commence?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The accident record does not suggest that there is undue hazard.
- (2) No.
- (3) Provisional estimates indicate a cost of approximately \$320,000, not including land acquisition.
- (4) Late in this financial year subject to the satisfactory conclusion of negotiations for land acquisitions.

29. TRAFFIC FATALITY

Landini Castafaro: Withdrawal of Charge

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Referring to the announcement in *The West Australian* of 10th November, 1971 of the withdrawal in the Supreme Court of the charges resulting from the death of Landini Castafaro of Kelmscott in a road accident at Gosnells on 17th August, 1971—

- (a) will he advise the reason for the Crown withdrawing the charge;
- (b) on whose recommendation was the charge withdrawn;
- (c) when was the decision taken to withdraw the charge?

- (2) Will he advise the family of the deceased the reasons for the Crown withdrawing the charge?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Action has been taken on a complaint sworn on the 16th September, 1971 to bring the

alleged offender before the court for a breach of the Traffic Act. For this reason I do not consider it proper to answer these questions.

30. MINING

Temporary Reserve 1979H: Allocation

Mr. GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Mines:

When temporary reserve 1979H was created in 1961 to whom was it allocated?

Mr. MAY replied:

When temporary reserve No. 1979H was created in 1961, the occupancy rights thereover were granted to Athol Stanley Hilditch and Charles Harold Warman.

31. HOSPITALS

Staff Reduction

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he issued instructions to board hospitals to reduce staff?
- (2) If so, by what number?
- (3) Would he table a copy of the instruction?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (3) No, but the subsidies for the present year have been, in some cases, based on a level of staff below that previously employed. Discussions and correspondence have taken place with a few boards and the differences in viewpoint have been resolved in virtually all cases.

It is probable the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about the Three Springs Hospital. I am pleased to advise we were able to accommodate that hospital with a larger grant.

32. TOWN PLANNING

Land Acquisitions for Roads and Freeways

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Town Planning:

What has been the cost of acquiring property for roads and freeways since the inception of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority?

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Graham) replied:

The amount spent by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority on acquiring property for roads and freeways since its inception to 30th September last, was \$10,404,400.

33. MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Land Acquisitions for Controlled-Access Roads

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

How much has been spent by the Main Roads Department in acquiring property for controlled access roads within the metropolitan region in the last five years?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

The following amounts have been spent by the Main Roads Department in acquiring property for controlled-access roads within the metropolitan region in the last five years:—

	\$
1966-67	1,772,079
1967-68	1,412,626
1968-69	1,520,641
1969-70	1,665,072
1970-71	2,112,368
	<hr/> 8,482,786

34. TOWN PLANNING

Publications

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Town Planning:

Concerning the following publications could he please advise how many of each have so far been printed and issued, i.e.—

- "Perth: Region and People";
- "A Plan for the Swan and Canning Rivers";
- The annual report referred to on page 3 of "Perth: Region and People";
- Both the report and bulletin on the corridor plan?

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Graham) replied:

- "Perth: Region and People"—printed 4,000—issued 3,924.
- "A Plan for the Swan and Canning Rivers"—printed 1,000—issued 995.
- Annual report 1967—printed 500, issued 495.
- "The Corridor Plan for Perth"—printed 2,000 issued 1950. "Planning Bulletin—The Corridor Plan for Perth"—printed 3,000—issued 2,950.

35. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

"Kwinana" Publication

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

How many copies of the publication "Kwinana" (all editions) have been printed and how many have so far been issued?

Mr. T. D. EVANS (for Mr. Graham) replied:

		copies
1st Edition	1967	20,000
2nd Edition	1968	20,000
3rd Edition	1969	20,000
4th Edition	1971	20,000
Total issued to date		63,000

36. *This question was postponed.*

37. TOWN PLANNING

Local Authority Schemes: Submission

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- Within the metropolitan region how many local authorities have yet to submit their town planning schemes to the Minister?
- How many of the submitted schemes have yet to be approved?
- In regard to those schemes so far approved, how many objections were received for each during the period allowed for such objections?
- Were any of the submitted schemes rejected or modified before approval by the Minister?

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Graham) replied:

- Five.
- Fourteen.
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Claremont Town Council | 39 |
| Cottesloe Town Council | 3 |
| Fremantle City Council | 416 |
| Gosnells Shire Council | 74 |
| Kwinana Shire Council | 34 |
| Nedlands City Council | 192 |
| Peppermint Grove Shire Council | Nil |
- Yes, every scheme has required modification.

38. CO-ORDINATOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Activities of North-West Department

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

- Has finality been reached with the future organisation of the role of Co-ordinator of Development and his staff;
 - if not, when is finality expected;
 - if finalised, what are the details of the revised organisation and who will be filling the senior appointments?
- How will the North West Department fit into the new organisation;
 - how will the work previously undertaken in the North by the Administrator and his Assistant be handled now that

the Administrator's services on a residential basis in the North are being terminated;

- (c) are further changes contemplated which will provide more local administration resident in the North?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
 (b) Answered by (a).
 (c) The Co-ordinating and Planning Authority and the Department of Industrial Development and Decentralisation have been integrated in a new Department of Development and Decentralisation under the ministerial jurisdiction of the Deputy Premier and Minister for Development and Decentralisation. Mr. D. C. Munro has been appointed to the new position of Co-ordinator of Development and Decentralisation and will be the permanent head of the Department.

The Department is to consist of two Divisions—

- (i) Division of Development, to be headed by a position of Deputy Co-ordinator (Development), to which Mr. E. R. Gorham has been appointed. This Division will carry out broadly the existing functions of the Co-ordinating and Planning Authority.
 (ii) Division of Industries, to be headed by a position of Deputy Co-ordinator (Industries), to which Mr. T. J. Lewis has been appointed. This Division will carry out broadly the functions of the Department of Industrial Development and Decentralisation.

The new organisation will function from 29th November, 1971.

- (2) (a) The administration machinery associated with the north-west will continue its entity as a separate branch of the new department directly under the Co-ordinator.
 (b) The work in the Kimberley region will be undertaken by the Kimberley Regional Manager stationed at Kununurra. The Port Hedland office will remain open and after the Administrator relinquishes his office will be staffed by

officers of the Department of Development and Decentralisation.

- (c) Not at this stage.

39. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Orders for Generating Equipment

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Premier:

- (1) As he has stated publicly that he had to increase electricity charges in order to pay for generating equipment ordered by my Government, does he consider that these orders were unnecessary at that time?
 (2) Is he aware that the orders were placed on the recommendation of the State Electricity Commission?
 (3) As it was claimed that such orders were necessary to avoid future rationing of power if the growth rate at that time continued, does he consider that there was any alternative to us accepting the recommendation?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) Yes.
 (3) No, but having made the decision there was an obligation on the Government to take the necessary steps to provide the money required and nothing was done to this end.

Sir David Brand: Absolute nonsense!

40. PATERSON'S CURSE

Parliament House Grounds: Eradication

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is "Paterson's Curse" a declared primary noxious weed?
 (2) Is it true that this weed is growing in the grounds of Parliament House?
 (3) If so, will he take steps to have it eradicated?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) It was present.
 (3) Agriculture Protection Board personnel have taken action to destroy all plants found.

41. BUILDERS' REGISTRATION BOARD

Complaint by Ian C. Lush

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Builders' Registration Board received a complaint from registered builder, Ian C. Lush, that another person is building in his name?

- (2) If so, will he say what action has been taken by the board?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Mr. Lush lodged a complaint with the Builders' Registration Board on 3rd October, 1969, that another person was building in his name.
(2) The board investigated the complaint, resulting in the person building in his name being prosecuted on 8th June, 1970, found guilty and fined \$250 plus costs.

42. RESEARCH ASSISTANT TO PREMIER

Appointment

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he correctly reported in the *Sunday Times* of 24th October as having employed a person described as a "trouble shooter"?
(2) If so, what is the name, background and qualification of the person appointed, and what is his salary?
(3) In which field is this so-called expert now operating and what will be the future facets of Governmental responsibility that this person will examine?
(4) What possible justification can there be for the appointment of another person to advise him when already he has access to technical advice from departmental experts?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The Member's attention is drawn to the answers given at yesterday's sitting to questions asked without notice by the Leader of the Opposition.
(3) This question is a gratuitous insult to a civil servant and as such does not merit an answer.
(4) Every justification in my judgment as time will show.

43. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Increased Accommodation

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

What proposals are being considered by the Government to increase the much needed accommodation for country senior high schools?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The Government is desirous of establishing, as soon as possible, more secondary schools in rural areas. Such a policy involves a major building programme, increased hostel accommodation

and the appointment of specialist teachers. Major commitments in the current financial year will necessitate deferment of priority proposals until the earliest opportune date.

44. BUNBURY REHABILITATION CENTRE

Increased Security

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

- (1) Will he give an immediate assurance to the residents of Bunbury and Yelup that the Bunbury Rehabilitation Centre will in future only be used for the purpose it was designed for, namely, young first offenders serving time for minor offences and requiring rehabilitation services?
(2) Why are convicted rapists and murderers—
(a) sent to the centre;
(b) allowed on grass planting parties alongside the perimeter fence which can be scaled in 30 seconds?
(3) Is he aware—
(a) that the area surrounding the centre is so thickly wooded that immediate apprehension is almost impossible;
(b) that there are a number of elderly women living alone on secluded five acre blocks together with a male workforce away for the greater part of the day;
(c) that the morale of the capable rehabilitation staff is being undermined by placing them in a hopelessly unfair position?
(4) If "No" to (1), then will immediate steps be taken to upgrade the present fence to prevent such easy escape?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The Bunbury Rehabilitation Centre was designed for the rehabilitation of young offenders who were serving a sentence which would allow sufficient time for them to benefit from such rehabilitation programmes. Young offenders serving sentences for minor offences, namely those heard in the police courts, do not fulfil this time requirement.
(2) (a) and (b).
All inmates transferred to the centre are fully assessed by the department's assessment centre and screened by the department's

classification committee. A rehabilitation programme is designed for each inmate, which includes participation in necessary work parties.

- (3) (a) Department of Corrections land is not thickly wooded. The area referred to in this question is outside the control of the Department of Corrections.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Continuous meetings between senior department officials and rehabilitation staff at Bunbury have not disclosed any such morale problems.
- (4) The Department has held discussions with the Public Works Department regarding this matter.

45. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Increased Charges: Deferment

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) In view of the opinion expressed in the House by the former Minister for Electricity that funds were urgently needed by the S.E.C. and that the proposed 21% increase was to be made retrospectively, will he say what enabled the Government to defer the increase until early next year?
- (2) Was the deferment made because of the Ascot by-election?
- (3) Was the Commission informed of the Government's decision before it was released to the press?
- (4) From which source will come the \$500,000 lost to the S.E.C.?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) The increase in tariffs was applied to accounts on a *pro-rata* basis from 1st November in fairness to consumers.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) This is being considered.

46. TRAFFIC

Morley Motor Vehicle Licensing Office

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

When will the Morley area motor vehicle licensing office, which the Minister for Police stated on 7th April he had approved, be opened?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

The opening of a licensing office in the Morley area has been delayed because of shortage of funds, but will now proceed as soon as suitable premises are available.

47. AGE OF MAJORITY

Reduction to 18 Years

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Attorney General:

When is it intended that legislation to reduce the age of majority to 18 years, and attendant matters, will be introduced into Parliament?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The matter has been referred to the Law Reform Committee, whose report is expected in sufficient time to enable introduction of legislation in 1972.

48. DAYLIGHT SAVING

Short-term Money Market

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Have the Perth officers or agents of the Treasury who make the decisions and place or receive loans on the short term money market adjusted their working hours to the three hours difference between Western Australia and the Eastern States?
- (2) Now that the three hours difference between local and Eastern States time has been operative for two and a half weeks, can he state the actual financial losses, if any, which have occurred on account of this time difference to the Treasury using the short term money market in Eastern capitals?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No. Final decisions on the investment of funds held in the Government of Western Australia account cannot be made until the balance of the account at the Reserve Bank is known at 10.30 a.m. each day whereas the market now requires placement of money "at call" by about 10.00 a.m. An earlier start by officers would therefore serve no purpose in this situation.
- (2) The extent of the loss to the Treasury cannot be stated precisely as it represents the loss of earnings at fluctuating rates on an average investment of \$1 million. This sum is the average daily amount by which Treasury placement of funds "at call" has been reduced because of the earlier closure of the market in this State.

49. TEACHERS

Salary Increases: 1971-72

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the amount of the revenue estimates for 1971-72 estimated to be used for the last increase in

teachers' salaries for the financial year including the increases paid out retrospectively within the terms of the last determination?

- (2) What is the amount in the revenue estimates for 1971-72, if any, which has been allowed for further increases in teachers' salaries other than the increase referred to in (1)?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) \$9,309,000.
(2) It is not desirable to give details of the provision as many agreements are yet to be considered by the appropriate wage fixing tribunals.

