

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 31st October, 1979

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Annual Report: Tabling

THE PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths): I wish to lay the following paper on the Table of the House—

The annual report of the Legislative Review and Advisory Committee for the year ended the 30th June, 1979.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 406).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

STATE FORESTS

Revocation of Dedication: Motion

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Forests) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forest Nos. 4, 27, 28 and 70, laid on the Table of the Legislative Council by command of His Excellency the Governor on the 24th October, 1979, be carried out.

This motion is presented in accordance with section 21 of the Forests Act, 1918-1976, which requires that a dedication of Crown land as a State forest may be revoked only in whole or in part by a resolution being passed by both Houses of Parliament.

In this instance, approval is sought for the partial revocation of the dedication of State forests Nos. 4, 27, 28, and 70. Members will note that the proposed excisions amount to 765.4 hectares, and the gain to State forests through exchanges contingent upon these proposals is 208.9 hectares. This amounts to a reduction of 556.5 hectares, attributable mainly to the proposed excision of 538 hectares located about 16 kilometres south-east from Rockingham townsite to provide for the establishment of an explosives reserve and safety zone to replace the Woodman Point facility.

While it is necessary to excise this area, it will not be entirely lost to forestry. The safety zone

surrounding the magazine will involve the retention of some 458 hectares of established pine plantation and, by arrangement with the Mines Department, will continue to be managed by the Forests Department as a pine plantation.

It is desirable to draw members' attention to the fact that additions to State forest in 1978-79 amount to 301.7 hectares and excisions embraced four hectares.

Notes on each of the five areas involved and plans covering the areas proposed for excision were tabled for the benefit of members on the 24th October. However, in order to have that information recorded in *Hansard*, I will now provide those details.

Area No. 1 is of about 12.8 hectares located about one kilometre east of Collie townsite, comprising a narrow strip of land required to regularise the tenure of a deviation of the Collie-Narrogin railway line following a request by the Public Works Department.

The deviation was effected some years ago and excision has been in abeyance pending the completion of a survey of the area.

Area No. 2 is of about 5.7 hectares adjoining the western boundaries of Collie townsite. This land is required for extension to the Collie railway yard and will be reserved for "railway purposes".

The area was part of the former site of the Co-operative Colliery and the abandoned mine workings have caused continual problems through burning coal ash creating wild-fires. There is no millable timber on the area and the Public Works Department has indicated that it has no objections to the proposal.

Area No. 3 is of about 81 hectares, located about four kilometres north-east of Boyanup townsite, containing fairly heavily cut-over forest, with little remaining marketable timber on soils unlikely to support a good quality jarrah forest in the future. The area is also subject to the likely presence of jarrah dieback.

This land adjoins the southern boundary of the applicants' property and its addition to their holding will assist in making it a more viable unit.

The area of private property to be exchanged and included in State forest adjoins an established pine plantation and is largely suited to *Pinus radiata*. Those sections which are unsuited to pines and those which present management problems contain good quality cut-over jarrah forest, free from dieback and of good forest potential. The soils are largely dieback resistant.

Area No. 4 is of about 127.9 hectares, located about 10 kilometres westerly from Kirup townsite, having been cut over in the past.

The land now contains good quality, but small jarrah forest which is pocketed with recent dieback and will spread gradually over the area. Its use for forestry purposes is therefore limited and, as the land is bordered on three sides by private property, problems of management and protection also exist.

The private property to be exchanged and included in State forest is partly cleared and contains soils suited to planting with *Pinus radiata* over 80 per cent of its area. This will make it a valuable addition to that which has been purchased already for plantation establishment in this vicinity.

The applicant's property adjoins the State forest area to be exchanged and its addition to his holding will make it a more viable unit.

Area No. 5 is of about 538 hectares located about 16 kilometres south-east from Rockingham townsite, to be used for the establishment of an explosives reserve and safety zone to replace the Woodman Point facility.

The central core area of about 80 hectares is to be reserved for explosives purposes and vested in the Minister for Mines, with the remainder reserved for explosives and forests purposes vested jointly in the Ministers for Mines and Forests.

The area is at present planted with pines and these will be retained where possible as a buffer and continue to be managed by the Forests Department for a one rotation crop.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. F. Claughton.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. R. G. Pike, and read a first time.

BILLS (6): THIRD READING

1. Unauthorised Documents Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

2. Armorial Bearings Protection Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

3. Fisheries Act Amendment Bill.

4. Local Government Act Amendment Bill.
5. Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

6. Perth and Tattersall's Bowling and Recreation Club (Inc.) Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. R. J. L. Williams, and transmitted to the Assembly.

GOVERNMENT SCHOOL TEACHERS ARBITRATION AND APPEAL BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 16th October.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [5.00 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill, introduced by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie, is to establish an additional method of appeal in the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act. When introducing the Bill the honourable member made it clear that what he was primarily concerned with was not in the Bill itself but was clause 15 of the MRPA scheme.

I would like to remind members of what the Bill seeks to do. It seeks to grant a right of appeal to the Minister in all cases, whether it be an amendment to the scheme of a minor nature or an amendment to the scheme of a major nature. I will remind members of the sections of the Act which deal with this subject. Mr McKenzie has already referred to them but I think it is proper that I should go over some of the ground, particularly in regard to the detail of the sections.

Section 31 of the Act provides the procedure for adopting the metropolitan region scheme. In the first place the scheme is to be formulated by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and after being formulated is to be submitted to the Minister. If it is approved by the Minister it is deposited in various places for inspection and notices are published in the *Government Gazette* and various newspapers. At that stage objections may be lodged by members of the public, and other steps must be taken to make the scheme public and ensure everybody knows all about it.

An opportunity is provided for people who lodge objections to be heard. In fact they must be

given the opportunity to be heard if they so wish. The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority then submits the scheme to the Minister, with or without modifications. In other words, it listens to the objectors, reads their submissions, and makes a formal submission to the Minister on the scheme and the objections, making modifications if it decides to accept any of the objections. So the scheme is submitted to the Minister with or without modifications.

The Minister may direct that the scheme with its accompanying plans be again deposited in various places for public inspection, as before, and further publicity be given to it. The Minister may direct that it be published. If that happens, opportunity is available for further objections to be lodged and further modifications to be made. The authority submits a further report and when that comes up the scheme is finally presented to the Government.

Members will see that a long-winded and devious process must be followed before the metropolitan region scheme is adopted. Members may think this is all a matter of past history because we have a metropolitan region scheme; but it is not, because when there is an amendment to the scheme it goes through the same procedure all over again. The new scheme goes right through the same process in accordance with section 31.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: That is if it is dealt with under section 31, but there are other options.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: An amendment or a revocation goes through again. There is one kind which does not. But it goes right back again through the whole procedure. In other words, it is submitted to the Minister and deposited for public inspection. Notices are published in the *Government Gazette* and objections may be lodged. It is reconsidered by the authority, which recommends modifications if it wants to, in which case they are resubmitted to the Minister. There may be further objections, and so on. It goes through the whole procedure and there is another opportunity to have another bite at the cherry.

Under section 32, when the Governor approves of the scheme it is published in the *Government Gazette* and laid before both Houses of Parliament. It may be disallowed within 21 days. This is an entirely separate procedure. When it has gone through all the preliminaries of the objections and modifications, further objections and modifications, and so on, it then comes to stage two where the Governor approves the scheme. It is then published in the *Government Gazette* and laid before the Parliament, and it

may be disallowed within 21 days by either House of Parliament.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I think it is only 12 days.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No. It is 12 days in the case of an amendment but 21 days under section 32.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Agreed.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: That is in the case of an original or new scheme. That is stage two. We have had stage one, with all the procedure I have spoken about, in the original formulation of the scheme, which also applies to the amendment. In stage two it is approved by the Governor and laid on the Table of the House, and either House of Parliament has the opportunity to reject it.

Section 33, with which the honourable member is principally concerned, provides for the variation or revocation of the scheme. Here we come to the question where the scheme is to be varied or revoked. It may be varied by an amendment or it may be revoked *in toto*. So there can be two situations: an amendment which varies a part of the scheme or a revocation where a subsequent scheme is formulated. In the case of an amendment or a subsequent scheme, as I mentioned a moment ago, it goes right back and down in again under section 31. It goes right through that process all over again. It is submitted again and approved as before by the Governor. Then it comes back and is tabled again in both Houses and may be disallowed.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is what is referred to as a substantial amendment.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I will come to that. As Mr McKenzie said an amendment lies on the Table of the House for only 12 days the second time up one might say, and either House of Parliament can reject it; but 12 days means 12 sitting days, so it is still rather a long time. That is the procedure for a substantial amendment.

We now come to a minor amendment. That phrase is not used in the Act but the honourable member knows what I mean. It is the situation where the authority says the amendment does not constitute a substantial alteration to the scheme. Where the authority certifies that an amendment—not a revocation—does not constitute a substantial alteration to the scheme, the amendment does not have to be submitted and approved in the manner I have just indicated. This is a bypass procedure or a new procedure. The resubmission and approval by the Governor are bypassed. Sections 31 and 32 are bypassed. Where this happens it is dealt with under section 33(1a) which is the section the honourable

member is chiefly proposing to amend. We are now dealing only with the case of a minor amendment, where the authority certifies that the amendment does not constitute a substantial alteration.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: There is a lot of conflict in regard to what the authority believes is substantial.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: There may well be differences of opinion but the authority has to certify that the amendment does not constitute a substantial alteration. In that case it is dealt with under section 33, which has its own appeal system built into it. It is a different appeal system from the one we have been talking about. Section 31 refers to the appeal which is by way of individual objections. People are heard individually, and so on, and the scheme is tabled in the House and may be disallowed.

In the case of a minor amendment we have to look at section 33, which provides that notice of the amendment is to be published in the *Government Gazette* and the owners of the properties affected must be notified that the amendment is taking place, because the original procedure is being bypassed. Because many people do not read the *Government Gazette*—and I am not one of its regular readers, although I receive it in my office—in addition to being published in the gazette the owners of the properties affected must be individually notified. The section goes on to say the minor amendment goes into operation on publication in the *Government Gazette* but any person may appeal to the Minister. So the person affected may appeal to the Minister. This is a different procedure altogether. The Minister then determines whether or not the matter goes on. That is the appeal procedure laid down in section 33.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: The only matter at issue up to this point is what constitutes a substantial amendment. Otherwise I am satisfied with what you have had to say. I am waiting for the last part.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I have been describing what is in the Act. I will now put the Act aside. Mr McKenzie's amendment purports to affect not only amendments which do not constitute substantial alterations—in other words, not only minor amendments—but all amendments, including those which must go back through the processes I described of being published in the *Government Gazette*, being deposited for inspection, receiving and hearing objections, tabling in the House, and being

subject to disallowance by either House. As well as all that, under the honourable member's proposals these amendments will not only be liable to be appealed against to the Minister but will have to go right back through the other procedures as well.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Not only to be heard by the Minister?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No. They must go back through the whole procedure.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: What I am seeking is the right of appeal to the Minister.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The honourable member's proposal does not only do that. He has overlooked the fact that those amendments still have to go through sections 31 and 32.

In effect Mr McKenzie is not only establishing a right of appeal to the Minister in the case of minor amendments—an appeal people already have under section 33—but he is providing also that all other amendments shall have a right of appeal to the Minister in addition to the other procedures of the Act. That means he is considerably complicating procedures under the MRPA scheme. The real problem is that Mr McKenzie proposes to amend the particular subsection of section 33 which deals only with minor amendments, and under that subsection he is purporting to deal with matters outside it. Subsection (1a), which Mr McKenzie is proposing to amend, deals only with minor amendments. However, his amendment stretches out and goes back to other amendments apart from minor amendments.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I did not intend to do that.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No, but I am afraid that is what has happened. For those reasons Mr McKenzie's amendment cannot be accepted by the Government. However, I feel he was really concerned with something else. In his second reading speech, Mr McKenzie said—

As it is my aim to ensure that, when a person's home or property is affected because of proposed changes to previously adopted schemes, that person is given the right of objection or appeal, and I am able to achieve that by amending sections 32 and 33 of the scheme Act, there is no need for the deletion of clause 15.

I gather from that he intended to delete clause 15, if he could do so.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: If that would overcome the problem, fair enough.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: It is not open to the member to delete that clause any more than it is open to the Parliament to delete it, because clause 15 is part of the scheme text which was inserted by the MRPA. Only the MRPA has the prerogative to amend the scheme. I assume that is the reason Mr McKenzie did not move to delete the clause, although he could have moved a motion or taken some other action to draw attention to the matter. Probably that would have been a more appropriate course for him to follow. However, he is entitled to exercise his own judgment.

Unfortunately, Mr McKenzie's proposal goes much too far. I suggest the best course for him to have followed would have been to proceed purely in relation to clause 15, because by proposing his amendment to section 33 he has expanded his intention into other areas which I do not think he wanted to cover.

It would be illogical to grant a right of appeal to the Minister for all amendments as well as for the comprehensive procedures to which I have referred in sections 31 and 32. In any event, his proposal seeks to amend the wrong part of the Act.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: You will realise that I had the guidance of the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I fully appreciate the difficulties the member has.

I have made some inquiries of the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning, and I speak with her authority. She informs me a review was made some time ago by the MRPA, which suggested that clause 15 be deleted from the scheme. It has been the intention of the MRPA to submit amendments to the scheme text after its current review of the Act is completed.

In case anyone thinks I have invented that, I would refer members to the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament. He said it was the Government's intention to make administrative amendments to the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act during this session. This decision followed from a period of review of both the scheme text and the Act, as both date back a number of years and such a review was consistent with good management. I do not know whether all that is taken from the Governor's Speech, but that is the official advice I received. The Governor clearly made the point that the Act was to be overhauled in the current session.

Indeed, the Minister has informed me that she is about to introduce a Bill in another place to

amend the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Will that include an amendment to clause 15?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No, because that is part of the scheme text, which was promulgated by the MRPA; and the MRPA is an independent authority over which Parliament does not have that degree of control. Only the MRPA can amend the scheme. We can amend the Act, but our amendment to the Act would have no reference to clause 15.

However, I am pleased to advise members that the MRPA, at its meeting on the 24th October, resolved to delete clause 15 from the scheme text.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Applause!

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: It took me a fair while to get around to that!

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: When it gets here we will send up a rocket.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: That was my punch line.

Because the Bill would require substantial amendment in order to provide an acceptable alternative, and in view of the fact that the Minister will introduce a Bill and the fact that this amendment does not fit in with the wording of the Act, I suggest there is only one course for the House to follow; that is, to oppose the Bill.

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [5.23 p.m.]: As the Attorney General has announced clause 15 will be deleted from the scheme, the problem I attempted to overcome will be solved. It is unfortunate that I attempted to overcome the problem by seeking to amend the Act. My intention was to delete clause 15 of the scheme, but I thought I could effectively overcome the problem by amending the Act. The Parliamentary Draftsman, with whom I consulted for a long time, indicated that the best way to do it was to amend the Act. I did not think the MRPA would agree to the deletion of the clause, and I am surprised to hear it. Nevertheless, I am pleasantly surprised.

If clause 15 is deleted from the scheme, all citizens whose home or land is reserved will have a right of appeal, at least to the Minister. That is primarily what I was seeking.

In respect of the case in question, a constituent came to me and explained his problem. It took me some time to understand what was involved. Initially, when the scheme was published, only a small portion of his 4½ acres was affected. Subsequently, because of actions under clause 15—and I am not sure, but it could be disputed in

respect of sections 31 and 33 being at times also used—a great proportion of his land was reserved. As a result, he stood to lose his home, and to be left with one-half acre out of his original $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres. I thought that was a serious matter.

The person concerned has been most persistent in his efforts to gain the right of appeal. He has spent a considerable amount of money on legal costs and court appearances in an endeavour to establish his right. I am pleased to say that as a result of his persistence the obnoxious clause 15 will be deleted from the scheme. That is all I sought to achieve.

I thank the Attorney General for his reply. His comments were accurate, and while he was speaking I was concerned about the fate of my proposal. However, I was pleased to hear his final few words.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I had to have a bit of fun.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am sure we all have a better understanding of this complex Act as a result of Mr Medcalf's comments.

Mr President, I seek leave of the House to withdraw my Bill.

Leave granted.

Bill discharged.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [5.27 p.m.]: Mr President, you and members will recall that on the 30th March, 1976, I made an appeal in this House to the Government to amend an iniquitous Bill we had passed at an earlier date, that being the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill, 1975. After the passage of the Bill through Parliament and its proclamation, we found it contained many iniquitous passages which we could not foresee when it was passed.

It was only after application in the field in country areas that the inequities came to light. After that speech in the House I published a small booklet, which I seem to mention many times here, entitled, "How Well-intentioned Governments can Strangle the Development of a Nation." In that booklet I outlined some of the inequities that exist because of our lack of foresight in the passage of the 1975 Bill. By taking contributions for the fire brigade funds from a levy in country areas, it was found within my electorate people were paying up to seven

times more than their city counterparts towards funding the metropolitan fire brigade.

We also found that people in country areas who did not have a fire brigade could set up a voluntary fire brigade with voluntary workers, but the moment they did this these volunteers would have a levy placed on their properties, which meant that the very volunteers who had set up a service to the community in the form of a fire brigade would be paying more insurance in the way of levies than they had in the past. Because of this inequitable situation, some members including myself carried out personal investigations and we found other inequities which included the avoidance of paying a levy to the fire brigades through insuring with the SGIO by some companies who may have had a loan from a Government agency which would give the Government an interest in their properties. It was such that even though the property insured might have been worth \$1 million the Government interest may have been only a few hundred dollars. With the right type of insurance broker with sufficient knowledge, this would make it possible for that company to insure with the SGIO and so avoid the payment of the fire brigade levy.