50. DAYLIGHT SAVING

Effect on Rural and Industries Bank

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Have the Perth officers or agents of the Rural and Industries Bank who make the decisions and place or receive loans on the short term money market adjusted their working hours to the three hours difference between Western Australia and the Eastern States?
(2) Now that the three hours difference between local and Eastern States time has been operative for two and a half weeks, can he state the actual financial losses, if any, which have occurred on account of this time difference to the Rural and Industries Bank using the short term money market in Eastern capitals?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) It would appear that substantial losses have been sustained but it is difficult to assess their degree because of other depressive factors in the market.

On one day one half per cent. was offered for \$2.5 million and one reason given was "daylight saving". On another occasion the bank was unable to invest surplus funds over a weekend.

The bank's average weekly money market rates fell by 1.72% in the first week in November and by a further .31% in the second week.

QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. POSEIDON NICKEL AGREEMENT BILL

Government's Proposals

Mr. COURT, to the Acting Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Does the Government propose to make a detailed statement on the changed situation with the Posei-

don project since the Bill to ratify the agreement was introduced and the debate was deferred while the Government studied the new position arising from the announcement of partners or joint venturers with additional mining areas?

- (2) Is it proposed to proceed with the Bill this session and, if so, are amendments to the Bill or the agreement planned as a result of the changed situation?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

On behalf of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for sufficient notice of the question and advise as follows:—

- (1) Yes. I will seek leave to make a statement within a few days.
(2) Yes. It is considered that no amendment of the agreement is necessary at this stage to give effect to the arrangement Poseidon has with Union Oil, Hanna Mining, and Homestake Mining. Further explanation of this point will be contained in the statement.

2.

POINT PERON

Leases

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Lands:

Adverting to my question without notice of the 16th November, 1971, regarding Point Peron—

- (1) Did the Shire of Rockingham town planning scheme provide for a large portion of Point Peron being reserved for public use?
(2) Has the M.R.P.A. approved this plan?
(3) Is the Government's announced intention of extending the leases to 1993 at difference with the shire and M.R.P.A. plan and recommendations?
(4) If the answer to (3) is "Yes," in which way does it differ?
(5) Who are the organisations to whom the National Fitness Council has subleased at Point Peron—

- (a) 18 organisations who have developed their subleases;
(b) 11 organisations holding undeveloped areas; and
(c) area of each sublease?

- (6) On what day, to whom, and by whom was the submission made for extension of leases on behalf of the Greater Peron Development Committee?
- (7) Did the Minister for Education, the Minister for Lands, or the Premier submit the recommendations to the Government?
- (8) When were the recommendations submitted to and approved by Cabinet?
- (9) Will he acknowledge the inaccuracy of the statement in part (2) of yesterday's answer—"No response has been forthcoming"—as he is aware of the representations for a deputation from the Shire of Rockingham to be received by the Government which has been arranged with him for 10.00 a.m. on the 24th November?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the honourable member for adequate notice of the question. The reply is as follows:—

- (1) I understand that such a town planning scheme for Rockingham has not been finalised.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) See (3).
- (5) (a) National Fitness camp—Area undefined—approximately 6 acres.
Education Department camp—13a. 1r. 9p.
War blinded ex-Servicemen—0a. 1r. 24.1p.
Caledonian Pipe Band—0a. 3r. 0.9p.
Royal Perth Hospital Engineers Social Club—0a. 2r. 33.3p.
Apex—5a. 0r. 10p.
Postal Institute—4a. 1r. 23p.
L. & S. Recreation Centre—8a. 0r. 27p.
Waterside Workers Federation—6a. 1r. 8p.
Sister Kate's Home—1a. 1r. 8.2p.
Seamen's Union—5a. 0r. 0p.
Point Peron Aquatic Youth and Family Association—5a. 0r. 24p.
Swan Brewery Social Club—3a. 1r. 5p.
East Fremantle Football Social Club—4a. 0r. 20p.

Federation of Police and Citizens Youth Clubs—5a. 2r. 15p.

Police Union—5a. 2r. 15p.
Boans Sporting and Social Club—5a. 2r. 3p.

Churches of Christ—5a. 1r. 26p.

(b) Church of England Boys Society—10a. 0r. 39p.

Methodist Missions—3a. 3r. 39p.

Young Christian Workers—4a. 2r. 6p.

Methodist Young Peoples Department—4a. 2r. 27p.

Guild of Undergraduates—4a. 3r. 38p.

East Perth Football Social Club—4a. 2r. 36p.

Apostolic Church—4a. 3r. 22p.

Air Force Association—2a. 1r. 8p.

Baptist Union—4a. 2r. 17p.

Architectural Students Association—5a. 0r. 23p.

Australian Broadcasting Commission Social Club—5a. 0r. 2p.

(6) The submission was presented to the Minister for Lands on the 10th September on behalf of Mr. A. Powell, lessees' representative on the Greater Peron Development Committee.

(7) and (8) An objective report on the position as it exists at Point Peron was submitted by the Minister for Lands to Cabinet on the 25th October. Cabinet decision was reached on that day.

(9) No. Comments requested in the letter referred to have not yet reached me.

3. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Report

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that he has commissioned his so-called "trouble-shooter" to make a report on the matter of fluoridation of water supplies?
- (2) If so, has this report yet been received by him and has it been considered?
- (3) If not, will he release the report when it is received?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes, at the appropriate time.

4. ABATTOIRS

Proposals for New Establishments

Mr. COURT, to the Acting Minister for Development and Centralisation:

My question arises out of the answer given to question 18 on today's notice paper regarding abattoirs and investigations by his department. In his reply to part (2), which dealt with abattoir proposals currently under consideration by the department additional to the T.L.C. and U.F.G.A. proposal, he stated that the only one currently being studied was the site located between the townships of Pinjarra and North Dandalup. Would he be good enough to have this answer checked, because I have not heard any announcement about the decision in respect of Katanning and one or two other proposals that were being studied by the department?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Yes.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Days and Hours

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier)

[5.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 4.30 p.m., and on Thursdays and Fridays at 11.00 a.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [5.26 p.m.]: As everyone knows, the House finds itself in rather a peculiar position in respect of the time that is available for this session. It is therefore understandable that the Government should decide to sit on four days of the week. The House will be sitting at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays until late in the evening, I should imagine; then at 11.00 a.m. on Thursdays—until a late hour on Thursday nights, no doubt—and at 11.00 a.m. on Fridays. As the Premier did not say anything to the contrary, I gather there is a possibility of sitting late on Friday nights.

I would like to hear from the Premier that he does not intend to sit on Friday evenings. I believe that to do so would be beyond a fair thing, having regard for the country members, for *Hansard*, and the staff of this House. I do not believe it will be absolutely necessary to sit on Friday

evenings, if the House is well managed and all members present co-operate. I realise it will be necessary to sit reasonably long hours in order to carry out the legislative programme.

I think the problem which had developed before the prorogation of this House resulted partly from some firm arrangement that the House would adjourn at about 10.00 o'clock each evening. This is one of the theories we all have—this Government, our Government, and all those before them.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: So the Opposition sets out to frustrate it.

Sir DAVID BRAND: The Opposition did not set out to frustrate it at all. If there was any frustration, and if any example was set, we took the very good example which had been set over the previous 12 years by the then Opposition, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Davies: Well spoken!

Sir DAVID BRAND: The Minister for Environmental Protection might say, "Well spoken," but the fact remains that it is the truth.

Mr. Davies: Hardly!

Sir DAVID BRAND: I might add that if the Government wishes to achieve its purpose I would advise it to seek co-operation and not have its members make stupid statements such as that which the Minister for Environmental Protection has just uttered.

Mr. Bickerton: You have a better Government than we had.

Sir DAVID BRAND: That is very true. I am pleased that the Minister for Housing and Fuel made that statement.

Mr. Bickerton: You will not like it when you read it.

Sir DAVID BRAND: I trust the Premier will consider whether there is a need for members to return on Friday evenings, having regard for the very heavy demand on the staff of *Hansard*, the staff, generally, and all members.

However, if we have to sit on Friday evenings I presume the Opposition will be in a better position than the Government to sit longer hours, having regard for the 25th December. We support the motion; as far as we are concerned we have no real opposition to it provided the Premier will give an undertaking to do his best to avoid Friday evening sittings.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Environmental Protection) [5.31 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. O'Neil: Hello, hello, hello!

Mr. DAVIES: In considering this question one matter the Leader of the Opposition overlooks, of course, is that the—

Mr. O'Neil: We have a new Premier.

Mr. DAVIES: I think anyone is entitled to take part in the debate. As I recall it, I do not think there are any restrictions.

Mr. Court: Except that you are using up your own time.

Mr. DAVIES: If the honourable member wishes to give us the benefit of his opinion, that is all right with me.

Mr. O'Neill: I do not propose to hold up the business of the House as you are doing.

Mr. DAVIES: I have merely one point to make and that is that we have to contend with an Opposition which is different from that with which the previous Government had to contend; and this point seems to have been overlooked.

Sir David Brand: That is a lot of absolute nonsense, as reference to *Hansard* would prove.

Mr. DAVIES: The point I am trying to make—

Mr. O'Neill: Very badly.

Mr. DAVIES: —above the continued vulgar interjections is that we have had speakers from both the Liberal Party and the Country Party on each Bill which has been introduced. This is exactly how it should be; both parties are part of the Opposition and are entitled to make a contribution. However, of course, this has meant that more speakers have spoken to the various measures than normally would be the case. This matter seems to have been overlooked by the Leader of the Opposition when making his contribution. I suggest that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party could well consider the list of speakers on each measure and decide who should speak—

Mr. O'Neill: Now you are not only the Premier, but also the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Gayfer: Come over here.

Mr. May: Aren't we touchy!

Mr. DAVIES: —if they have a genuine wish not to sit on Friday evenings and to get through the business of the House as quickly as possible. No-one wants to deny any member the right to speak in this House, but this point has been overlooked and it is one which could be easily attended to and would probably save much time.

Mr. O'Neill: I have never heard anything like it.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.33 p.m.]: It is quite understandable that the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite should be concerned about the programme which has been outlined and it is one I would ordinarily not like to adopt. However, it must be remembered that we have lost five weeks' sitting time and there are Bills which are important to the Opposition as well as

to the Government which must be considered. Revenue is being lost as a result of the delay in the passing of some Bills which had reached the third reading stage.

If a spirit of sweet reasonableness prevails there is no reason at all why we should not finish the business on the notice paper weeks before Christmas. However, of course, if it is intended to stage a fill-buster every now and again then it is completely out of the question.

It must be remembered also that arduous as this programme is for ordinary members, it is far harder for Ministers; and those sitting opposite with 12 years' experience in the Ministry will know that is so without any further emphasis from me. So if we are prepared to punish ourselves in the interests of getting the legislation through we are entitled to expect that there will be a spirit of reasonableness to enable the work to be done.

I have no intention whatever of sitting on Friday evenings and, although the Leader of the Opposition said I had not made this clear, it is recorded that I did indicate this when I foreshadowed that it would be necessary to sit for four days each week. I indicated at the time that whilst we would sit after tea on Thursday I did not propose to do so on Fridays—nor do I.

Sir David Brand: That is all we wanted to hear.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Further, I do not propose to sit late tonight or tomorrow night, nor on any Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. I expect that we will be able to adjourn at a reasonable time—around 10.00 p.m. or a little later—in order to afford members an opportunity to get some sleep. If we approach this in the knowledge that we only punish ourselves, without any exception, by unnecessary talk and using two words where one will do—

Mr. Hutchinson: You are a master of that; you are a master of repetition.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: But in circumstances different from those we are now in. As has been truly said, circumstances alter cases.

Sir David Brand: In this case they have altered somewhat.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am pleased to see the Opposition in such a generous and happy mood; it augurs well for the prospects ahead. I hope that with the assurances I have given—to which I propose to adhere—we will be able to get on with the business.

I have had deputations from people in the country who have pointed out to me the urgency to primary producers of certain Bills on the notice paper and I am just as anxious as the members of the Country Party to get those Bills through. However, it needs co-operation on the part

of the Opposition and the Government and, so far as we are concerned, it will be forthcoming.

Mr. Hutchinson: It needs good management.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Precedence

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier)
[5.36 p.m.]: I move—

That on all sitting days until the 31st December, 1971, or until such earlier date as may be ordered, Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day.

I gave an undertaking previously, when I was speaking privately to the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the business which would be dealt with, that all private members' business which was on the notice paper when Parliament was prorogued would be discussed in Parliament, and an opportunity to do so would be provided. I adhere to that undertaking. However, it does not apply to new private members' business because, unfortunately, time is not available for that purpose. As has already been indicated, we have a heavy programme of important legislation to deal with and at this stage we cannot afford to give priority to private members' business other than that which was on the notice paper when Parliament was prorogued.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [5.39 p.m.]: It is true that the Premier, when speaking to me privately, indicated that private members' business on the notice paper at the time of the prorogation of Parliament would be considered. However, the member for Vasse has given notice of a motion prior to the motion we are now debating, and I think it is worthy of some consideration. As far as we are concerned, it is not our intention to introduce much private business. At this moment I do not know of any other private business to come forward. However, I think it is reasonable to ask that the member for Vasse be given an opportunity to present his motion—as it is not of a party-political nature—so that we can hear what he has to say about this important matter.