When the Government was made aware of these inequities it set up a Government parties committee which looked at ways and means of correcting the legislation. In his second reading speech, Mr McKenzie said he did not think the Government had consulted with local government prior to the introduction of the Bill. I can advise the House that the committee did meet with Mr Coffey, who was Secretary of the Local Government Association, and he was asked to make a submission to our Government parties committee, which he did. We met also with the Secretary of the Fire Brigade Officers' Association, the Chairman and Regional Director of the Insurance Council of Australia, the Chairman of the Fire Brigades Board, and others.

After some time our committee came up with recommendations. We had several options. I am very pleased to see this Bill before us today, because it does correct the inequities I mentioned earlier. We also considered—and this is not secret, because it is also considered by a lot of people throughout Australia and not just in this State—that any legislation brought forward by any State Government should be only stop gap because fire brigades really should be considered as para-military organisations funded from Federal revenue. In other words, the whole of the community should pay for a service which in

wartime comes under the direct control of the Federal Government anyway.

I commend the Government for this Bill which does all the things we wanted it to do. It is a fair Bill; but I hope one day we will have sufficient pressures from the States with sufficient evidence to give proof to the Federal Government of the need for it to take over the funding of fire brigades. As members know, I am an anti-centralist, but in this situation the fire brigade is like the Army, Navy, and Air Force; it should not be funded by the States; it should be funded federally. I am very pleased to offer my congratulations to the Government Ministers for bringing forward this Bill. I am sure the people in my province and other parts of the State will commend them for it. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [5.35 p.m.]: Mr President, I think both you and the Hon. Claude Stubbs would be somewhat disappointed if I did not speak on this Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill. Firstly, I would like to refer back almost seven years to what transpired on the 8th November, 1972.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I remember it well.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: When I heard the Attorney General say this afternoon that he must have his little bit of fun sometimes, I was reminded of the time seven years ago when he was in a similar mood and when you, Mr President, were in a rather capricious mood yourself. At the time we were debating this same subject of fire brigades. The Hon. Claude Stubbs was the Minister who introduced the Bill in question. It was a Bill I considered had some merit; but there were certain parts of it to which the then Opposition objected, as the Hon. Bill Withers has said. I refer members to page 4864, volume 5, of the 1972 *Hansard* where I said—

From my experience it would appear to me—and I say this quite seriously—that to be effective fire brigades should not have to operate on finance belonging to the State Government, on finance belonging to the insurance companies, or on finance belonging to local authorities. In point of fact, to be effective fire brigades should be the fourth arm of defence and, as such, should be part of Commonwealth funding.

I went on to point out the work done by fire brigades, including voluntary fire brigades.

I then prepared some amendments to the Bill to increase the Government's contribution of funding and decrease the amount to be supplied by local government. The Hon. Claude Stubbs sat in his seat and listened very kindly to the proceedings

and then stood up and created a situation I have not seen since. To my astonishment he gave a Crown Law opinion that my amendments were out of order. He said they could not be introduced. He gave a Crown Law opinion by a most respected lawyer who is now in Melbourne, one Mr Dick Viney.

The Hon. Norman Baxter was in the Chair. Mr Stubbs then sought a ruling from him to say my amendments were out of order. As Chairman of Committees, Mr Baxter ruled against the Chief Secretary who immediately moved to disagree with Mr Baxter's ruling. The President was summoned and the debate was adjourned. It was you, Mr President, who had the temerity to turn to me and say, "I am not having this." The President then said the Chief Secretary was correct and the Hon. Arthur Griffith, the Leader of the Opposition at the time, moved to disagree with the President's ruling. You, Mr President, said you would not have that nonsense and you told the President that his ruling was absolutely correct. You said you were firmly convinced of that. Unfortunately you did not have the eloquence or the persuasiveness, or the facts to assist your point, because for the first time ever the President's ruling was disagreed with.

Mr Stubbs was not angry or nonplussed; he said that if he did not have the Bill as it was he would not have it at all; the local authorities would lose the lot, and we were talking about \$180 000. Fortunately the amendments went through and the Bill was passed. It was indicative of an extremely interesting debate.

I still stick to the original statements I made during that debate. I know the two speakers from our side never realised that a small Bill like that would occupy us for the next 10 days, more or less. The supporting speaker at the time was the Hon. Neil McNeill who felt it was wrong that the impost for fire brigades should be put on people such as the Hon. Bill Withers mentioned.

I still maintain that fire brigades as such are financed, as I said then, with a 19th century concept for a 20th century style fire brigade like that we have in Western Australia. My research at the time proved that it is only in Australia and New Zealand that fire brigades are left in this state; all other countries in the world have made them almost a part of their defence forces. I suppose if I remain here a further seven years some other alteration will be made to the Act and I will be allowed to look back at that debate in 1972 yet again.

I commend the Government for the way it grasped what was obviously a very difficult task.

The Hon. Bill Withers' committee is to be congratulated on its tenacity in sticking to its task. The Government is to be congratulated on recognising the inequities which exist. I only hope that the time is not too far distant when Federal funding for fire brigades, whilst still controlled by the States, will come about.

It would be remiss of me if I did not take this opportunity to commend the Western Australian fire-fighting forces, including the volunteer forces, and the Bush Fires Board for the wonderful job they do. There has not been a serious fire in Western Australia since the absolute disaster at Dwellingup. That says a lot for the training, the officers and men, and the equipment we have. Our forces have reached the peak of efficiency.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: And the Forests Department, I hope.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: That is correct. Their efficiency in fire fighting is superior to quite a number of other organisations throughout the world. I know the Minister for Forests would dearly love to have the Treasurer allocate sufficient funds in the Budget for the purchase of a few aircraft for the purpose of water bombing forest fires.

With those remarks in support of the Bill, I add that I really am delighted with the Government for taking this action—this very well merited action.

THE HON. NEIL McNEILL (Lower West) [5.43 p.m.]: I too wish to make reference to what happened in 1972. It may be equally relevant to make reference to what happened a number of times prior to the introduction of those amendments to the fire brigades legislation and to make particular reference to the funding arrangements.

As Mr Williams said, the debate of 1972 really ought to be made compulsory reading for members of this House. I say that quite sincerely because I am sure the Hon. Claude Stubbs realises more than most the nature of the debate which occurred and, more importantly, the amount of work and research that was undertaken by members in the House at the time. It would make members conversant with the funding of fire brigades and, more particularly, provide a good example of the Standing Orders of the House as applied to the situation as it was then. It would be a very useful exercise for members to undertake.

The essence of my remarks is really directed to Mr McKenzie because of the sentiments he expressed when speaking to this Bill. The sentiments he expressed were quite contrary to

the views of the Labor Government at that time. So many of the arguments he used were in fact the arguments of the then Opposition. He drew attention to the same points to which the then Opposition drew attention.

Mr McKenzie drew attention to the inequities brought about by those people who did not take out fire insurance. Therefore all other people, to a greater or lesser extent, carried the burden of the people who did not insure.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: This Bill does not correct that situation. That problem still remains. However, it does not in Tasmania.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am not so sure about that because I do not know the new Tasmanian situation. Therefore I am not prepared to make an observation.

During my period as Chief Secretary this matter was constantly under review. It was a vexed question as can be seen from the utterances and representations by the Hon. Bill Withers; also it was keenly felt by the Fire Brigades Board itself. That board is a representative body.

Mr McKenzie said that there was no evidence of discussion with the local government authorities. He must remember that local government authorities are represented on the Fire Brigades Board and of course the present chairman was and is one of the local government representatives on the board.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: That may be so but it is not the same as direct consultation with the local government organisations.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I realise it is not but I make the point because even though the second reading speech does not indicate discussions took place, they may have taken place on a ministerial level. This matter has been discussed over many years and no doubt local government authorities would have had consultation with the department.

I am reminded when I see the amendment in relation to the 1972 Bill that the rates of local authority contributions were to be reduced, from memory, from 20 per cent down to 12½ per cent. I am not sure of the precise figure. The cost of the fire brigade was \$14 million and there was a very strongly held belief that because this service was essential it ought to be funded fully by the Government—State or Commonwealth. It was simply a question of how the Government could provide an amount of \$14 million in one swoop. It is not a practical proposition.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: When was the cost \$14 million?

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am talking about the period 1976-77.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: In 1972 the figure was \$6 million.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I think that figure was quoted in the debate in 1972. I repeat, the expenditure was in the vicinity of \$14 million. That of course adds weight to the comment of the Treasurer, because as this is a budgetary measure, there was no way the Government could pick up the full tab. The best the Government could do was to stage in the funding little by little. This Bill is regarded as the first step in that direction. What other subsequent steps will be taken I am not sure and I am not even sure the Government is aware of them at this time. Members should bear in mind that this funding arrangement will not operate until the year 1980.

In answer to Mr McKenzie's previous query, there was no mention of how much this financial arrangement would cost the Government. The Treasurer in his speech of the 13th September said the figure would be \$1.7 million for this programme. As reference has been made to the 1972 debate I would like to refer to the speech I made on the 8th November, 1972, and to one particular passage. It reads as follows—

Let me say a word about the contributions made by local authorities, and I am referring mainly to country local authorities, and their activities in regard to fire prevention and control. Many of the local authorities have a volunteer fire brigade. Let us contemplate for a moment the burden these districts will carry if the legislation is passed. The point has been made that the people should not bear the extra burden, and this applies even more to the local authorities. Accordingly, I have no objection to the contribution made by the shires being reduced as is provided in the legislation. We must not forget the contribution made by the local people in terms of their participation in volunteer fire brigades. If we try to assess the contribution in terms of money, we may well find that it runs into a very considerable figure. Of course, we do not attempt to assess this, but we must recognise, nevertheless, that it is a contribution in kind of very great value.

In view of that comment it will be obvious why I express my support for one particular provision—amongst others—in this Bill and that provision is to relieve those districts of the necessity of funding the fire services. It is really unfair that people should have to carry them bearing in mind the tremendous contribution the

volunteer fire brigades make throughout Western Australia. They really give a tremendous service and some even consider it a sport. The service is available at all hours of the day and night. These people are actually doing more than their share because being fire conscious they are probably taking out fire insurance policies as well as providing the voluntary service. I welcome this Bill to relieve those districts from the funding of their portion of the fire service.

Of course the Bill goes further; it will be one of the major contributions by Government. I am sure it will be understood that for economic reasons the status quo will remain where permanent brigades operate. There is something else of importance, and this concept was the subject of consideration in the 1972 Bill; that is, the lack of contributions by the State Government Insurance Office and the State Housing Commission. These two instrumentalities will be brought within the ambit of this legislation and they will make a contribution from 1980 onwards.

This will go some distance in alleviating the burden on the insurance companies or more particularly on the policy-holders of insurance companies plus local government authorities, particularly those in the fire volunteer brigade areas. So, all in all, it is a very welcome piece of legislation.

Mr McKenzie said that the Government has not gone far enough. Quite frankly in terms of what the Government of his colour was pressing to do and in fact did do, his words sound quite strange.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I was quoting the Premier in the policy speech when I said they were not going far enough.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: The Treasurer did not offer any excuses, he simply said that it was not reasonable and not practical to expect the Government to make a greater contribution from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. He inferred that there may be some moral ground for making a greater contribution but it was not feasible unless certain things could be done. One would be of course to avoid any tax benefit that might otherwise have been available. Alternatively it would be necessary to make further taxation increases in order to fund the fire brigade.

The step taken by the Government is very significant in terms of the funding of an essential fire service in Western Australia. I support the Bill because I really do have a very close association and a very soft spot for the fire brigades in Western Australia. I am talking about

the fire brigades, the volunteer brigades, and although they are not related to this Bill, the bush fire brigade and Forests Department as well. I believe their tremendous services should be recognised and I welcome the Bill and support it wholeheartedly.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [7.30 p.m.]: I am rising to support the Budget in general terms. Later I will make some comments of a local nature to please the Opposition, and I will refer to places of which members of this House probably have not heard, such as Dumbleyung and Donnybrook.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are not talking about police stations, are you?

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I hope the Dumbleyung police station is all right at last.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: He has a new one he intends to boast about.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We should boast about a Government which can provide these things. At the start I would like to talk about a Government which does not provide anything and is tardy in the extreme about pretty well everything it handles. I am talking about the Federal Government and in particular, its handling of the energy crisis that exists, not only in Western Australia, but also in Australia.

The Institute of Public Affairs of New South Wales has produced a booklet which was circulated to members in the last week. In it appears the following—

In fact, the problem of Australia's liquid fuel needs can be encapsulated in "find more use less"—and do something about it immediately and decisively.

I draw that word "decisively" to the attention of members. The slogan I have just quoted is one with which few people here or outside would quarrel.

I want to raise tonight a matter that concerns the Commonwealth Government and its Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs. One wonders what the Commonwealth Government knows about business and consumer affairs.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Who is he, anyway?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: A gentleman called Fyfe, a reject from the New South Wales Parliament.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I do not think that is quite fair.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think it is.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: He is not a reject at all.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Attorney General may know something about the matter, but I think I know more about it. When there was a change of Premier in New South Wales, Mr Fyfe failed to have a job.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: It is unfair to say he is a reject; he resigned voluntarily and entered the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Whatever he did, he has not performed particularly well in the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Which Premier of New South Wales are you talking about, Mr Lewis?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The best one New South Wales has had in the last few years, a man by the name of Lewis. I do not want to get on to personalities, but I want to talk about the decisiveness of Mr Fyfe. He may be going to do something about the matter I intend to refer to, but certainly he is not doing it immediately or decisively.

Everybody believes in the energy crisis—indeed, anyone who does not believe in it does not know what is going on about him and in the Arab States. Even the Irian Head of State will have to be very careful for his job; he will have many problems if he does not do something about fuel.

I do not think the Arab States believe that putting up the price of fuel will solve any of their problems, but who really taught them to put up the price of fuel in line with the demand?

The Federal Minister to whom I have referred either ignores opportunities, or has insufficient energy to act on any that come his way.

The Commonwealth Government's apparent lack of concern has been criticised politically—and I do not blame the Opposition for this—and editorially—and I do not blame the editors of newspapers either. In this State we have a gentleman who has invented a still to produce power alcohol. I am no expert on alcohol, and especially the production of this type of alcohol.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It is the production you are not good on.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are learning about it.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am learning about the consumption of it. I have been a farmer for many years and I know the rate at which it is being consumed.

Mr Leslie has invented a still which cuts down the stages of the production of power alcohol from 23 to three. He has produced a still in the United States at a cost of \$20 000 that will provide the power alcohol needs for 30 average wheat farms. This still can produce something like 280 000 litres of fuel per annum. So with the outlay of \$20 000 a farmer can produce alcohol more cheaply than he can purchase it. He has the raw material on his farm, not only in grains, but also in straw and stubble.

The production of power alcohol from these ingredients is becoming common in America. The members of the American Agriculture Movement are using this method, and anyone interested in the subject should get in touch with Eugene Schroder, of Campo in Colorado.

The grain alcohol can be used in two different mixtures. Firstly, one can use 25 per cent alcohol, 25 per cent water, and 50 per cent distillate. That method could halve our distillate costs and usage in this State alone. Grain alcohol can be used also in a combination of 80 per cent alcohol and 20 per cent vegetable oil. The vegetable oil is used purely to lubricate the fuel pump. I am speaking of the use of tractors which are not modified in any way at all.

I hope that the Minister will listen to my comments tonight and that he will pass them on to his colleague, the Minister for Industrial Development. I am sure that the Minister for Industrial Development and the Treasurer would be as horrified as I am about the situation that has developed.

The gentleman who has produced this machine is Mr Rob Leslie. I am sure members have heard of him because he has been working on grain and power alcohol for many years. The American Government thought so much of him that, like my colleague, Mr Pike, he was invited to America to demonstrate the production of his stills. I do not know whether Mr Pike was taken to America to produce stills or to move them.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: He intends to introduce an amendment to the Liquor Act.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That amendment may be dealing with stills also!

By the use of a system not as modern as Mr Leslie's, the Americans are producing grain

alcohol at a cost of 18c to 21c a litre. The latest price for power alcohol in this State is 37c a litre, so members can see what we could be doing in this State, and not only in this State; we could be manufacturing stills to be used right throughout Australia.

Mr Leslie applied to the Bureau of Customs for a licence, but he was told that there is no provision to issue a licence for experimental purposes.

I queried the advice that Mr Leslie had received, and I discovered that because the application was a little out of the ordinary, it had been forwarded to Canberra. We all know what happens or what does not happen in Canberra, and it does not seem to matter whether Mr Whitlam or Mr Fraser is in power—all movement seems to be internal and nothing ever shoots off like a shooting star to give us any glee.

I then approached a friend of mine, Senator Withers. First of all Senator Withers said what I had said, "That is rot; of course this man can have an opportunity to try out a still to save the country thousands or even millions of dollars." Members will recall that Senator Withers was the man who between the years 1972 and 1975, had preached with great fervour about the curse of centralism as well as the curse of all those things embodied in centralism. No doubt Senator Withers was naive enough to believe that even when the Fraser Government was returned to power twice with magnificent majorities, especially in the States of Western Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, that Government would reverse the trend. He believed that the policy would not be towards centralism, but rather it would apply a policy of federalism towards State Governments and within its own departments. Well we know what has happened with regard to State Governments, and certainly there has been no change in the policy of the Department of Business and Consumer Affairs.

So on my behalf Senator Withers kindly wrote to the Minister. What sort of reply did he receive? I know that some members of this House are critical of the replies our Ministers give to our questions and also to the letters that we write to them. I am sure, then, members will be interested in the letter that the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs wrote to Senator Withers. It reads as follows—

Dear Senator Withers,

I refer to your personal representations of 17 September 1979 on behalf of Mr R. L. Leslie in relation to the production of grain alcohol. In particular you asked why Mr

Leslie's application to the Collector of Customs for Western Australia was referred to Canberra for decision.

I ask members to listen particularly to this next paragraph which reads—

There is considerable interest in the concept of power alcohol as a renewable fuel resource, and a number of representations along broadly similar lines have been received by me.