I would hope the Premier will reconsider this matter in view of our general co-operative approach. There is not much private members' business on the notice paper of either House and, therefore, if this matter is reconsidered a better atmosphere will be created.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier)
[5.41 p.m.]: I am not prepared to give an assurance that this motion will be dealt with because I do not know what the

circumstances will be. I cannot be expected to accord the motion precedence over Government business on the notice paper at this stage, having regard for the short period available to deal with the urgent matters we have before us. However, if we dispose of the measures on the notice paper and the other two or three urgent Government Bills which are yet to come forward, and time is available without sitting unduly late, then the member for Vasse will be given an opportunity. However, his motion certainly will not be given precedence over Government business at this urgent stage.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Appointment

The following sessional committees were appointed on motion by Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Premier):—

Library.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fletcher, and Dr. Dadour.

Standing Orders.—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. McIver, Mr. Mensaros, and Mr. W. A. Manning.

House.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Bickerton, Mr. O'Neill, and Mr. Gayfer.

Printing.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. R. Tonkin, and Mr. I. W. Manning.

Public Accounts.—Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Lapham, Mr. Harman, Mr. O'Neill, and Mr. W. A. Manning.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper: Motion

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier)
[5.43 p.m.]: I move—

That under the provisions of Standing Order No. 407 the undermentioned Bills be restored to the Notice Paper at the stages which they had reached in the previous session of Parliament, namely—

Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—To be read a third time.

Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Act Amendment Bill—To be read a third time.

Marketing of Linseed Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Stock (Brands and Movement) Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Beekeepers Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Bee Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Dried Fruits Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Inheritance (Family and Dependents Provision) Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Milk Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Land Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Companies Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Bills of Sale Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Environmental Protection Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Parliamentary Commissioner Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Marketing of Lamb Bill—To be read a second time.

Commonwealth Places (Administration of Laws) Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill—To be read a second time.

Cement Works (Cockburn Cement Limited) Agreement Bill—To be read a second time.

Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Western Australian Products Symbol Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Administration Act Amendment Bill—Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's Message No. 21.

Property Law Act Amendment Bill—Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's Message No. 22.

Wills Act Amendment Bill—Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's Message No. 23.

Appropriation Bill (General Loan Fund)—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund)—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Repeal Bill—To be read a third time.

Loan Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Poseidon Nickel Agreement Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Zoological Gardens Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [5.45 p.m.]: I have discussed this matter with the Premier and we have come to what I believe is a reasonable arrangement.

The problem which exists is the determination of the priority which should be accorded to some of the Bills that do not really carry a very high priority. Some of the legislation deals with matters which could well be held over for the next few months until another session commences in March of next year. I hope that if the co-operation about which we have spoken is forthcoming from both sides of the House we do achieve what the Premier has said we should achieve weeks before Christmas. In saying that I think he is letting his hair down! That is not quite right, but he is really looking into a crystal ball and making a rough guess. Nevertheless, I believe it is not essential that a number of the Bills which have been restored to the notice paper be passed during this session.

Another point I have raised with the Premier concerns the number of new Bills which might be brought down this session. With such a tight schedule before us, and in view of our assurance of co-operation, we should be made aware of whether there are three or four new Bills to be introduced. I am told there is about that number, and the Government considers they are essential to the Budget or to its legislative programme.

There is another point I need to raise. I suppose that at the next sitting of the House we will be given a list showing the priority of some of the Bills the Government considers are necessary to be dealt with. I wonder in doing this whether the Premier could furnish us with a longer list than the one he supplied yesterday. In view of the circumstances it would only be fair to the House for the Premier to list the priority of the Bills, and to place towards the bottom the less important ones. In so doing he will bring about a favourable reaction. I support the motion.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [5.48 p.m.]: With reference to the Bills yet to be presented for the consideration of the House I would like to put one point before the Premier. The Country Party will do all in its power to co-operate with the Government to get the legislation through. We appreciate the difficulties which have arisen and we will do all we can to help. I would ask the Premier what he intends to do with the Address-in-Reply. Will he use this debate as a fill-in between the debates on the legislation?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What do you think?

Mr. NALDER: I would like to know the intention of the Premier. Is it intended to proceed with the legislation first, as was indicated in the debate on a previous motion, and to debate the Address-in-Reply towards the end of the session? It would be advantageous to members to have this information from the Premier.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.49 p.m.]: If the Leader of the Country Party had read the items further down on the notice paper he would have noticed that I propose to move a motion to enable the House to deal with legislation before the Address-in-Reply debate is completed. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to see it debated again this session; but it is a necessary formality for us to go through. I hope that we will bring on this item and conclude the debate on the final day of the session. That will give an opportunity to members who want to keep on talking to do so and to sit on until Christmas Eve!

There is no intention to include items on the notice paper as fill-ins, because we have enough to engage our time fully without any need for padding. What I propose to do is to put on top of the notice paper the most urgent legislation so that it will be dealt with first. Bills of lesser importance will be dealt with after that, and legislation which can be held over until future sessions of Parliament will be held over. It is not intended that we shall sit until every item at present on the notice paper has been dealt with. The items have been placed there because this is the simplest method to restore the

situation as it was before Parliament was prorogued, and to give us the opportunity to deal with these matters if time is available this session. While some of these matters are not exactly urgent they are important, and if possible we should endeavour to deal with them. With that explanation I hope the House will agree to the motion.

Question put and passed.

Assembly's Message to Council

On motion by **Mr. J. T. Tonkin** (Premier) resolved:

That a Message be sent to the Legislative Council as follows:—

In accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to Lapsed Bills, adopted by both Houses, the Legislative Assembly requests the Legislative Council to resume consideration of the following Bills:—

Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.

Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill.

Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Bill.

Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.

Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill.

The Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that a Governor's Message has been received for the—

Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill, and the

Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

STANDING ORDERS

Suspension

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.53 p.m.]: I move—

- (1) That Standing Order 36 (Adoption of Address-in-Reply) and Standing Order 224 (Grievances) be suspended; and
- (2) The Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be introduced without notice, to be passed through all their remaining stages on the same day, and all Messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the same day as they are received.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [5.54 p.m.]: We agree to the motion. It is one which is generally moved in this Parliament at

about this time of the year. It enables rush legislation to be put through all the necessary stages at the one sitting. Sometimes this is a very necessary procedure to enable the legislation to be transmitted to the Legislative Council in time.

In the event of new legislation being introduced, I ask that we be given ample notice and also the opportunity to move for a reasonable adjournment of the debate. If the Premier is agreeable to this request we will offer no opposition to legislation being dealt with in the way it has been dealt with at this time of the year in previous sessions of Parliament.

The suspension of the grievance debate is almost automatic, although on this particular occasion there is a great field for discussion. However, I support the motion.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.56 p.m.]: The request of the Leader of the Opposition is quite reasonable, and I have no hesitation in saying that sufficient notice will be given of legislation to be introduced. I believe there will be three additional Bills only, so a great deal of time will not be taken up with them. Any request for a reasonable adjournment of the debate on those Bills will certainly be granted.

Question put and passed.

On motion by Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Premier) resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable lapsed Bills that have this day been restored to the Notice Paper to be considered at this sitting and, if necessary, passed through all their stages in one day.

LAPSED BILL

Restoration to Notice Paper: Motion

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [5.58 p.m.]: Notice of motion No. 9 on today's notice paper relates to a Bill that I introduced previously. I would like your assurance, Mr. Speaker, that this particular item will be restored to the notice paper, and that I will be given the opportunity to bring it on for debate. It is a lapsed Bill.

The **SPEAKER**: I will allow the honourable member to move for its restoration to the notice paper.

Mr. THOMPSON: I move—

That under the provisions of Standing Order No. 407 the undermentioned Bill be restored to the Notice Paper at the stage which it had reached in the previous session of Parliament, namely—

Local Government Act Amendment Bill—Second reading: Adjourned debate.

Question put and passed.

EDUCATION ACT

Disallowance of Amendments to Regulation 249: Motion

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville) [5.59 p.m.]: I would like to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Notice of motion No. 10 on today's notice paper appears in my name, and in this I seek to disallow amendments to a regulation. I had, in fact, given notice of my intention to move this motion prior to the prorogation of Parliament. I am concerned that if this motion is not moved prior to the normal period which is prescribed I might run out of time. At this stage perhaps it is a little early for me to ask you to give me some information for my guidance; however, I would request you to look into the matter and advise me in due course.

The **SPEAKER**: This is only a question of giving notice to move a motion, so the honourable member is well within the prescribed time.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Council Personnel

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees elected by that House.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper; Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read requesting that in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders adopted by both Houses relating to lapsed bills, the Legislative Assembly resume consideration of the undermentioned Bills which lapsed during the last session of Parliament:—

Censorship of Films Act Amendment Bill.

Adoption of Children Act Amendment Bill.

Property Law Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act Repeal Bill.

Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

2. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT REPEAL BILL

Third Reading

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Treasurer) [6.02 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [6.03 p.m.]: I rise at the third reading stage of the Bill to put a proposal to the Premier. When the measure was previously debated I indicated to the Premier that I intended to move an amendment, but circumstances have changed completely and it is not possible at this stage to proceed with my amendment. Rather than delay the passage of the Bill I wish to put a proposal to the Premier with which I hope he will agree. It will be necessary for me to take a little time to set out the reason I feel it is necessary and desirable to put forward my proposal.

It has been clear to all who have been interested in the road maintenance tax, which has been imposed for some time, that it has not been entirely satisfactory. I think this was indicated by a number of speakers during the second reading debate.

The previous Government acknowledged that the tax was entirely unsatisfactory, and a committee was appointed to try to find a more satisfactory and acceptable form of tax. Members of the Country Party have spent many hours at committee meetings and regular meetings discussing this matter. Quite a deal of research was carried out and different ideas and propositions were submitted for consideration by the committee appointed by the Government. However, we did not derive the satisfaction we hoped for as a result of the work which had been carried out. We believe there must be a better method of collecting a road maintenance tax, and we also believe that the proposal which I will mention in a moment would be accepted generally.

Legislation which requires an army of inspectors to ensure that road users meet their responsibilities and pay the tax has many undesirable results. People have been brought before the courts and fined, but the whole exercise has involved an unnecessary waste of man hours. Legislation which encourages the breaking of the law is not desirable. Such legislation is not in the best interests of the people of this country.

The member for Mt. Lawley, and also the Premier, mentioned the percentage of collections and the number of people who were evading the tax. The figures are beside the point; Parliament should not encourage evasion of the law. The situation which has developed indicates that a better method of collection should be introduced.

I am reminded of the many letters and telephone calls I received when the legislation was debated previously. I received one long distance telephone call from a person who was requesting some information about the tax and the new proposals. During our conversation I was surprised when he commented that he was doing all that was possible to duck out of paying the tax. He said that to be honest he had to admit he was not paying the full amount

of the road maintenance tax. I presume that that would be the attitude of many other road users. The present legislation encourages people to endeavour to sidestep the payment of the tax.

I cannot help but be reminded of a comment made by a great English statesman who said that the action of Parliament should be to help and encourage people to do the right thing, and discourage them from doing the wrong thing. That should be the situation with the road maintenance tax. My argument has been supported by almost every member who spoke to the second reading debate. The present Minister for Education—the then Treasurer—interjected on one speaker and said, “Your comments indicate the tax is inherently bad.” The member for Mt. Lawley agreed that it was not a good tax. He said there had been 1,343 prosecutions in Western Australia during 1970-71; 11,461 in New South Wales; and 5,592 in Victoria. Whether they were individual cases or not is beside the point; they were all cases brought before the court.

Another unsatisfactory aspect is the size of the Government departments involved in handling the legislation. I refer not only to Western Australia, but to Australia as a whole. We have been told that 432 people have been engaged in collecting the road maintenance tax throughout Australia. I would hazard a guess that many more people would be engaged in the operation, although perhaps not on a full-time basis. However, it is a very costly operation indeed and it would be interesting to find out the exact cost to the Australian public for the collection of the tax. The salaries and wages, rental of offices, cost of vehicles, and travelling expenses would run into a very large sum. I do not know whether or not the Premier has the exact figures, but they would be interesting.

The proposal for the replacement of the tax has many unsatisfactory features. It is unsatisfactory from the angle that costs will be increased to some sections of the community. I will refer to a particularly important section of the community—the stock carriers. Under the proposed method of collection they will definitely have to pay a larger sum of money and, of course, that increase will have to be passed on. I attended a conference with a group of carriers in the great southern, and unless some consideration is given to those businessmen a number of them will go out of business, or their operations will be very much restricted, a number of their trucks will be put off the road, and some of their employees will be out of a job. I say that consideration must be given to those carriers so that they will receive some relief.

I do not intend to go into the aspect of the effect on sheep prices because that matter has been covered in other discussions. However, the effect which the proposals will have on the sheep producers

must be apparent. The Federal Minister for Shipping and Transport has recently set up a Transport Industry Advisory Council. He said that the council was formed as a result of a unanimous decision of the Australian Transportation Conference held during March of this year. I mention this matter because I have received information during the past few days that in one State there is a move for the discontinuance of the road maintenance tax and the introduction of some other form of tax which would be more satisfactory.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. NALDER: Although, perhaps, I may be suggesting this a little early in the piece, there does appear to be an Australia-wide move—at least from information obtained from the other States—for a change in the present situation as it relates to road maintenance tax.

As I indicated, the Federal Minister for Shipping has appointed a Transport Industry Advisory Council. The appointment of this council has received strong support from all the States. The council would probably discuss problems similar to those we are discussing this evening, and because of this I feel we should at least initiate some move to bring about a situation which is more satisfactory than the one with which we are now faced.

As I said earlier, a number of members in this House—irrespective of the parties to which they belong—made similar comment. I can recall you yourself, Mr. Speaker, making a contribution to the debate and suggesting that possibly there could be some improvement in the present position.

The Minister for Housing also indicated that in his opinion there were probably better ways to bring in the money obtained by this tax than the method being adopted at present.

Although it is evident the Treasurer must proceed with the legislation in this House, I do suggest that he hold up the Bill in the Legislative Council for the present and that he request the Prime Minister to call a conference of Premiers to discuss this situation on an Australia-wide basis. I believe such consideration should be given to this problem as I feel the situation is quite unsatisfactory at the moment.

To suggest one source from which money could be made available to the States by the Commonwealth, I would point out that perhaps a tax could be placed on fuel. That, however, is only a suggestion, but in the present circumstances I believe it would be more favourably accepted than the situation which exists at the moment.

If the Treasurer were prepared to follow my suggestion, and if it were possible for him to influence the Prime Minister to call the conference I am sure

ways and means could be found to move in this direction, and I believe it would have the strong support of the public generally. I am sure the people concerned in the haulage business would be much more satisfied with such a proposal than the set-up which exists at the moment.

As I see it, a few months are neither here nor there in the present situation and it is possible that before the next sitting of Parliament—which will probably be in March—the Treasurer might have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Prime Minister together with the Premiers of other States.

If it were agreed that such an approach might be made, there is no reason that the ordinary conference held in February could not discuss the matter I have mentioned. Accordingly, I now suggest that the Treasurer gives some consideration to the suggestions I have made.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [7.36 p.m.]: I think all of us would agree that if a satisfactory alternative could be found to this rather difficult tax we would be very happy indeed. Accordingly, I support the views and the ideas expressed by the Leader of the Country Party, that the Prime Minister and the Premiers of others States should get together with our own Premier to discuss the possibilities of a satisfactory alternative.

It must be remembered that we tried very hard indeed to find a satisfactory alternative, but to my mind a satisfactory and feasible suggestion was never put forward. As I have said before, I am most concerned about the confusion that has arisen as a result of the election promise made by the Treasurer to repeal the road maintenance tax before a satisfactory and acceptable alternative had been found.

Western Australia has been very fortunate indeed in the percentage of road grants that has been made available from the Federal authority. As a result of these grants we have reasonably good roads. This is so because the formula which applied included a consideration relating to area and we, being a State of some 1,000,000 square miles—one-third of the size of the Commonwealth—received a very large amount.

The standard achieved is satisfactory from our point of view. The alternatives the Government has suggested, however, have not proved to be very popular and there is no proof that they are acceptable as alternatives.

It appears to me that in some respects at least what is intended will increase the costs to the farmers and others who are required to license a truck for certain purposes. No longer would the truck of eight tons and under be exempt from certain payments, as is the case now with road

maintenance tax. We must also appreciate that the license fees paid by these people are quite reasonable by today's standards.

If the suggestion made by the Leader of the Country Party is acceptable and the Treasurer is able to obtain the support of other Premiers, the attitude of the Commonwealth must surely be that at present a fairly heavy tax is applied to petrol and it is from this grant, when it is paid into general revenue, that allocations for roads are made from time to time under the agreement—in recent years it has been made every five years.

I do not know whether the Prime Minister or the Treasurer—irrespective of the political party to which they happen to belong—will be prepared to increase the petrol tax or whatever tax might be applied to fuel to make more money available to the States for the construction of their roads.

We should not overlook the fact that road maintenance tax was first introduced by other States and finally by ourselves for the maintenance of roads which had deteriorated rapidly as a result of the activities of interstate hauliers.

While we do not have this problem to the extent that it applies in other States, I believe the Governments of Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria were really at their wit's end and were wondering how they could possibly meet the maintenance costs that had been incurred over the years.

Because of their concern the States in question introduced a road maintenance tax which was in due course challenged in the High Court and found to be acceptable. I go along with the suggestion that it is a difficult tax to collect. We must appreciate the fact, however, that the other States are doing the same thing and they must be experiencing the same problems. They are, in fact, incurring a higher percentage of administrative costs.

It all boils down to the fact that a realistic and reasonable approach should be made to find an alternative, and I believe that until such alternative is forthcoming—whether it be as a result of the promise of the Prime Minister or of anyone else—we should not give away our road maintenance tax. This is very important indeed.

I repeat, that a great deal of confusion has arisen as a result of the Government's effort to repeal the road maintenance tax and, as mentioned by the Leader of the Country Party, there are many people who are now not paying legitimate road maintenance tax.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: So there were before.

Sir DAVID BRAND: There is a greater percentage of them now and, as the Treasurer knows, the Leader of the Country Party cited one case of a man who said,

"Others are not paying this tax so I will not pay it." This, of course, is a very human trait. The man concerned will not pay it if he does not have to pay it.

During our period in office we did at least try to enforce this law. We found that a number of difficulties existed and we all know that great play was made by the Leader of the Opposition of the day concerning the fact that we had put people into gaol. We did, however, enforce the law.

I hope the suggestion made by the Leader of the Country Party will be accepted by the Treasurer, and I trust he will be able to persuade the Prime Minister to discuss this matter at a conference with the Premiers of other States in an endeavour to find a satisfactory alternative to the present situation. We would be the first ones to accept the position if it did not alter the percentage of road money made available to Western Australia. Because of its huge size, this State of ours needs all the money it can get for this purpose. I would be all for it if such a solution could be found.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the Bill contains a clause which states that the legislation can be proclaimed in due course or at any time. The Treasurer has taken this precaution because he possibly feels his proposals might not be acceptable in another place, and if so he would be left with no alternative but not to proclaim the Bill and thus leave the situation as it is.

We support the retention of the road maintenance tax for the time being and oppose the Bill to repeal it.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Treasurer) [7.45 p.m.]: There is general agreement in the House that road maintenance tax is a bad and inequitable tax. I do not think a more unfair tax has ever been introduced or a tax so widely evaded.

It is no argument to say that because I gave an undertaking at the election, some people are not paying the tax. Many people, including some very big organisations, did not pay receipts duty during the whole of the time it was operative.

Mr. Gayfer: I did, and I did not get a refund.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Other people did pay it, and the situation is no different with regard to this tax. There is an obligation to pay it under the law. Some people are meeting their obligation and some are not.

Sir David Brand: There is not much effort made to enforce it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting we should gaol the defaulters?

Sir David Brand: You should enforce the law.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If we did that it would cost more money.

Sir David Brand: I do not think so.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: So there is no need for that course.

Mr. O'Neil: Is the Premier suggesting there are people who are not paying the tax?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am saying when the honourable member's party was in office there were some people who did not pay the tax. Either the Government did not gaol them or it released them a few hours after their arrest.

I consider this a tax which should be abolished for a number of reasons. I have already made reference to these.

Sir David Brand: It should not go until you get an alternative.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I gave an undertaking that the Labor Party would move to abolish this tax. From time to time it suits the Opposition to go out and tell electors of my broken promises.

Sir David Brand: We are talking facts.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I take it the Opposition expects me to carry out my promises and this is what I am trying to do.

Sir David Brand: But not to bring in a worse tax in its place.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about. There is nothing in this Bill to say what the tax is going to be.

Sir David Brand: You gave notice in your second reading speech.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am dealing with the Bill I am asking the House to pass.

Sir David Brand: You told us about the detail during the second reading.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I gave an outline at the time.

Sir David Brand: As part of this debate.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, in this debate.

Sir David Brand: Then why should we not raise it on the third reading?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What the Leader of the Opposition overlooks is that the Bill to impose these charges is not before the House. Representations have been made to the Government for alterations in the charges. Decisions have been made to effect the alterations and full details will be given when the appropriate Bill is introduced.

Sir David Brand: Until you let us know we will stick to the legislation we have.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Then the decision can be made by Parliament whether the alternative charges are acceptable or not.

Mr. Court: Are you being fair to Parliament? If you have made a decision that is different from what you told us.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: No, there are two separate Bills.

Mr. Court: You told us what you were going to replace it with.

Sir David Brand: In very precise terms.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Does it mean, Mr. Speaker, the Government is bound hard and fast to stick to its previous intention despite the fact that representations have been made and accepted that there should be alterations? Is that in line with the Opposition's thinking?

Mr. Court: So long as you tell us what it is.

Sir David Brand: Why do you not tell us?

Mr. Court: If you have changed your mind because of our pressure, you should tell us.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Opposition will be told when the Bill is introduced.

Mr. Court: We will hang on to this one until you do.

Mr. O'Neil: We will wait with bated breath.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This legislation has to be dealt with in two stages. First of all there is the question of whether we abolish the road maintenance tax. If Parliament says, "We will not abolish road maintenance tax," that is the end of it. If Parliament says, "We will abolish road maintenance tax," then an attempt will be made to replace it.

Mr. Blaikie: What about giving us an idea now?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Bill will be introduced setting out the alternative proposals.

Sir David Brand: What about letting us know about them?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I repeat that a decision on the alternative proposals will be made when they are introduced. That is the time to make it.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Why not give us this information now, on the third reading?

Mr. Court: You are implying there has been a change of heart on the part of the Government.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am not implying it; I am saying it.

Mr. Court: Why not tell us what it is?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I told members what we were going to do with the charges.

Mr. Court: If we had done this to you when you were on this side you would have raised "bobsy-die."

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The alterations are in the direction of reducing the charges for primary producers.

Mr. Gayfer: They will come down from 66½ per cent. to 48 per cent.?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I cannot hear the honourable member.

Mr. Gayfer: Will the charges come down from 66 per cent. to 50 per cent.?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That would be increasing the charges, not reducing them.

Mr. Gayfer: You said the concession would be 66 per cent. to the farmer and that it would be reduced to 50 per cent.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: On the first vehicle.

Mr. Gayfer: That is right.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am now saying the intention is that the tax on the first vehicle—

Mr. Blaikie: What about the contractors who never paid road maintenance tax?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am committed to attempt to abolish the tax and that is what I am trying to do.

Mr. Hutchinson: I'll bet you regret it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I did not think you were a betting man.

Mr. Williams: He only bets on certainties.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The proof that this is a bad tax is to be found in the attempts made by the previous Government to try to find some way of overcoming it. Very close attention was given to this. Such exploration would not have been carried out in the way it was if the members of the then Government were not convinced it was a bad tax and ought to go.

On the advice tendered to us, we believe that alternative charges of licensing will be less onerous than the existing road maintenance tax.

Sir David Brand: Where did the advice come from?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The new method will mean we collect less money from more people.

Mr. Lewis: You must get money from somewhere.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Is it denied that less money will be collected?

Mr. Gayfer: Yes, you will collect less from some.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The advisers to the Government who are in the best position to know tell me that less money will be collected under this licensing system than was collected under the road maintenance tax.

Mr. Gayfer: In total?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: In total, yes.

Mr. Lewis: But much more money from a large number?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If we collect less money in total and we collect it from more people, then the average impost must be less. That is plain logic.

Sir David Brand: What about the money for road maintenance? We cannot get less and less; we have to get more money.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Leader of the Country Party made a very good suggestion that a preferable method would be to impose a tax upon petrol. I remind him first of all—

Mr. Nalder: On fuel, not on petrol.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: On fuel, yes. I remind him first of all that one of the arguments advanced by the Opposition is that this proposed licensing scheme will make people who were previously exempt from road maintenance tax because they had vehicles of eight tons or less, liable to pay the tax. The tax on fuel would be levied on every motorist in the country. We should not lose sight of that fact.

Mr. Nalder: You will collect from a lot more people.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This system may be the most desirable method of raising money for road maintenance, because all motorists, whether driving private motor-cars or trucks are damaging the roads.

Mr. W. G. Young: Yes, but the money is not being paid proportionate to the mileage.

Mr. Hutchinson: There is a great inequity in what you are suggesting.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is quite right that the owner of every vehicle which does some damage to the roads should make some contribution to the maintenance.