However, there is no provision in the Excise legislation for any form of "experimental" licence. Anybody wishing to distil alcohol for any purpose must comply with all the requirements of the Distillation Act and associated legislation. As Mr Leslie's proposal does not comply, it was referred to Canberra for consideration.

As a result of the many representations, including those of Mr Leslie, the position of power alcohol in relation to the National energy policy is being subjected to a detailed review. The matter will go before the Government formally in the near future.

My Department will be a major contributor to the forthcoming Cabinet Submission, but until such time as a decision is made, there will be no administrative steps taken by my Department which could in any way pre-empt the Government's considerations on power alcohol.

You will appreciate that as this is a complex subject, which may ultimately involve amendments to a number of Acts of Parliament, it will take a little time to resolve.

Mr Leslie may be assured that his proposals, like a number of others, will be borne in mind during deliberations on this matter.

I draw the attention of members to the verbiage. We have heard it so often that it does really horrify one that a Federal Government, or any Government, could continue to talk of "detailed requests", "will go before the Government formally in the near future", "my department could not take any steps that would pre-empt a Government decision", and "you will appreciate this is a complex matter".

This is not only a complex matter, but also it is of great significance to Australia. It may be one of the things that in reality could make the inflation rate come within bounds. I do not think any of us believes it will not rise for a time. It may be one of the things that could make us very

nearly self-sufficient in fuel for farming properties. In other words, do anything, but do it immediately and decisively, as the IPA report asks.

If the Prime Minister wonders why his personal polls and the polls on his Government are so low, why does he not look at the performance of his Government and, in particular, so many of his Ministers? Why do Commonwealth Ministers see their role as doing everything possible to frustrate the energetic, progressive, and self-supporting people in this country?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Mr Fraser would like to read your speech; that's for sure.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Fraser has to be told by somebody on his own side of the fence. I have known Mr Fraser for a great deal longer than has anybody in this House—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Maybe so; but I am waiting to hear about the letters you have written to him, acquainting him with this problem.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not write letters to the Prime Minister. When I do, I do not receive replies because of the decisive action that is taken in Canberra. I will deal a little later with letters to his Ministers. One receives a letter from an associate Minister, replying with the same garbage.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I am no Liberal, but if it was a Country Party Minister I would contact the Country Party Minister involved.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is all very well. We have noted how we are going with air fares to the Eastern States.

The work does not get done unless one uses a needle. At this stage, I am using a needle because, like Mr Gayfer, I occasionally become fed up.

We have people in Western Australia who are prepared to risk their money. That would horrify the Opposition because people are risking their own money; they are not risking the Government's money. They are not socialised. These people are risking their money, their energy, and their talents to institute a power alcohol industry—a decentralised industry. What do they receive from the Federal Minister? Help? Encouragement? No way! All they receive is a letter full of justification for nothing being done.

I hope the House ponders on this problem, and ponders on our occasional outbursts against Ministers in our own Government. I hope the House looks at what is happening to the Federal system. Both Mr McKenzie and Mr Dans talked about the Federal system. They spoke about its

falling down. The new federalism has not fallen down. The concept has not become any weaker—

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It is just tottering.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It has not become any weaker. The inane remarks of Mr Cooley do not worry me because I can deal with him on most subjects, including BHP; and he has no answer.

I hope the Attorney General speaks to the Minister for Industrial Development and the Premier so that this industry can get off the ground. Not only would it give us in Western Australia an advantage, but also it would give us an export advantage to the Eastern States if we produced stills and sold them to the farmers in the Eastern States. We have a magnificent opportunity here, if we go on with it.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Have you ever tried to get help for small business people from the Department of Industrial Development here in this State?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, I have. I tried for myself before I came into this place, under the Tonkin Government. It has improved slightly.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I think it has got worse.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The situation has improved slightly, but not very much. I agree with Mr McKenzie that in reality the people who are instructing small business people how to run their businesses have never been in a small business. They never had a two or three-man business, and they never had to face the bank manager. They have always worked for somebody else, and been on a fairly good screw.

It is amazing that if one travels around this country looking at small businesses, one hears complaints against whatever Government is in power. All Governments believe that small businesses start with about 70 or 80 employees. The one, two, five, or 10-man businesses are not considered; yet they are the backbone of our economy.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I have a contrary view. I think the Small Business Advisory Service is a good one, but the DID will not give the business people any assistance.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If people go into business, are they to be carried by the Government, or are they going to carry themselves? If they have a proposal worth putting up, the DID will help. There are many people who would not go to the lengths of putting up a proposal to the Small Business Advisory Service, whether it be the Federal or the State service—whether it be under Tonkin, Court,

Whitlam, or Fraser. I do not think Governments understand how small businesses work, and how a person starts a small business and then develops it.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I have to disagree with you.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad Mr McKenzie disagrees, because he has run a fair few small businesses!

Members will recall that the last time I was talking in a debate of this nature I spoke about salt. I had people behind me who were talking about what tax deductions one could obtain. We argued a bit, but finally I think my case came through. I am glad to say that the Farmers' Union has now joined me. The Farmers' Union and I argue occasionally; but in its newspaper of the 2nd August the research officer of the Farmers' Union (Mr Groves) said it was behind the idea.

I have read letters from Ministers assisting the Federal Treasurer before; but I will read this one because it is like the one I have just read. It contains no decisions, and does not answer the question. I wrote directly to Mr Howard, and I asked, even if it took him six months, not to get somebody else to reply to it, but to reply to it himself so that I would know he received the letter. This is the letter I received in return—

Dear Mr Lewis

The Treasurer has asked me to reply to your further letter concerning income tax deductions for expenditure on salt affected land or land that may become salt affected. In particular you referred to expenditure incurred in the fencing of salt land. The delay in replying is regretted.

The decision to remove outright deductions for a number of classes of primary production expenditure and to replace them with either deductions over a ten year period or normal depreciation (as in the case of fencing) was taken by the Labor Government.

This was written on the 24th September, 1979. I am sure Mr Cooley can tell me the date that Fraser first gained power.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I remember it very well.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The 11th November, 1974?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: 1975.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I was out a little. On that date, Fraser came to power quite legally.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is debatable.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Four years later the poor old Labor Government is being blamed. One would think I was in the Opposition! There is one thing for which the country can blame the Whitlam Government, and that is the shocking state of the economy and inflation. I do not believe the Fraser Government can blame the Whitlam Government for its own lack of decision.

The letter continues—

Requests for re-introduction of these and other deductions in respect of primary production expenditure have been received and considered on a number of occasions since then. The questions you have raised were again considered by the Government in the deliberations leading up to the 1979/80 Budget. However, the Government was unable to see its way clear to move in this direction at that time.

It is interesting, because the salt is affecting a great deal of our farming land and the water for the masses in the cities, in the country towns, and in the country cities. That is all that is affected—just about 90 per cent of the population. It would mean only a very small cost; but one continues to receive letters like that.

I will leave the Federal Government alone for a while. I am sorry the Hon. Roy Cloughton is not here tonight. I believe he spoke about me when I was out of the House. I would not like to speak about him in his absence; but as I am saying nice things about him, maybe I will be forgiven.

In relation to the opening of the Art Gallery, I was horrified when I said to Mr Cloughton a week before, "Roy, have you been asked to the opening of the Art Gallery?" and he said, "No." I said, "That's funny; neither have I." Members may laugh, but long before most other members were in this place, Roy Cloughton and I, on different sides of the House and in different Houses, worked our hearts out to obtain for this State a new Art Gallery. I did not agree with all Roy Cloughton did, and the way he did it; but his object and my object were the same—to obtain for this State a new Art Gallery.

The Board of the Art Gallery should be ashamed of itself that it did not ask a dedicated follower of the arts like Roy Cloughton, who has put the point of view of the artistic world in this place—not to curry favour with the Government, or to harass the Government, but in an inquiring way—to the opening. The board left him off the invitation list.

We know that Ministers make the decisions to build these things, eventually. We also know that

on both sides of the House there are people who have specialties and who push those specialties. I look at the Hon. Fred McKenzie, and I think of railways. I have argued with him in relation to some of his ideas; but he is an expert. The Hon. Don Cooley, in his way, is expert on other things.

It horrifies me that a person like Mr Cloughton should not have been recognised by the Board of the Art Gallery with a simple thing like an invitation to the opening of the new Art Gallery.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: How do you know that the board of the Art Gallery was responsible for his being left off the invitation list? It might have been the Government.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I asked the Minister and the board who was responsible and both said that the board was. I am not criticising people; but I usually research my topic before speaking.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Have you asked Mr Cloughton whether he was invited, but declined?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I should not have to answer such an inane interjection. Mr Cloughton and I happen to discuss art galleries and other matters frequently. You, sir, and I discuss the same subject also.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Neither the Labor Party nor the TLC was invited to the Duke of Edinburgh award night. Are you aware of that?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I was not invited, either. I am extremely sorry about that. The member has raised a good point. On a number of occasions the Government and various boards forget about the elected representatives of the State. Perhaps Ministers should take note of my comments, because I believe members on both sides of the House are a little horrified at times when they see the guest lists for functions and realise they have been forgotten when the function concerns a matter in which they are particularly interested.

Members of Parliament are interested in a great variety of matters. However, we develop specialties and when we work hard in relation to certain matters, this type of courtesy should be extended to us.

If something goes wrong in the Art Gallery I am sure the man who will be approached will be the Hon. Roy Cloughton. It horrifies me that he was not included in the guest list.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I am glad you raised that matter.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about the people who helped to save His Majesty's Theatre from demolition? They deserve recognition also. That is a parallel situation.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I believe Mr Gayfer has a good point, because the grain growers of this State did a wonderful job on that occasion. Mr Gayfer was a member in another place, as was I, when I put up a proposition at a time when I was sitting on the Opposition benches. It was the first time such a proposition had been put forward in Parliament. I suggested the State should purchase the theatre, but my proposition was refused. I do not necessarily agree totally with the way in which the matter has been handled since then, but at least the theatre has remained and it will be an asset to the State for many years to come.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Why don't we ban all public openings and save a lot of funds? I would be happy not to go along.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We would be happy if the member did not go. However, some members like to attend opening nights. I would have thought Mr Withers, being such an artistic person, would want to attend the opening of the Art Gallery so that he could draw a cartoon of someone dancing on one leg.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Was a reason given for the failure of yourself and Mr Claughton to be asked to the opening of the Art Gallery? I think it was disgraceful also.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It was not my business to ask why we were not invited. The Hon. Roy Claughton worked on the matter for a longer period of time than I did; but I just wanted to say how disappointed I was.

I should now like to comment in a happier vein on Government achievements. The other day I looked around my electorate and wondered on what the Government spends its money. Time and time again we wonder where the money goes. I congratulate the Government on providing a police station at Dumbleyung and a hospital at Donnybrook.

Early this afternoon I performed a small mental exercise. In my mind, I travelled around my electorate town by town and looked at what had been done since the Court Government came into power. The list includes hospital improvements in Nannup; a new hospital in Bridgetown, whilst the old hospital has been turned into a camp school for the Education Department; a new hospital and primary school in Katanning; a contribution to the rebuilding of the Kojonup Hall; and a contribution in Boyup Brook which assisted in converting the flax mill into a recreation centre.

Members are frequently accused of looking after their own electorates and being extremely

parochial as far as Government spending is concerned. I should like to consider the situation in Collie. When I listed these matters, I was fascinated to realise that three new pre-primary centres had been constructed in Collie. A new library has been built at Amaroo. Another series of classrooms has been built at Fairview. A major repair programme is proceeding at Wilson Park. A new library and prevocational centre have been provided at Collie. A total of \$170 000 has been spent on a terminal care wing of the hospital. Another \$400 000 will be spent on the kitchens at the hospital. One wonders where all this money comes from.

However, that is only a small part of the total expenditure in Collie. In the last two Budgets \$80 million has been spent on the Muja power station. I remember in another place asking the Minister at the time what was going to happen to Muja power station. Finally, towards the end of the reign of the Tonkin Government approximately \$32 million was spent on the Muja power station over a period of two years. The Labor Party says, "The Liberals ruined Collie."

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Collie would be dead had it not been for the Labor Party.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members should listen to the echo. The Labor Party has done damn all for Collie. It has never rationalised facilities there and has never looked at forward planning. I believe the Government will go ahead with the future development of the Muja power station.

When I was taking part in a television programme I remember asking the former Deputy Premier why the Brand Government left the struts out of the first floor of the Muja power station. He said, "I do not know." I replied that it had been done because the Brand Government foresaw the time when the power station would need to be extended.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Nonsense!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That was not done by a Labor Government; it was done by a Liberal Government which is continuing to develop such projects. The people of Collie know who is assisting them. The people of Collie know who spends the money there.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members opposite can howl like wolves in the night if they wish. The people of Collie know who puts the money into the area and who is developing it. They do not need anyone to write a list as to what has been done for them and by whom. The people of Collie know the Brand and Court Governments have

supported and will continue to support development in the area.

Members can say that a great deal of the equipment in the Muja power station is purchased outside the State; but there must be a spin-off as a result of the installation and the employment opportunities it has provided to the people in Collie.

Collie will be one of the major centres in this State. I hate saying that when Mr MacKinnon and Mr Ferry are not here; but I believe Collie will eventually overtake Bunbury, because it has more going for it.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I believe Collie will continue to develop. The pattern was set by the Brand Government and the Court Government will continue it. The dead hand of socialism cannot stop Collie going ahead.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Look at what the Brand Government was doing for it!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Brand Government did more for the security of the people of Collie than did any Labor Government. We had some bad moments; but the Brand Government did more for the security of the workers there than did the Labor Party. Members opposite claim they look after the interests of the workers.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It went from 1 600 workers under a Labor Government to 800 under the Brand Government.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I should like to ask the member whether the 1 600 people had permanent employment. Members opposite are begging the question. They are not prepared to face the facts.

I should like to return to the theme I was expounding which related to the amount of money spent by the Government and the assistance it has provided to country areas. Members opposite have a great deal to say about decentralisation, but the matters to which I have referred prove that the Government is actively involved in it.

It has been announced that, under a new Minister for Health, the plans for the Donnybrook Hospital have been changed and the facility will be much more functional than the hospital envisaged in the plans drawn up previously.

Since I have been a member of Parliament, a new police station has been built at Donnybrook. Unfortunately, under a Labor Government I could not get it; but under the Court Government I was able to obtain a new police station there. A

new school was provided by the Court Government. In Mrs Piesse's home town of Wagin extensions to the hospital have been undertaken and a technical officer will be provided there to give the people a good technical background.

A resource centre has been provided at Darkan and a sports centre at Kukerin. I have mentioned the new facilities at Dumbleyung already; but a duplex for school teachers has been provided also. May I say on behalf of the people of Dumbleyung that a grassed oval and swimming pool are required? I will not argue the matter at this stage; but I should like to point out to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs that such facilities are required in the area. We are happy to wait until the next Budget comes out; but we would be pleased if a grassed oval and swimming pool were provided then.

In an outlying town such as Dumbleyung a grassed oval and swimming pool are most necessary. Surely nobody in this House would deny that.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No, you can have your swimming pool.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad the honourable member and I are in agreement on one subject.

I should like to refer to a couple of other matters within my electorate, firstly in relation to Manjimup. It fascinates me that gymnasiums are provided in high schools in the metropolitan area and they are more common there than in country areas. It is rather odd, however, that some wheat belt towns are provided with gymnasiums, but a town such as Manjimup does not have one. The Hon. F. E. McKenzie was down there recently looking at the wonderful job being done by the Forests Department with regard to wood chips and other matters. It is amazing that a place as cold as Manjimup does not have a gymnasium at the high school.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Does it have a swimming pool?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It has only recently obtained a swimming pool. I agree with the Hon. Neil Oliver that that is crazy; but a gymnasium is not provided there. A committee has been formed at the school to obtain a gymnasium. They do not want an expensive facility which will cost \$350 000. They will be satisfied with a gymnasium costing about \$50 000.

Another fairly serious problem exists down there. As members know, there is a special school for disadvantaged children with a magnificent teacher who has done a marvellous job. But if the

Government could see fit to give that lass an aide who could provide home help for the parents it would be a real piece of welfare work which would be very well accepted in the community. If the Government went even further and purchased what is left of the Donnelly River mill for a camp for disadvantaged children, so that disadvantaged children from the city, from Bunbury, and from other country areas could go there for recreation, I believe it would be another way to do something for disadvantaged children—and not an expensive way. I can see the Hon. Robert Hetherington pricking up his ears and accepting my proposition.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I will go and have a look one day. I have had a look at the Manjimup High School and I agree with what you say about it.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will move on to another proposition which Mr Hetherington might take up. We might form a love-hate relationship as Mr Claughton and I have done in respect of the Art Gallery. I refer to the fact that GEHA does not put phones in duplexes or houses in which female school teachers live. It is not that I want to ring up the school teachers, but many of them are young girls in their first year and they can be subjected to some fairly horrifying experiences with louts and other people. In one case in Collie where there was no phone, about six vandals came in and vandalised a car in the garage and the two girls in the unit were too frightened to go outside to stop them.

I have been told by GEHA and the department that to provide phones would set a precedent. I do not think any of those teachers would mind paying a little extra rent to have the phone. Of course, some people will walk out and leave the phone bill unpaid, but despite the few who will do the wrong thing, I believe it would be a good thing for phones to be installed.

In previous years I have mentioned the Community Recreation Council, and I intended to speak about it at length tonight, but I will not do so. The cost of the building of Perry Lakes and its administration still horrifies me. In reality, community recreation is meant to be about people, and the officers should not remain at headquarters, but should be out among people developing skills and recreation among people. They should not be sitting at central office writing volumes. We want the minimum of central office staff and the maximum of field workers.