Mr. Hutchinson: Great inequity in that proposition.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The argument against my delaying this Bill in order to see whether the Commonwealth Government will do something is that the proposition of a fuel tax has been put up before and rejected. This does not mean it might not be acceptable in the future, but it would take a long time to get a decision.

Sir David Brand: The fuel tax problem is a constitutional one.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The State cannot do this; it has to be done by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth will not do it unless all the States agree. Even then there is no certainty of a favourable decision because one of the reasons the Commonwealth handed over pay-roll tax to the State was to avoid the obligation of collecting the money itself.

Sir David Brand: That is right.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think the Commonwealth will put itself in the position of imposing an additional tax, and this is especially so as it is likely to face a general election within a few months.

Because of these difficulties, I cannot afford to wait. I propose to endeavour to pass this Bill and to put in its place some other method of obtaining the necessary money for road maintenance. If Parliament refuses to pass the legislation, that will be Parliament's decision. However, I believe when the schedule is brought down under an amendment to the Traffic Act and the various charges are thoroughly examined, it will be seen that a great many of the fears expressed are groundless.

Mr. Gayfer: They can be groundless only if there is a change in the structure of the charges. The previous charges were analysed fairly closely.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I always thought the member for Avon was a patient sort of gentleman who was prepared to wait until a case was put before him before he expressed an opinion.

Mr. Gayfer: I have had a look at one of your cases.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: My suggestion is: let us pass this Bill and get on with the job. In due course the amendment to the Traffic Act will be brought before Parliament. That Bill can be amended if it is not satisfactory, or it can be accepted or rejected. Whatever happens to that Bill will decide the issue.

I trust that the House agrees this Bill should be passed. I am prepared to try for assistance from the Commonwealth, and this system of licensing could be superseded by some other system if the Premiers in the various States agree. I express this view because I know the Premiers of other States are concerned with the inequity of this tax. There are a number of unsatisfied summonses floating around the continent. The other States are anxious to find another method.

I believe that if we abolish the road maintenance tax in Western Australia the pressure will be so great on the other States that they will follow suit, which will facilitate our reaching a stage where we will get a more satisfactory alternative than the licensing system we propose. I admit, without hesitation, that this system is not completely satisfactory and that there would be a better way of achieving our objective, but I am not prepared to admit that what we propose to substitute is more inequitable than the system which is already in existence. I consider it will be a definite improvement and we are entitled to get this improvement as a first step, because I believe it will greatly facilitate the possibility of obtaining an Australia-wide acceptance of a better alternative.

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

Ayes—28

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Bertram	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brady	Mr. May
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nalder
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Reid
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hartrey	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Jones	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Noes—16

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Ridge
Sir David Brand	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Court	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Stephens
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. O'Neill	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Burke	Mr. Gayfer
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Grayden

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

MARKETING OF LINSEED ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [8.05 p.m.]: In supporting this Bill to amend the Marketing of Linseed Act I hope to be fairly brief because of the spirit of co-operation we entered into before the tea suspension. The Bill seeks to provide for the inclusion of rapeseed in the provisions of the principal Act. For the moment this is the only seed under consideration. In 1969 the Marketing of Linseed Act was passed because at that time a large crop of linseed was grown in southern districts and production was increasing. However, since then the growers of linseed have encountered some difficulties and production has declined to the extent that it is estimated only 12,000 acres will be sown to linseed during the 1971-72 season. On the other hand, it is estimated that during 1971-72, an area of 70,000 acres will be sown to rapeseed and this crop is expected to yield between 10,000 and 17,000 tons of seed.

Support for the amendment contained in this Bill has come from all sections of primary-producer organisations. They desire that rapeseed should be administered by the statutory marketing authority and this is exactly what the amendment proposes to do. However, the Bill intends to do a little more than that, because it seeks to make provision for the Minister to introduce, from time to time, and as he deems fit, other seeds that will come within

the provisions of this legislation and be handled by the existing marketing authority. The provision has had a rather mixed reception.

Mr. Nalder: You are speaking of small seeds.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes. Some sections of the industry agree that all seeds should be handled by this authority, but others consider that as there is a difference in the end use of the various types of seeds produced it would perhaps be better to have a separate authority for oil and protein seeds as distinct from a marketing authority operating in the clover seed field.

It will be appreciated that in the end result oil seeds need to be processed. A developer will process and produce the oil or the protein meal from whatever type of seed he uses, whereas clover seed, generally, is sold for use as a seed on a farm-to-farm basis and is not processed. As it is difficult to find the necessary expertise and marketing knowledge for the export of all these seeds some growers have expressed the opinion that perhaps it would be better if a referendum were held on the provision allowing the Minister to include these small seeds in the existing legislation. At this stage I cannot agree with the opinion that has been expressed.

At the moment we are discussing only the inclusion of rapeseed within the provisions of the Marketing of Linseed Act and it will be up to the industry itself to approach the Minister to achieve its objective. I cannot imagine the Minister travelling around the countryside looking for other seeds to be embraced by this legislation without a request coming from the industry itself.

If in the future it is found that the existing statutory marketing authority is becoming too unwieldy because it is composed of men engaged in the production of linseed and rapeseed, and other sections of the industry are asking that small seeds be embraced by the legislation, it would be within the province of this House to divide the marketing authority by having one authority to administer the production of rape, linseed, and lupin seeds, and another to administer the production of other small seeds.

Sir David Brand: How can we be assured that the division will be brought about?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: At the moment we are dealing primarily with rapeseed and, as I said earlier, unless the Minister introduces other seeds into the legislation without the authority of the industry, I do not think there is any danger of a request being made that other small seeds should be embraced by the marketing authority if they can be marketed outside. When the question of marketing linseed was

first mooted a marketing authority was established for this purpose, so if the clover growers approached the Minister and asked for a separate marketing authority to be established this, no doubt, could be done without forcing the Minister to include clover seed in the existing legislation.

At this point the only question we are discussing is the inclusion of rapeseed in the Marketing of Linseed Act and, with the remarks I have made in regard to the other seeds that could be introduced from time to time, I think I indicate my support for that part of the Bill.

A further amendment in this measure proposes to allow the marketing authority to take up to $\frac{1}{2}$ a bushel from the growers to implement research on marketing, production, quality, improvement of various seed types, and that sort of thing. Similar research is conducted by other boards of this nature. It indicates the willingness of growers to improve their product and a desire to assist themselves, and I am in full accord with this.

The only other point I wish to make is that, unfortunately, this authority was not able to establish itself in time for this season's crop, but this is a factor that was beyond our control. Unfortunately, many growers have started to deliver their seed to a voluntary pool and thus they have lost the advantage of being able to market their seed under the provisions of a Bill of this kind.

With those remarks I indicate my support for the measure. I hope it will have a speedy passage through the House because I am certain the growers of seed will welcome it.

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.14 p.m.] My remarks in support of the Bill will be brief. Like the honourable member who has just spoken I am also quite concerned that the Government did not see fit to have this amendment to the Marketing of Linseed Act sufficiently high on the notice paper before Parliament was prorogued to have it passed by now, because, unfortunately, a number of growers will suffer as a result. Nevertheless, I support the generalities contained in the Bill, and I hope it has a speedy passage through the House.

Although I support the Bill in general, I do not agree with clause 4, which reads as follows:—

4. The principal Act is amended by adding after section 3 a section as follows:—

3A. The Governor may by Order in Council published in the *Government Gazette* declare that any seed, in addition to linseed and rapeseed to which this Act expressly applies, specified in the Order in Council is seed for the purposes of this Act.

This gives the authority of the day the power to include any seed, and at the appropriate time in Committee I intend to move amendments to that clause, but I will explain those amendments at a later stage. They represent a common-sense approach and will give the growers of other seed the opportunity to decide whether or not they wish to be included in a pool. A number of growers have approached me on this matter, and I understand approaches have been made through the small seeds section of the Farmers' Union.

However, at the moment I give my general support to the Bill and commend its speedy passage through the House. At a later stage I propose to move amendments.

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [8.16 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill and, like other speakers, I will be brief. I support it because it is in line with my view concerning the need for orderly marketing of all agricultural produce. Perhaps, more importantly, the measure has the support of the growers in my electorate.

As has been mentioned by previous speakers, rapeseed, to a large extent, is replacing linseed and it is only natural that the legislation be amended to make provision for rapeseed. I am pleased that the opportunity is being taken to include the amendment contained in clause 4 which will allow, with ministerial approval, other seeds to be included. After all, if the principle of orderly marketing is sound for linseed and rapeseed, it must also be sound for other small seeds.

If eventually it becomes apparent that because of the proliferation of the various seeds involved the board is unwieldy, Parliament will no doubt take the necessary action to amend the legislation and thus enable the board to be divided into various sections.

One comment I would like to make concerns the remarks of the present Minister for Works when the parent legislation was introduced in 1969. He called the measure socialistic. I do not want to waste the time of the House by going into the definition of socialism, but I believe that a vast difference exists between a grower-controlled organisation co-operating with the Government, such as is the case in connection with the measure under discussion, and an organisation being dictated to by the Government. This latter action I would regard as being socialistic.

However, I would agree on one point the present Minister for Works made at that time, and that was in regard to his concern for the fact that of the five members on the board, two are elected by the growers and a third grower representative is nominated by the Minister. The Minister also nominates two other members of the board, which means that the Minister nominates three of the five members. I agree with

the remark he made then, but I regret he has not used his influence in Cabinet to have an amendment made at this stage so that there could be three elected grower representatives on the board. With those remarks I support the Bill.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [8.20 p.m.]: I, too, would like briefly to offer my support to the measure. However, I do agree with the comments made by the member for Vasse concerning clause 4 which enables the Government of the day to include any other small seed in the provisions of this legislation.

I believe producers should be able to request orderly marketing if they so desire, and that any legislation covering them should be introduced only at their request. This measure is making provision for rapeseed, and I think it is wrong to include in it a provision to include any other seed. It is this principle which I contest.

It is the policy of the party to which I subscribe that producers of a commodity should have orderly marketing only if they request it. Such a request has been made in regard to the orderly marketing of rapeseed but, by including provision for other seeds, we deny producers of those other seeds the opportunity to resist orderly marketing if they do not desire it.

That is the only comment I wish to make at this stage because generally the Bill fulfils the purpose for which it was introduced and for which it was requested by the producers of rapeseed. But I repeat that the scope of the Bill should not be widened to include any other seed.

MR. REID (Blackwood) [8.23 p.m.]: I would like to add my general support to this Bill and I, too, will speak briefly on the matter. I believe one or two areas require some clarification and one of these, which I think is most important—that is, clause 4—has been mentioned by the member for Vasse. I disagree that by publication of a notice in the *Government Gazette* further seeds should be automatically included under this legislation. It should be left to the various organisations concerned with the growing of other seeds to make a request to be included. In that regard I am not in agreement with clause 4.

However, I am in general agreement with the principle of the clause which deals with the grouping of the various seeds under one pool. We are dealing with large overseas concerns and this State is too small to make any impact if it has a complexity of small pools. In all our legislation relating to agricultural produce we must think big enough for the people with whom we are dealing, and I am sure overseas concerns do not wish to deal with a linseed board, a rapeseed board, and various other boards scattered all over the countryside. Therefore the idea of grouping the various seeds under one pool is

good, but I disagree with the proposal that all seeds should be included under this legislation.

The other point I would like to raise is that for some time now the growing of rapeseed has shown considerable promise to the growers in a number of different areas in the State. It has been an outlet which I am sure everyone in agriculture will welcome. It is a trend towards the greater diversification of crops. Some growers have already established contracts with processors for this oil seed. However, one problem has arisen. I have spoken with many growers in my area and they have been offered a good contract with Refinoll for rapeseed. In the contract there is a provision for a premium for quality seed.

The seed grown in some areas does produce a higher percentage yield of oil and those growers are paid a premium. I wonder whether under this legislation the f.a.q. will be the minimum growers will have to achieve and that no incentive will exist for growers to maintain a higher quality than the f.a.q.

These two points are most important and I would like the Minister to clarify them when he replies to the debate.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [8.26 p.m.]: I thank members who have spoken for their blessing of the Bill and their brevity, but I would like to clarify one or two points and perhaps allay several fears.

The member for Roe gave his general support to the Bill, but indicated he was opposed to the referendum provision which has been suggested by some people outside this House and, I think, rather wisely so. He sees, too, the possibility that a large number of small pools could be established and so become unwieldy. Indeed, if this point were followed to its logical conclusion, the ludicrous situation could arise under which a particular declared seed might not have representation within the overall pool structure, and so a limitation on the ultimate size of the number of products within such a group is desirable and has been considered. It was certainly one of the first considerations made not only by the department, but also by the Farmers' Union.

The member for Vasse also supports the Bill, but he, too, has reservations and has indicated he will move amendments at the appropriate time. I will reserve any remarks and feeling I have towards his amendments until we reach the Committee stage.