I want to mention a couple of other subjects. The first is the killing of stock, either cattle or sheep, on farms and the hoo-ha that goes on about it with the Health Department. As the law stands,

one can kill stock for one's own use in any unhygienic conditions, haul it up on the limb of a tree, cut it down, throw it in the mud, and put it in one's own deep freezer. Some people have turned their dairies into nice, fly-wired chopping-up rooms with cold stores next to them. Neighbours say, "If we knock the beast over can we bring it to your place to hang it for a week in the cool store, and then take it home and chop it up to put it in the deep freezer?"

This seems to be a crazy law. I know butchers must be licensed and must have special niches. But this practice will continue. The fines will not catch up with the number of people who are doing it. It seems to me there must be a way to overcome the problem. Mr White of Dinninup has suggested giving the farmer who kills the stock two or three tags a year with which to tag the beasts when they go into the central cool store. It is a simple scheme and it could work.

In previous debates I have spoken on a matter about which the Attorney General has written me on many occasions; that is, an alphabetical set of Statutes, preferably in loose-leaf form. I now have about five letters from Ministers for Justice and Attorneys General saying, "We are getting on with the job and it is going rather well". I refer members to the editorial in *The West Australian* of the 15th July, 1963, which related to the Government's decision to overhaul the law.

I am bitterly disappointed that nothing has happened. It is extremely difficult in electorate offices when one is trying to do research, and so on, and one has not a wonderful clerk such as those in the Legislative Council who keep everything up to date. This cannot be said of the other place. I can refer back to the Hon. Frank Wise, the Hon. Arthur Griffith, the Hon. Keith Watson, and the Hon. Dr Hislop, who referred to this matter. I could quote from their speeches, but I will not bore the House by doing so. I merely implore the Government to get on with the job. Sixteen years is not a bad span and most of us would be extremely happy to have an alphabetical set of Statutes. It would make our job much easier.

I want to touch briefly on two other subjects. One is the Farm Machinery Dealers' Association, in which I have some interest, as members know. The Government gets a bit of a belting occasionally, but I congratulate it on starting the apprenticeship course in farm machinery. It is a forward step. This is the first State of Australia to establish such a course. The Farm Machinery Dealers' Association was behind the move and pushed it, and the proposed syllabus has now gone right around Australia. The other States are

pushing to catch up with us, but I would think they will be a year or two behind the Western Australian Government, as they usually are.

I would also like to congratulate the Road Traffic Authority on the booklet it is preparing to provide information on how to tow machines and what one is allowed to tow along a highway.

The next matter I propose to deal with will appeal to members of the Opposition because it relates to their favourite country, South Africa. Much is said about what happens in South Africa, and I just picked up this article to talk about one matter—sport. Some people say apartheid is ruining South Africa, and I must admit the Federal Government and the Prime Minister do not perform very well in this area. I will quote what South Africa spent on sport in the 1978-79 financial year. I wish we in Australia had a record like this.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: White sport or black sport?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad Mr Cooley asked. These figures relate to the development of sport and they reveal how badly the South African Government treats people other than whites. The budget, in rands, was: blacks 15 762 451, coloureds 2 852 464, Indians 1 139 880, and whites 1 305 600. That is a classic case of apartheid which shows what the South African Government is doing and how it bears its responsibilities. Mr Cooley asked how much was spent for blacks, and I have told him it is 1 000 per cent more than that for whites.

Let us have no more of the nonsense we get from the other side without knowledge, with bigotry, and without really following the problems or going to look at them. Our Prime Minister tends to do the same thing.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What is the source of your figures?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The source is *South African News and Views*, which is published monthly by the Information Counsellor of the South African Embassy in Canberra, ACT. Unfortunately I do not have the date of it, but it is published monthly and this issue would have been published in the last 12 months.

We talk about what the Federal Government does, and in tonight's edition of the *Daily News* we find this on page four, under the headline, "\$60 m Nomad deal called off—"

The Federal government has put a clamp on any deal with South Africa involving the Nomad aircraft.

The Minister for Productivity, Mr Macphee, announced in a statement today that all negotiations with a French dealer acting for South African interests were called off.

It does not seem to me as though he wants much productivity for Australia when he cannot deal with our neighbours in South Africa.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No other nation in the world will deal with them.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Every nation is dealing with them. All nations want to deal with them, and why should not we in Australia have the guts to say we want to deal with them, instead of hiding behind all sorts of things and not being prepared to come out and say they are our neighbours?

South Africa was built with people like ourselves. It was a colonial nation. It has done a magnificent job and those people are our equals except in one thing; that is, their treatment of their coloured and black population, where they are so far ahead of us it does not matter.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Nonsense!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: "Nonsense", the honourable member says, when he has nothing to back it up.

I move on to a matter which will interest the Minister for Lands who represents the Minister for Agriculture. On the 8th August, I asked a question of the Minister about the Lamb Marketing Board. Part (4) of the question was—

- (4) (a) Would the Minister list the months when the purchases were made; and
- (b) the average price paid for those purchases?

The answer was—

- (4) The board must maintain f.o.b. price confidentiality in the normal course of competitive trading. Details of f.o.b. prices are not therefore available for publication.

That sounds very good until one looks at the report of the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board for the year ended the 30th June, 1978. When I looked at the report one of the first things that caught my eye was the following comment—

The report indicates a deficit of \$1 374 883

... A shortfall in production necessitated purchases of lamb carcasses outside the State in order to fulfil contractual commitments and contributed approximately \$300 000 to the deficit.

I continued to read through the report, and I came to the chairman's report. I found that exactly 140 175 carcasses amounting to 1 736 tonnes were purchased from Tasmania and New Zealand to fulfil Middle East contracts. Of course, Western Australian lambs are acquired; they are not purchased, but acquired, as a result of the acquisitive nature of the Lamb Marketing Board.

Then I turned to the financial statement of the Auditor General, and I found that \$13 863 315 was spent on the acquisition of lambs. Further on I found that carcase purchases amounted to \$2 247 394; they are the carcasses purchased in Tasmania and New Zealand. When I worked out the figures I found that Western Australian producers—renowned lamb producers—received \$13.47 a carcase, while Tasmanian and New Zealand producers must have grins all over their faces because they received \$16.03 a carcase.

Mr President, you have heard me speak about the Lamb Marketing Board previously, and I will not continue. However, I would like to point out that on the 4th October I asked the following question—

- (1) Is the Lamb Marketing Board at the moment purchasing lambs in South Australia or the Eastern States?

The answer supplied by the Minister was as follows—

- (1) No; the Lamb Marketing Board is however purchasing lamb carcasses in the Eastern States on an f.o.b. basis for shipment to Iran.

The next part of my question was as follows—

- (2) If so, how many per week on average?

To which the Minister replied—

- (2) 2 480 tonnes of lamb were purchased in the Eastern States between July and September, 1979.

According to my calculations that represents about 5 000 tonnes a week. I do not know how much longer authorities such as the Lamb Marketing Board will be able to get away with answers like that in this place. I feel many members are beginning to query the answers they receive. When we compare that figure with the 1 736 tonnes of carcasses which I quoted previously, we can add 50 per cent and say that about 210 000 carcasses were purchased from the Eastern States and New Zealand between July and September. I do not believe that is in the interests of lamb producers in Western Australia.

In total, I agree with the Budget. I congratulate the Treasurer for producing another magnificent effort. He has again presented a balanced Budget.

I believe any Government which thinks any economy can continue with deficit after deficit is doomed to failure. I do excuse the Federal Government for producing deficit Budgets, because it was left far in the mud, and it is gradually getting out of it. I believe a balanced Budget is certainly the thing for this State.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. O. N. B. Oliver.

House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

RECREATION

North-West Shelf Gas Project

305. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Recreation:

In the event of the North-West Shelf gas getting the go ahead—

- (a) is planning of recreation facilities being shared with the shire council;
- (b) will the current study of recreational facilities make its findings public;
- (c) will programmes of recreational activities suitable to the area and climate be developed; and
- (d) will use of parks and reserves be planned and supervised?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) The Minister is advised that it would be made available in due course.
- (c) A departmental recreation officer is currently working with the shire to assist the community to develop adequate programmes and activities. This work will be further supported when a recently appointed regional recreation adviser takes up duties.
- (d) In the first instance, this is a function of the local government authority.

HERDSMAN LAKE

Mining

306. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Does the pit from which landfill is currently being obtained to supply landfill for the Katanning Holdings development adjacent to Pearson Street, lie within mineral claim No. 70/16893?
- (2) (a) Are results of Government Chemical Laboratories tests of samples from Herdsman Lake available; and

(b) if so, would the Minister advise the results?

- (3) (a) Has the field exploration by Biala and Malina Mines begun in February 1978, been completed;
- (b) if so, on what date; and
- (c) if not, when is it expected to be completed?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) I understand the pit is on private land which is to be excluded from application for mineral claim No. 70/16893.
- (2) (a) and (b) No samples have been submitted to Government Chemical Laboratories.
- (3) (a) to (c) The companies do not propose to carry out field exploration until a decision is made on their mineral claim applications.