The member for Stirling echoes the sentiments of his electorate by expressing his support to the Bill, even though his views on certain political matters may differ from those of the member for Belmont.

The member for Wellington, too, shares some concern about clause 4. He believes producers should be consulted and not just

included. I will give an assurance on that point when I deal with the member for Vasse and his amendments.

The member for Blackwood likewise is concerned with clause 4 and says that some difficulty may be experienced in having a seed declared under this legislation. However, I do not share his fears in this regard. The legislation will include powers for a board, if it deems fit, to have the discretion concerning premium prices, and it depends upon the experience of the board and the desires of the industry what particular action it takes in this instance.

I have no further desire to expound on the measure at this moment, but I look forward to hearing the explanation of the member for Vasse when we reach the Committee stage. At that time I will make the appropriate remarks on clause 4 which seems to be the concern at this juncture. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Addition of section 3A—

Mr. BLAIKIE: I propose to move to delete lines 12 to 17 inclusive and to insert in lieu—

- (1) In this section "proposal" means a proposal by the Minister that a seed be declared a seed for the purposes of this Act.
- (2) In order to determine whether a proposal is favoured by the producers of the seed concerned the Minister may arrange a ballot of those producers to be held at such time and in such manner as the regulations prescribe.
- (3) Where a ballot of producers held under this section results in a majority of votes in favour of the proposal the Governor may by Order in Council published in the *Government Gazette* declare that the seed is seed for the purposes of this Act.

I refer members to the clause as printed. As I mentioned during the second reading, the effect of the amendment would be to give growers of any other seed the opportunity to ballot, should they so wish, to be included in a pool. As the Bill is printed this opportunity is not given to the growers. It could be given at the express wish of the Minister, but it is certainly not a proposal.

Members of the seeds section of the Farmers' Union are concerned over the present wording. I personally concur with

the thoughts expressed by the growers who have contacted me and I believe the amendment proposed is worth the Committee's consideration. I move an amendment—

Page 3—Delete all words in lines 12 to 17 inclusive.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I am afraid the amendment moved by the member for Vasse is unacceptable, as are his reasons. He seeks to give the Minister power to allow a referendum to be held. The Minister can do this in any case; he may hold a referendum if he so desires.

I am afraid the member for Vasse has missed the purpose and the intention. The purpose of the clause, as indeed the whole measure, is to accommodate the growers involved. I cannot conceive any situation—nor could my predecessor—where such a measure would be introduced to Parliament without proper consultation with those who are involved and whose livelihood depends upon it. Quite properly there would be consultation. To make a referendum mandatory would make the measure completely inflexible and, apart from the cost, the time involved would make such a proposition unwieldy. The member for Vasse does not seek to make a referendum mandatory, but at the same time the provision exists if the Minister wishes to avail himself of it.

The normal course is that those within the industry make the initial approach and after a measure of agreement has been established the Minister then takes the steps he thinks necessary to bring about amendment of a particular measure. This can be achieved in a number of ways. It may be through an expression of opinion of organisations representing a section of the rural industry, but if that is not clear it may be necessary to conduct a ballot of some kind to ensure there is no direct antagonism or, more particularly, that the greater proportion of those involved desire the course to be adopted.

There must be a certain amount of flexibility for these reasons. A ballot is a time-consuming proposition and the present position illustrates this very point. Had a referendum been conducted, and had rolls been established and voting held right throughout the entire State amongst the growers concerned, this measure would not be before the Chamber this evening. There would not have been the time to do that, draft the legislation, and bring it to Parliament. Apart from the time factor there is also the expense that could be involved on each and every occasion when a ballot is held.

I do not know whether I can do more at this stage than give an assurance—and to have it recorded—that at no time would I, as Minister, endeavour to introduce a measure without consultation with the industry involved. This has been established

practice in agriculture over a long period of time and I am perfectly sure it will continue. It must; without the co-operation of those involved we would be defeating our own purpose. With those remarks I draw attention to the redundancy of the amendment suggested by the member for Vasse, which I must oppose.

Mr. NALDER: I can see the point that has been expressed by some members in relation to the proposed amendment, but I must agree with the Minister. Had the provision in clause 4 been included in the Act originally the growers would not be in the unfortunate situation they are in at the moment, because the Government could have acted straightaway to set up the machinery necessary to allow rapeseed growers to come under this legislation. It is unfortunate, and today we know that a number of growers will not be as well off as they would have been had the provision contained in clause 4 been included in the existing legislation.

I see no difficulty whatsoever if we retain the clause as it is printed. It is perfectly reasonable. It will mean that in six months' time, for argument's sake, if lupin growers decide they wish to be included the legislation will allow this. I am quite sure that no Minister for Agriculture would take any action unless he was satisfied that the growers concerned wanted to be included. If he was not satisfied he would ask for a referendum.

The proposal at the moment is laudable; if the Government has no doubts it can bring in growers of other seeds. We would not be in the position we are in today had this provision been included in the Act previously. I think it is a good step forward and I support the clause as printed.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I strongly contest the line of thinking propounded by the Minister and the Leader of the Country Party, because I do not think Parliament should write legislation in the form of a blank cheque of the nature suggested by both the previous speakers.

In all instances there is some opposition; not everyone is entirely in agreement with the suggestion that produce should be controlled by orderly marketing. There are always some who dissent from this viewpoint and I think they should be given the opportunity to voice their opinions. Provisions should exist in all legislation for people who desire a certain line of action to achieve what they want by representation to the Minister or the departments concerned, and then to Parliament. That provision is now being written into this legislation by allowing for the inclusion of rapeseed.

The member for Vasse seeks to delete clause 4 of the Bill which makes no reference whatsoever to the purpose of the

measure; namely, to provide orderly marketing for rapeseed. The clause under discussion writes a blank cheque for any other seeds.

I know of many instances but I shall mention one specific case in my electorate where small seed producers are exporting throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, and even to South America, a market which they have found for themselves. This may be an isolated instance, but it highlights the point of view I am expressing. Unless producers in a particular agricultural industry seek orderly marketing it should not be considered and, further, when legislation is provided for orderly marketing it should come to Parliament. At the very least, the people concerned should be given the opportunity to express an opinion in favour or against it.

I strongly contest the view that we should write in a blank cheque to cover any other seed. I offer the strongest possible opposition to this attitude. I think we should completely delete clause 4, but alternatively I would support the amendment suggested. If it is successful we can consider the amendment outlined by the member for Vasse that provision be made for a ballot of producers, as there may be some merit in this suggestion. First and foremost I oppose the provisions in clause 4 and I support the deletion of the clause.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: There is something in the argument of the member for Vasse, but really the amendment suggested by him has nothing in it. It simply says the Minister may conduct a ballot, but he may do this under the present wording of the Bill. I think the amendment is perfectly useless as it stands and I could not support it. I would sooner oppose the clause in total than do that.

I would prefer a different course of action, and if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I shall outline it now. I would move for the insertion of any seed other than any type of clover seed. I mention this now because it is an alternative to what is before us. It would, of course, exclude all types of clover seed. It could include all oil seeds and any other seeds. After all, clover is a completely different seed from those proposed in the measure; namely rape and linseed. They would require a separate Bill. I do not think there is any reason why clover should be included. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLAIKIE: I would like to ask a question of the Minister. He has stated he always keeps very close to the industry and understands at all times exactly what the industry wants and is proposing. In this regard, has the Minister had any correspondence from either the president or the secretary, or both, of the small seeds section of the Farmers' Union; and are they in full agreement with the proposed amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Before we can put the amendment proposed by the member for Narrogin, the member for Vasse will have to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not moving it at this stage.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I oppose the suggestion of the member for Narrogin because it conflicts with the principle of giving seed producers the opportunity to indicate whether or not they require orderly marketing. It also denies to those who are opposed to such legislation the opportunity to voice their opposition. I think an important principle is involved in the amendment moved by the member for Vasse. This legislation is specifically designed for rapeseed and we are trying to exclude all other seeds. I suggest the member for Narrogin should not persist with his amendment because, while the alternative suggested by the member for Vasse does not achieve a great deal, the important thing is to delete from the Bill clause 4, which is quite unnecessary in legislation designed to provide for orderly marketing of rapeseed.

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the amendment moved by the member for Vasse.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Will the Minister have the opportunity to answer the question I asked him?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I have written confirmation from both the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association that they favour this amendment.

Mr. Blaikie: The small seeds section of the Farmers' Union?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The confirmation has come from the Farmers' Union direct and, in its internal organisation, no doubt it has consulted with all sections.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I take it I cannot now move the amendment I foreshadowed.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Addition of section 25A—

The CHAIRMAN: On page 5 there is a clerical error in line 10. The Clerks will attend to it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

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

MILK ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture [8.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The present Milk Act prevents the Milk Board from issuing milk treatment licenses to a licensee in excess of 40 per cent. of the total number of such licenses issued, or four in number, whichever is the greater. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to remove this restriction from the Act and allow the maximum number of treatment licenses which one licensee may hold to be prescribed in the regulations under the Act, in accordance with circumstances.

The need for this amendment arises from the proposed merger of two companies. This merger is regarded as being in the best interests of the dairying industry as it will allow a desirable rationalisation of milk collection and treatment operations in some areas. At present a total of 11 treatment licenses is held. After the proposed merger of companies the members of the merged companies would have interests in excess of 40 per cent. of these licenses.

It is clear, then, that under the present Milk Act the members of the merged companies would be ineligible to continue to hold all of the treatment licenses previously held, as they would be limited to the maximum of four such licenses. While the rationalisation and centralisation of milk treatment operations consequent upon the merging of these companies may well reduce the number of treatment licenses necessary, such reorganisation would take some time to effect.

This particular section of the Milk Act was previously amended in 1963 when the proportion of treatment licenses allowed to be held by one licensee was increased from 25 per cent. to 40 per cent. At the time of this amendment it was indicated that future circumstances could require a further increase in this proportion.

The intention of this section of the Milk Act is to ensure that producers and consumers are protected from a monopolisation of the treatment of milk for liquid consumption. The proposed amendment will enable this objective to be retained, while at the same time allowing freedom to deal with special circumstances as they arise, thus removing the necessity to seek periodical amendment of the Act.

Increasing costs within the milk treatment industry have to be countered by attaining lower transport mileages per gallon of milk collected and a larger throughput at treatment plants. These sorts of economies can only be effected through some degree of rationalisation of milk collection and treatment within fewer

companies. Excessive competition among several different companies for limited milk supplies could become a luxury that the industry cannot afford. The proposed merger of dairy companies is seen as a desirable move towards effecting economies in operations which must be of at least indirect benefit to producers and consumers. It is essential for this merger that the Milk Act be amended as I have proposed.

It is proposed at a later time to introduce a Bill to consolidate the dairy industry Acts. However, this is a very complex piece of legislation which will take some time to prepare and introduce. In the meantime, it is not desired that the proposed merger of the two companies concerned should be delayed by obstacles contained in existing legislation. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Lands) [9.01 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now before the House seeks to amend various sections of the Land Act, to accomplish four things. These are: the relinquishment by the Crown of its rights to the indigenous timber on alienated or partly alienated land; granting of rent relief to pastoralists whose natural pastures have been damaged by fire; limiting the period of application of a pastoral lease development plan; and conveying to the Minister for Lands the power to defer pastoral rentals when, in his opinion, economic conditions so warrant.

Land Act regulations require that all Crown grants, and Crown leases and licenses include a provision which reserves to the Crown all marketable indigenous timber, but which permits the settler to fell and destroy any timber in the normal course of clearing. This reservation applies during the whole of the term of a conditional purchase lease or license, and for the first 20 years of the Crown grant. In practice this results in the loss of much valuable timber, since the settler has no incentive to leave any timber standing when he is clearing his land. It is proposed to repeal this regulation, which will result in future grantees and lessees receiving the rights to the timber, as well as the land. In addition, by clause 3 of this Bill, it is proposed to remove the reservation from the existing Crown grants, leases, and licenses. This will encourage farmers to preserve the timber and, by the receipt of timber royalties, be compensated for the extra cost of clearing.

Pastoralists at present may be granted relief from payment of rent when suffering from the adverse effects of drought, cyclone, or flood; but there is no existing provision to enable rent relief to be granted when natural pastures are rendered unusable by fire. Clause 4 seeks to add the natural cause of "fire" to those causes which at present enable rent relief to be granted.

Existing pastoral lease legislation requires a pastoralist to compile and submit a plan, which must provide for the reasonable development of all usable portions of his pastoral lease during the whole of the term of the lease. The expiry date of pastoral leases is June, 2015, and it is considered to be beyond the ability of any individual or body to anticipate what will be reasonable development 45 years from now. Developments in many fields, including land utilisation and management, make it desirable to review pastoral development plans from time to time to ensure that the leases are being used to best advantage. Authority is therefore sought in clause 5 of the Bill to limit the duration of a development plan to five years and to require revised plans at the end of each five-year period.

As members will be aware, many pastoralists whose properties are suitable only for raising sheep for wool production are in financial difficulties caused through adverse seasons coupled with low wool prices. Where the seasons have been so bad as to be accepted as drought, rent relief can be granted under the existing provisions of the Land Act. There is, however, no provision for rent relief where poor seasons, not sufficiently serious to be accepted as drought, coincide with low wool prices. Clause 6 of the Bill seeks to authorise deferment or cancellation of the whole or part of the rent of a pastoral lease where economic conditions so warrant. Present conditions have been persisting for some time, and it is therefore proposed to make this provision retrospective to the 1st July, 1970. All of these four provisions are most desirable, and I commend them to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

MARKETING OF LAMB BILL

Second Reading

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [9.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Lamb producers in Western Australia have expressed dissatisfaction with lamb prices and other aspects of lamb marketing in

recent years. In particular they have been concerned with the prices obtained for lambs from sale to sale and even at different periods during the same sale. Producers have questioned whether the existing marketing system is the most relevant one for today's needs and whether it is in the producers' best interests. A similar situation exists in other States.

The lamb marketing scheme which is the subject of the Bill originated in proposals of the Farmers' Union, which has expressed strong support for statutory marketing of lamb. Proposals of the Farmers' Union for a reform in lamb marketing were submitted to State Cabinet in August, 1970, and were studied by a sub-committee of Cabinet. It was decided at that time that a poll of lamb producers should be held to determine the degree of support for the proposed marketing scheme. For the purpose of this poll a lamb producer was defined as "a person carrying on the business of farming and, as such, produced 100 or more lambs of any breed, suitable for slaughter in any one of the years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, or 1970." At this time the Farmers' Union conducted a number of meetings at country centres to explain the operation of the proposed board. The poll was held in December, 1970, and the proposal was supported by a large majority of those voting. A total of 2,466 producers applied for enrolment on the roll of electors, and 2,028 voted with the following result:—

For	1,760
Against	228
Informal	40
Total	2,028

The Pastoralists and Graziers Association is opposed to the establishment of a marketing board for lamb, partly because the association foresees dangers in having the lamb industry in Western Australia operating differently from the industry in other States.

After the referendum it was necessary for the proposals to be developed in detail, and the responsibility for this rested with the Farmers' Union. In this the union was assisted by officers of the Department of Agriculture and following a series of discussions more specific proposals were developed. The Government then decided that draft legislation be prepared to create a lamb marketing board to acquire lambs for slaughter in Western Australia.

It is proposed that the board be subject to the Minister for Agriculture and have the power to register abattoirs to act as its agents for the receipt of lambs. All abattoirs in the State which slaughter lambs will be required to supply such statistics as the board may require.

Furthermore, the board will acquire all lambs offered for slaughter at all abattoirs throughout Western Australia. Thus

there would no longer be any auction sales of lambs intended for slaughter, but auctions will continue for store lambs. Apart from certain exemptions—for example, for farmers' rations—no lambs could be slaughtered unless, at the time of slaughter, the lambs were the property of the board. The board will arrange for their slaughter and sale on a weight and grade basis—with the exception of those lambs rejected for human consumption—to wholesalers, exporters, or direct to the retail trade. The board will also have the power to export and trade in lambs and lamb meat on its own account.

Under the proposed marketing arrangements the board will set the wholesale price per pound, including current killing charges, at which it will sell lamb of various grades for specified periods. The net return on the sale of lambs on export markets is usually less than that obtained for lambs of similar quality sold on the home market. Producers will be paid an equalised price within prescribed grades, which is a composite of the wholesale price and the export price for specified periods, for a particular grade, less authorised deductions to cover the board's handling and administration charges. Any producer delivering lambs to the board will receive the equalised price for a particular grade, irrespective of whether the lambs delivered by him were actually all exported or all consumed on the local market or partly both.

Payments to producers will consist of a first advance followed by one or more supplementary payments, and will also include payment for skins. The board will grade or classify skins and pay producers the amount it receives from their sale. The payment for skins will be quite separate from the pooling procedure for local and export sales of lamb meat products.

The board will require the power to borrow, in particular to finance returns to growers for lambs received, so that prompt payment can be made.

The board will have the power to regulate and control deliveries of lambs to abattoirs in any period and will negotiate with abattoirs for its required killing space. This will require that producers give notice to the board of their anticipated deliveries. The board will be required to accept delivery of lambs in all cases where lambs were delivered in accordance with its regulations, and where the board's approval had been obtained for the delivery of a specified number of lambs in any period.

On the other hand, the board will not be obliged to accept delivery of lambs in any case where the delivery or proposed delivery was not in accordance with its regulations—in particular, if lambs were diseased, in dirty condition, or if it appeared that the carcase would be below the minimum weight acceptable under the board's grading system.

Measures would be necessary to ensure that any lamb supplied by the board and designated export lamb was, in fact, exported and not sold on the domestic market.

The board may, in lieu of selling offal, enter into arrangements whereby the offal is disposed of to other interests without payment being made to the board, if the disposal of the offal results in a commensurate adjustment in the slaughtering and treatment charges.

There are two areas in which the Bill departs from the proposal submitted to Cabinet in June. Firstly, it is now proposed that the board consist of five members instead of four as previously intended. The revised composition is a chairman, two representatives of producers, one representative of the meat trade, and the manager of the board, which would be an *ex officio* appointment. As the lamb marketing board would be a trading organisation it is considered there is merit in having the manager as a member of the board. The Farmers' Union agrees with this change.

The two representatives of producers would be elected by producers; the representative of the meat trade and the chairman would be nominated by the Minister. The chairman would be appointed for a term of five years and the other members for a term of three years, except that in the first two years of operation there is a provision to enable the phasing in and out of members to prevent the terms of several members expiring in the same year.

The second alteration to the previous proposal is that it was considered earlier that the board might exempt certain abattoirs from the requirement that abattoirs be registered as agents of the board. The intention was that it may have been desirable for the board, for administrative convenience, to exclude certain country abattoirs, in particular those with a low throughput of lambs supplying local needs. If this had been possible the board may have then required a levy to be placed on lambs which were delivered to exempted abattoirs; the levy would have been based at a level which was designed to bring the net price for lambs delivered to exempted abattoirs in line with the equalised price for lamb.

However, subsequent legal advice was that, for the legislation to be valid, it would be necessary for the board to acquire all lambs. Thus, all abattoirs would be required to register with the board, and the levy arrangement considered earlier would not apply.

The Bill also provides that the lamb marketing board be given the authority to deal in sheep other than lambs. Subject to ministerial approval the board may declare that during certain periods it will accept the delivery of sheep.

The board would not be required to accept any sheep except where it had given prior approval to a producer to deliver sheep, and the sheep were delivered in accordance with the board's requirements. There would not, of course, be any compulsion on producers to deliver sheep for slaughter to the board; but sheep which were consigned to the board would be handled, and the sheep products marketed, in essentially the same manner as lambs. However, it is expected that the board's dealings in sheep would be mainly for export markets.

A major reason for the reluctance to introduce lamb marketing boards in other States is that problems would arise through the movement of lamb across State borders, thereby avoiding acquisition by a marketing board. This is a real problem in the Eastern States; however, in Western Australia the distance between major consuming centres in this State and major producing centres in other States would give the board in Western Australia a degree of natural protection from imports of lamb from other States.

However, the possibility of imports into Western Australia still exists and this would have to be considered at all times by the board in its pricing policy.

Mr. Lewis: Can the Minister indicate when the Act will be proclaimed?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Not as such. It will come into operation on a date to be fixed.

Mr. I. W. Manning: What is the position of producers with less than 100 lambs?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: They will be included, but in the poll they were not given a vote entitlement. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Nalder.

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [9.22 p.m.]: I thank members for their general acceptance of the principles of this Bill. I think it is generally recognised now that more attention has to be given to the protection of the environment. We on this side believe that the legislation previously enacted did not go far enough, although it was a step in the right direction, and we have endeavoured by the legislation before us to strengthen the protection.

I think it is desirable that the legislation should be brought into operation as quickly as possible, more particularly as there are

certain other agreements before Parliament in connection with which the Director of Environmental Protection will be required to give some attention.

Some amendments have been fore-shadowed, and I propose to deal with them on their merits. I think that subject to argument some of them could possibly be accepted, although I would emphasise that when the Bill before us was drawn up a great deal of time was given to its preparation by the Director of Environmental Protection, who was appointed by the previous Government and who is a very skilled man in this area of administration, and by the officers of the various departments which were likely to be concerned.

Consideration of the principles in the Bill took place over several months, and was very careful and meticulous. I therefore believe we have been able to prepare a measure which, if it becomes an Act, will be amongst the foremost legislation of its kind on the Statute books anywhere in Australia.

A few weeks ago I had occasion to speak to the Mayor of Munich who somewhat surprised me by saying that Munich had reached the stage where not a single industry was allowed to be established unless a guarantee of the industry being pollution-free could be given.

I believe that the world generally has come to acknowledge the necessity of taking strong steps to prevent what has occurred in other countries, where it will now require a lot of money to alter the position. If this Bill becomes an Act it will provide an opportunity for us to take advantage of the mistakes that have been made elsewhere, and to order things in this State in a way that will protect the environment, maintain a proper balance between industry and the requirements of the people, and I hope enable the State to be developed in the best interests of everybody.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Inconsistency—

Mr. COURT: There is an amendment on the notice paper in my name. When notice of the amendment was originally given I had to take the step in a rather hurried way. After conferring with the Clerk I included a number of alternatives. I know that normally this is not done, but at the time there was no other way. I indicated then that I would endeavour to move for the deletion of clause 7, but I did provide for an alternative which referred only to agreements that had been ratified by the

State Parliament, and to which the State was a party. I emphasised the last words, "to which the State was a party."

I was hoping that when the Premier replied he would deal seriatim with queries I had posed to him in the second reading debate. It will be recalled that I dealt with the matter in two parts; firstly, the general principles of environmental protection and, secondly, the more specific terms of the Bill.

Clause 7 was one of the provisions I mentioned. If members look at that clause they will understand very readily that the environmental protection authority has overriding powers. The legal people have assured me that in its present form clause 7 will also override agreements that have been ratified by the State Parliament.

My amendment is intended to ensure that the integrity of the State is not in doubt in any way because some of the very large projects which have been undertaken, based on contracts ratified by Parliament, have raised the necessary money both in Australia and abroad on the understanding that the terms stated were those on which the project was to be undertaken. I have always found most of the major corporations prepared to sit around the table and negotiate if there were changed circumstances. I am not suggesting we will be up against a blank wall if the Government of the day does desire to modify some of the conditions.

If the Committee is prepared to agree to my main amendment, which will add a new subclause (2), it will be necessary for me to move the machinery amendment to change the subclause numbers.

Another reason for my proposed amendment is I think there is a danger that the Government of the day—or the State—could be exposed to a claim for damages if we do not add this precaution in respect of agreements which have been ratified, and to which the State is a party. Therefore, I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 32—Insert after the clause designation 7 the subclause designation (1).

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I think the argument advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quite good. We have no intention of breaking agreements and I realise that if we attempted to do so, or attempted to make a vital change which would involve a company subject to an agreement in any substantial expenditure, the Government could be up for quite considerable damages.

The provision in the Bill was to ensure that so far as other Acts were concerned this was the important Act to give control over matters which could be unsatisfactory and could be done legally under certain other Acts. So it was set out here that

this Act would have overriding power. I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. COURT: I move an amendment—

Page 4—After line 3 add the following new subclause to stand as subclause (2):—

(2) This section has no application to Acts ratifying agreements to which the State is a party.

I will amplify briefly the reason for the new subclause and comment on the point raised by the Premier. It was not intended that the amendment should be more far-reaching than the words indicated, but I am working on the assumption that this will automatically apply in future agreements because the Government of the day will be submitting agreements to Parliament to provide for the observance of the existing laws. Unless there were very special circumstances where the Government and the Parliament desired to grant certain exemptions, I am assuming all future agreements submitted for ratification, to which the State is a party, will provide for adequate protection. The objective is to make sure that anything ratified up to date, to which the State is a party, is not unintentionally abrogated.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 16 put and passed.

Clause 17: Constitution of Council—

Mr. RUSHTON: We expect local government to play a big part in the protection of the environment and my proposed amendment emphasises this fact. It may well be that the Premier intends to give local government more representation. I have no intention of unbalancing the ratio between one group and another but I do know that local government is most concerned. The intention of my amendment on the notice paper is to give more representation to local government.

I have no wish to enlarge the council but by taking away one member and adding another the representation on the council could be changed without any great impingement on the council itself. It is my intention to move an amendment at a later stage of the Bill to take away the right of the Minister to impose by-laws without the councils having a say.

If councils are obliged to carry out certain environmental protection work without any financial reimbursement they could find themselves in a sorry predicament. I move an amendment—

Page 10, line 3—Delete the word "seven".