TRANSPORT: AIRPORTS

North-west

307. The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has there been a joint Commonwealth-State advisory committee studying Western Australia's airport requirements?
- (2) Did the Minister's news release of the 11th October, 1979, reflect the committee's recommendation on Western Australia's airport requirements?
- (3) As this news release referred only to Perth Airport at Guildford, the secondary airport at Jandakot, and a suggested future metropolitan airport at Karnup, can it be assumed that the committee and the Minister see no significant "airport requirements" in other parts of Western Australia?
- (4) If, in fact, the joint Commonwealth-State advisory committee was established to study "Western Australia's" airport requirements, as opposed to those of Perth metropolitan area, will the Minister direct that it concern itself with northern airports, one or some of which must be prepared for direct interstate and international flights during the coming decade?

- (5) Is there a report prepared by the committee which is available for examination?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes. It has been in existence for seven years.
- (2) No. Only those in the Perth region.
- (3) No.
- (4) The committee has been studying northern airports for some time. A committee working group has completed interim work on Karratha and preliminary work on the Pilbara as a whole.
- (5) The committee's report on the Perth region is available.

POLICE AND RTA

North-West Shelf Gas Project

308. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

In the event of the North-West Shelf gas getting the go ahead—

- (a) is any planning being done concerning the future style of police presence in Karratha-Dampier;
- (b) are police patrols of townships being considered; and
- (c) will RTA facilities and staff be increased?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf (for the Hon. G. C. MacKINNON) replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes, as and where necessary.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Shallow Wetlands Mining

309. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

When will the environmental review and management programme prepared by Malina Holdings for proposed mining of shallow wetlands from Lake Gngangara to Dongara be available for public study?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The company is presently undertaking studies to prepare an ERMP, but the Minister has no knowledge as to when it will be completed.

LAND AND RECREATION

Karratha

310. The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What was the date of the last release of residential land in Karratha?
- (2) Of the services premium charged on a single residential allotment of average size, how much was attributable to—
 - (a) drainage;
 - (b) roads;
 - (c) electric power;
 - (d) water supply;
 - (e) sewerage;
 - (f) landscaping or general area betterment;
 - (g) other services, if any;

and what was the charge raised by the Lands Department to cover the normal administrative function?

- (3) What is passive reaction?
- (4) Is the cost of developing passive recreation areas in the newer Karratha subdivisions included in the landscaping vote above?
- (5) Will the successful tree-planting programme in the open space areas in the first residential cell (Bungarra) be repeated in Peg's Creek and Millars Well subdivisions?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The 28th March, 1979.
- (2) (a) to (g) Servicing and setting of service premiums at Karratha is co-ordinated under the jurisdiction of the Townsites Development Committee. The land price component set by the Lands Department for a single lot was \$200.

- (3) The word "recreation" may be defined in various ways but in essence it denotes the refreshment of the human mind and body as well as its entertainment and amusement. The term "passive recreation" can be used to describe areas such as parks and public open space where passive rather than active, organised recreational or sporting activities can be enjoyed. There can be numerous refinements of the term depending on circumstances.
- (4) Refer to (2).
- (5) This is a matter for the Townsites Development Committee and the local authority.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

North-West Shelf Gas Project

311. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

In the event of the North-West Shelf gas getting the go ahead, what Government-TLC discussions are taking place to prepare for North-West Shelf development?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf (for the Hon. G. C. MacKINNON) replied:

This matter has previously been discussed at Ministers for Labour advisory committee meetings and also at a specially convened meeting on the 16th June, 1978, involving the Minister for Labour and Industry, the Minister for Industrial Development, Mines and Fuel and Energy, and representatives of the WA Trades and Labor Council.

It was agreed at those meetings that at the appropriate time it would be desirable and beneficial industrially for relevant parties, such as the TLC, employers, and Government to meet and discuss matters relevant to the proposed project.

Matters relating to the training of skilled tradesmen have been under continuous discussion with TLC representatives in the WA Industrial Training Advisory Council for some considerable time.

The Minister is of the view that this type of consultative action can be further taken immediately a firm decision is

made that the North-West Shelf project is to proceed.

RAILWAYS

Rolling Stock: Reflectorised Strips

312. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Minister received a submission from the Association of Apex Clubs requesting that reflectorised strips, similar to those used on roadside marker posts, be placed on all Westrail rolling stock?
- (2) If so, will he advise what action, if any, he is taking on the submission?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Minister will have the matter examined when the submission is received.

WATER SUPPLIES

Port Hedland and South Hedland

313. The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Leader of the House:

In relation to the water supply of Port Hedland—

- (1) (a) When was the first reticulated fresh water supply provided in the townsite of Port Hedland; and
- (b) from what source did this water come?
- (2) Before the date given in the answer to part (1), how was the Port Hedland community serviced with water?
- (3) (a) When was the Turner River basin first used as a source of water for Port Hedland;
- (b) what was the maximum daily yield of this borefield; and
- (c) what was the total capital cost in the development of this supply?
- (4) (a) When did the Yule River basin first supply water to the Port Hedland/South Hedland conurbation;

- (b) what was the maximum daily yield when this borefield was fully developed; and
 - (c) what was the capital cost to develop this supply?
- (5) (a) When will the De Grey River water scheme be inaugurated;
- (b) what is the estimated total daily yield of the De Grey scheme when fully developed; and
 - (c) what will be the total capital cost of this scheme when fully developed—including borefield, pumps, electric power supply, pumping mains, and associated storage tanks, etc.?
- (6) What financial contribution was made by the Mt. Newman Mining Co. Ltd. to—
- (a) the Turner River scheme;
 - (b) the Yule River scheme; and
 - (c) what contribution has been committed by the company to the De Grey scheme?
- (7) What financial contribution was made by Goldsworthy Mining Ltd. to these three water supply projects?
- (8) Is any part of the capital cost involved in these projects—properly described as headworks—apportioned to the allotments in new residential subdivisions, thus inflating the services premium which has to be paid by the individual purchaser of building lots?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf (for the Hon. G. C. MacKINNON) replied:

- (1) to (8) Some of the information requested cannot be answered with accuracy. Most of the rest of the information is a matter of record, having been published in annual reports over the years.

Practically all the information sought will be used in the address which will be given on the occasion of the opening of the extensions to the De Grey water supply scheme. A copy of this speech will be forwarded to the honourable member after it has been delivered.

HERDSMAN LAKE

Dredging

314. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Further to the Minister's reply to my questions without notice on the 25th October, 1979, will he advise, in relation to the agreement between the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the development company—

- (a) the conditions applying to the operation of the dredge on Herdsman Lake, including—
- (i) the surface area over which the dredging may take place;
 - (ii) the actual size of the area proposed to be dredged by the company;
 - (iii) what purpose, if any, the dredging is being undertaken other than landfill;
 - (iv) the depth to which dredging is proposed to be taken; and
 - (v) the actual maximum depth currently reached; and
- (b) (i) what rehabilitation conditions apply to the pit; and
- (ii) who is monitoring the conditions?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (a) Conditions applying to the operations of the dredge on Lake Herdsman are arranged through the agreement entered into by the developers and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority on the 28th February, 1979.
- (i) Described in the engineering drawings referred to in the agreement;
 - (ii) approximately 10 ha;
 - (iii) the creation of wetland habitat and acquisition of knowledge of the lake's biophysical character;

- (iv) in the eastern half of the newly developed water areas depths will range between one and two metres to provide shallow feeding areas but are deep enough to inhibit *Typha orientalis*. Depths in the western half will be variable, averaging seven metres;
- (v) maximum depth currently reached is nine metres.
- (b) (i) There is no pit; the developed wetland habitat will be rehabilitated under the terms and conditions contained in the agreement between the developers and the MRPA.
- (ii) Dr T. Riggert, consulting ecologist, and Mr D. Everall, Biologist of the Town Planning Department; failing agreement by these ecologists, then to the satisfaction of the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning acting as arbitrator, whose decision shall be final and binding on the parties.

HERDSMAN LAKE

Public Use

315. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Town Planning:

When will the area on Herdsman Lake referred to by the Minister in a letter to the Tree Society of the 27th August, 1979, be returned to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority for public use?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

When the development on the open space reservation has been completed and title has been issued for the adjacent subdivisional lots in the scheme.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Film: "Harlequin"

316. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Industrial Development:

What is the extent of the Government's financial commitment to the production of the film "Harlequin"?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The Government has supported the WA Film Council investment in the film "Harlequin" to the extent of \$100 000.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

LAND: NORTH BEACH

Public Education Endowment Trust

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Lands:

In reference to land held by the Public Education Endowment Trust at North Beach which was the subject of an exchange for land owned by the trust at Cottesloe, would the Minister advise—

- (a) a description of the land formerly owned by the trust at Cottesloe;
- (b) the surface area of the above land;
- (c) the date on which transfer was effected;
- (d) who presently holds title to the land; and
- (e) the purpose for which the exchange was required?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) Part of Cottesloe Lot 162 and being part of the land comprised in Certificate of Title vol. 815, folio 144.
- (b) The land contained in the title referred to in (a) comprises 61.1075 hectares.
- (c) and (d) Transfer to the Crown has been executed and endorsed with the approval of the Governor. Registration under the Transfer of Land Act has not taken place.
- (e) Continued occupancy by the Cottesloe Golf Club under different tenure.