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I hope the member for Dale will not press his amendment. It must be appreciated that the Bill has been drawn to give overriding power over all other Government departments. It is

desirable that, as far as possible, the Government department shall be in a position to have a say in the drawing-up of the policy and in bringing matters before the authority. The proposed amendment would reduce the number of representatives of State departments in order to give local authorities greater representation.

In the interests of the State generally I think it is far better to retain the existing provision because all State departments are not represented; only the most important of them. I am afraid I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have no intention of pressing the point other than to say I would appreciate a statement from the Premier regarding the protection of local governing bodies. I would like the Premier to erase from my mind the concern I have for the imposition of penalties on local governing bodies which will cause financial difficulties. If the Bill is passed in its present form the local governing bodies will be required to comply with by-laws which will be forced upon them.

The wording used in building by-laws is "may" not "shall," but the Bill before us specifies "shall." I make this point purely because of the financial involvement that local government could be required to match. It would be totally unacceptable in my opinion to place tremendously larger burdens on local authorities and not give them a voice in how things are to be done. I appreciate the Premier's point of view, so far as balance is concerned, but I am worried about the position of local government which, as I hope we all recognise, plays a most important role in our community. I do not want to see a burden placed upon the shoulders of ratepayers who carry many other responsibilities. I do not want to see imposed a financial burden far beyond their means.

I have raised the question now, although I intend to remedy it later on. I would appreciate it if the Premier could indicate that local government will not be subjected to a severe financial burden.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The fears held by the member for Dale in this matter are quite groundless. There is no intention to burden local authorities or anybody else.

Mr. Rushton: That would satisfy me, because later on they could be burdened. I will move to change this and I hope the Premier will support it at the time.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: We will deal with that at the appropriate time. It is possible to read all sorts of things into a Bill if one wants to. The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that, so far as industry is concerned, it shall not establish itself in such a way as to be harmful to the environment. This may be by sending out

CO₂ in such quantities as to endanger the life of people in a certain area. It is intended to have control over the actions of these industries and to ensure that initially they put in protective devices and machinery available at the time the industry is established.

In no way is this intended to put local authorities to expense. As a matter of fact, the tendency is the other way. If local authorities are in trouble because they cannot meet commitments they come to the Government for assistance. I do not think the member for Dale need have any worries on this aspect.

Mr. COURT: I do not propose to comment on the remarks made by the member for Dale at this juncture beyond saying that I hope we can consider the present wording of the measure when we come to the appropriate clause, because there is no doubt that if authority found its way into the wrong hands it could impose a burden on local government which could be quite unbearable. As long as we have made the point, that will be sufficient for the moment. We want to take it up with some vigour, because I do not think it was intended that local authorities should be exposed to an intolerable burden. The member for Dale was seeking to give them some assurance.

It is much better, I feel, to do this at a later stage and to provide the necessary security so far as local authorities are concerned. It is one thing for the environmental protection authority to make a big fellow of itself and come down with all-embracing laws and another thing for the local authority to shoulder the burden.

My main purpose in rising is to ask the Premier whether he has had representations from outside bodies, such as Environment 2000 and the conservation council regarding the constitution of the authority and the council. In this respect I refer to clause 17 (1) (b) (iii) on page 10 of the Bill which says—

two (being persons who are not employed by the Crown in right of the State and who shall have special knowledge of, or experience in, environmental protection) shall be representative of individuals and bodies of persons having a special interest in environmental protection;

The previous measure, which is being repealed, had provision for three people. At the time there was thought to be a good case for having three people of this kind on the council. I wonder why the Government has decided to reduce the number from three to two. It is in this area that I believe we can attract people who can give the greatest assurance to those who are deeply involved in the fields of conservation and environmental protection. It does surprise me the Government has

decided to reduce the number from three to two and perhaps the Premier could give us an indication as to why this decision was made. I also understand that one of the bodies has asked for three representatives.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The reason for altering the number was to keep the body from becoming unwieldy. It would be possible to keep on adding one here and one there without gaining any advantage at all to the work the council will perform.

In considering this matter it was believed by the Director of Environmental Protection and officers from the various departments with whom he consulted that two persons, as provided in the measure, would meet the situation adequately and enable us to keep the representation within bounds.

For example, I have already mentioned that we have not given representation to all State departments. By increasing the size we could have decided that every State department which was likely to be affected should have a representative. We decided against it for the reason that we did not want to overload the council with representatives. It was felt that two outsiders would be sufficient.

I could not see that three would make any real difference. Three would not form a majority of the council and would not make any great difference to the points of view put forward. Surely two persons, other than those employed by State departments, can put forward the points of view. I think it should be left at this number.

Mr. COURT: I do not propose to press this with an amendment, but I suggest the Premier should give it further thought. I well recall that we had a good reason for including three people of this type when the constitution of the council was considered and the former measure drafted. The main purpose was to give greater flexibility in the choice of people. I can foresee that when the question of environmental protection becomes much more sophisticated a number of disciplines will be involved. The situation could easily arise where we would want fairly wide representation.

I want to make it quite clear now, as I intended to do at the start, that the Opposition has no intention of trying to make major amendments to the Bill. I hope the Government has appreciated this attitude from the amendments shown on the notice paper. We have accepted the principles of environmental protection and we hope the amendments we have put on the notice paper will make the measure more workable instead of weakening it. I intended to make that point at the start. We are not trying to take the teeth out of the legislation, but we hope the teeth will be more effective.

I would like to feel the Government will give some further thought to this matter. I again address a question to the Premier when I ask whether he has answered the representations made to him by Environment 2000 and the Western Australian Conservation Council. From the newspaper reports and other reports in my possession I gather they were pressing for greater representation of these people and also for the amendment of a number of other features in the Bill.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: A number of organisations and persons have written in. Some of them have come to see me and have put forward their points of view. It would be quite impossible—and, in my view, against the intention of the legislation—to agree to the suggestions for alteration which have been made. In some cases indication has been given to the people concerned that their proposals cannot be accepted. In other instances they have been told that when the Bill is under consideration the suggestions they have made will be kept in mind.

A further reason for deciding not to provide for three instead of the two mentioned in the Bill is that we felt it would be extremely difficult to get two such persons, let alone look for three. Let us look at the provision which states—

two (being persons who are not employed by the Crown in right of the State and who shall have special knowledge of, or experience in, environmental protection) . . .

Where could we find such people? They are not in abundance all around the place. There are many who think they would qualify but when it comes to tin tacks it will be extremely difficult to find people who have special knowledge of, or experience in, environmental protection. We believe it will be quite difficult to locate two, let alone three. That is the main reason for limiting the number to two. The other reason is that we did not want to increase the size of the council unnecessarily.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 18 to 23 put and passed.

Clause 24: Convening of meetings of Council—

Mr. COURT: I move an amendment—

Page 13, line 3—Insert after the word "Authority" the words "or any two or more Council members".

By way of interjection during the second reading the Premier questioned my remarks on this matter. At that time I had alternative amendments on the notice paper. One amendment provided for one councillor to be able to convene a meeting and the other provided for two. I readily concede this could not be placed in the

hands of one councillor, because he may be a man who is difficult to get along with and the end result would be council meetings all day and every day. Likewise I accept that if two councillors cannot be found who want to convene a meeting, the meeting should not be held anyway. It would be a waste of time.

In view of the fact that there is a wide difference of disciplines and interests on the council, I believe it is fair enough for two people to convene a meeting. Some may ask why we would want to have this provision. In view of the nature of the work of the council I believe it is highly desirable to have meetings when two or more of the council's number feel a meeting should be held to consider a special situation without it being dependent upon the Minister or the authority to convene a council meeting. Consequently we believe it is fair enough if two council members have the right to convene a meeting.

I also make the observation that I realise this could bring a certain burden upon the council, particularly if the two people seeking to convene meetings were over-zealous in respect of environmental protection and conservation matters. However, I assume that the appointees on the council will be people of good sense and, over a period of time, will be culled out so that the council consists of people with a practical approach. Consequently I recommend the amendment to the Committee because I consider it is desirable.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I cannot believe that the Minister or the authority would not call a meeting if they were approached by a member with a good reason. It is unreasonable to allow any two members out of 14 to decide to have a meeting whether they have a valid reason or not. Surely if the council is not meeting, and deliberately not meeting because the chairman is not prepared to call it together, the person or persons who want a meeting would let the Minister know that a meeting is desirable for a special purpose. The person could then state his reasons and I cannot imagine any Minister refraining from calling the council together in these circumstances. However, if we provide that any two members of the council can bring about a meeting, they could do so without giving a reason if we include this provision.

We would not agree to a proposal of this sort in any organisation of which we were members. For example, just imagine a rule saying that any two members of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, or the Country Party, can call for a meeting of the party. It is always left to the leader, officers, or the chairman to listen to reasons when a member or members require a meeting. If he is satisfied the meeting is called.

It is not good administration to provide that any two members of this council of 14 can call a meeting whenever they like.

If a Minister or the authority can require the director to convene a meeting, the way is open for a single member of the council who has a case to approach the Minister or the authority to call a meeting. I am certain if the request was reasonable, the Minister would take the necessary action to make the director call a meeting.

In my opinion it is unnecessary and quite unwise to give power to two members of the council to call a meeting. We would not tolerate this in a political party, and I do not think we should make a provision in our law to permit it in an important body like this. I am satisfied there is sufficient safeguard to ensure meetings will be held when there is cause. I cannot imagine that a director who knew some council member had a case for a meeting and something worth while to discuss would refrain from calling a meeting to stop the discussion. I do not think there is any need for the amendment.

Mr. COURT: I am afraid the Premier has missed the point. He may reconsider this after I have given some further explanation, even if the number is increased from two to three.

First of all, we are dealing with a council with only 14 members—a director and 13 others. If we disregard the director, seven of the 13 are Government people. We have discussed this point earlier. However, when we look at the remainder of the people, they fall into a different category. One member is a representative of local government, two are persons having special experience, one person represents primary industry other than industries referred to in another subparagraph, one is to be a representative of persons engaged in secondary industry, and one is to be representative of persons engaged in the extraction and primary processing of mined material.

It could happen that the people other than the official Government people might have some difficulty in having their point of view discussed in respect of a matter which has become controversial. I am treating this as very special legislation, quite different from anything we have had before. It is legislation which will be dealing with matters which often have a very strong emotional content. Frequently these emotions get out of hand if a situation is not rapidly dealt with. It would be of great assistance if we could convince the people involved that a responsible attitude is being adopted by those in authority.

I am really seeking this right to convene meetings for people other than the director and the Government appointees. I could not imagine one of the Government appointees wanting to use this power. For instance, to pluck a name out of the air, I could not imagine the Commissioner of Main Roads having difficulty in getting

a meeting convened. He would have the ear of his Minister who would soon raise "bobsy-die" if there was any tardiness in having a meeting. However, the non-Government members of the council are not in this position. I am not fussy if this power is given to two, or three people, but I would like this provision for the small group of people who are, for practical purposes, outside the Government appointees.

I hope the Premier will give this further thought and that on reflection he will see it is not an idle piece of machinery to allow cranks, for want of a better name, to convene meetings at the drop of a hat. This machinery would enable responsible people on the council to have a meeting of the full council called. It must be borne in mind that nothing can be passed unless the council agrees, so it is not a question of the Government or the environmental protection authority being defeated in its objectives. This amendment would merely mean that a meeting can be held and a decision made quickly. Members will realise that speed will be very important in many of these issues.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has established a need for this provision. I cannot see why a request to the Minister or to the authority would not result in a meeting if there was a genuine reason for it. However, I would be prepared to accept the amendment if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would agree to three members. This would mean that at least two groups of representation would be involved, as otherwise the two persons not employed by the Crown could call a meeting irrespective of the wishes of the others. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is prepared to amend his amendment to three, I will accept that.

Mr. COURT: I accept the argument of the Premier that with three people we would need to go outside one group and would avoid any ganging up. Mr. Chairman, I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. COURT: I move an amendment—

Page 13, line 3—After the word "Authority" insert the words "or any three or more Council members."

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Harman.

House adjourned at 10.14 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 18th November, 1971

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

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE.

1. PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION

Payment of Adjusted Rates

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

As it is understood that former Members of Parliament receiving superannuation pursuant to the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1970, have not yet commenced to receive the adjustment arising from the recent determination of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, would the Leader of the House ascertain the reason for the delay?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

Superannuation increases to former Members of Parliament were paid on 22nd October retrospective to 16th September the effective date of the increase resulting from the recent determination of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal.

2. BOARDS AND TRUSTS

Details of Personnel

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON (for the Hon. R. Thompson), to the Leader of the House:

Will the Minister submit to the House in printed form for the purpose of laying on the Table an up to date list of the personnel of all boards, commissions, trusts, etc., operating pursuant to State statutes, indicating—

- (a) the name of the body;
- (b) the individual members and the date when their appointments are due to expire;
- (c) the qualifications of such persons and who they represent; and
- (d) the remuneration paid to each person?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

This information has been received from Departments and is at present being collated by the Public Service Board. It will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is completed.