

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 20th October, 1976

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

WHITE GUM VALLEY SPECIAL SCHOOL

Construction of Second Stage: Petition

MR FLETCHER (Fremantle) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition worded as follows—

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, parents, relatives and friends of children attending the White Gum Valley Special School respectfully pray that you urge the Minister for Education, the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, M.L.C. to proceed with the building of the second stage of the White Gum Valley Special School forthwith.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Parliament assembled should use their influence to see that the children of the said school receive adequate education in suitable facilities, to which they are morally entitled.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray, that you will give this matter your earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 69 signatures, and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly. I have signed it accordingly.

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

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 488).

QUESTIONS (43): ON NOTICE

1. HOUSING

Kimberley: Aged Persons

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware that frail aged accommodation is sorely needed in the Kimberley region for both the Aboriginal and European population of the north-west?
- (2) What is his department doing to provide such accommodation?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) The main intent of programmes through public housing authorities has been to cater for independent families or individuals. Frail aged and other special

housing requirements are, in the main, catered for through other programmes.

2. HOUSING

Kununurra: Waiting List

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many pensioners are currently on the waiting list for accommodation in Kununurra?
- (2) How many young married couples are currently on the waiting list for accommodation in Kununurra?
- (3) What is being done to relieve a possible housing shortage in Kununurra?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) The information sought by the member will require some time to obtain, and he will be advised by correspondence in due course.

3. HOUSING

Kununurra: Aborigines

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

What number of Kununurra Aborigines live in—

- (a) State Housing Commission houses;
- (b) transitional houses;
- (c) reserve huts;
- (d) the open with no houses at all?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The information sought by the member will require some time to obtain and he will be advised by correspondence in due course.

4. HOUSING

Kununurra: Rents

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware of the alleged disparity in Government housing rentals in Kununurra?
- (2) What rents are paid to the State Housing Commission by its tenants in Kununurra?
- (3) What rents are paid by Government Employees' Housing Authority tenants?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) The information sought by the member will require some time to obtain, and he will be advised by correspondence in due course.

5. POLICE STATION AND COURTHOUSE

Derby: Air-conditioning

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What attention has been given to requests for air conditioning at the Derby police station?
- (2) Is it possible to provide air conditioning to the police station at the same time as the job is done on the courthouse as provided for in the current budget?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Contract documents are being prepared for the air conditioning of the police station at Derby.
- (2) Funds are available in current loan programme for both police station and courthouse and it is proposed that tenders should be called conjointly.

(c) within the local authority of Kwinana?

- (4) Did his department or any other to his knowledge, prepare and distribute to newspapers any news release which sets out an expenditure figure of \$5.5 million or thereabouts?

- (5) If "Yes" will he table such statement?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (5) I shall seek permission to table the press release dated 7th October which I assume is the one referred to in the member's question. I think this press release, together with the information contained in the Budget papers, effectively answers the questions which have been raised.

The Paper was tabled (see Paper No. 489).

6. FISHERIES

Lake Argyle: Species

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What types of fish are currently known to exist in Lake Argyle?
- (2) Have any of the species been introduced by man?
- (3) By whom were these species introduced?
- (4) In what years and in what numbers were the fish introduced?
- (5) Have any studies been done to ascertain the effects any introduced species may have on the indigenous fauna of the area?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), what are the conclusions reached by such studies?
- (7) Will he table the copies of such studies?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Native fish.
- (2) to (7) Not applicable.

7. BUDGET

\$5.5 Million Expenditure: Cockburn Electorate

Mr TAYLOR, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Does his budget show that an amount of \$5.5 million is to be spent on works in the Cockburn area as described in a recent press release distributed to newspapers?
- (2) Is this amount or an amount like it to be spent in Spearwood?
- (3) If "No" to (1) and (2), will he advise the total amount shown as for expenditure—
 - (a) within the postal district of Spearwood;
 - (b) within the local authority area of Cockburn; and

8. STOCK-ROCKINGHAM ROADS JUNCTION

Relocation

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

With respect to that section of Stock Road between Fanstone and Russell Roads—

- (1) Will the present section of Rockingham Road continue to be used as part of the dual carriageway?
- (2) Is it intended later to construct an additional section of road so that Rockingham Road could revert to becoming a service road?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), is the present junction of Rockingham Road and Stock Road likely to be either re-engineered or moved to another point?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Redesign of the junction will be required.

9. ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY

Opening of Account

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has a "Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority Account" in accordance with the Act yet been opened either at the Treasury or at an approved bank?
- (2) If not, what is the cause for the delay?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes, at the Treasury.

10. TOWN PLANNING

Albany Highway-Carradine Road Area

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Has the Town Planning Board made any recommendation or suggestion regarding the use of the area of land between Albany Highway and Carradine Road, Armadale?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) what is the recommendation or suggestion;
 - (b) to which person or organisation was it made; and
 - (c) what are the details regarding shape, size and suggested land use?
- (3) (a) What is the present zoning of the land; and
(b) who are the present owners?
- (4) If the suggested land used is incompatible with the present zoning, how will the land be acquired?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (4) As the question leaves some doubt as to the exact land referred to, will the member indicate the precise locations over which he requires his answers?

11. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

Courses

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What body determines the courses that are to be held at Murdoch University?
- (2) Will a pre-school teachers' course be available at the Murdoch University for the 1977 school year?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Subject to the provisions of the Murdoch University Act and the WA Tertiary Education Commission Act, the Senate of Murdoch University determines courses that are to be held at that university.
- (2) No.
- (3) The university has decided not to go ahead with its plans for a pre-school course pending the review of teacher education needs by the new WA Post Secondary Education Commission and the tertiary education institutions.

12. SEWERAGE

Shire of Kwinana: Site Plan

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Works:

With respect to the proposed expenditure of almost \$1 million on sewerage works within the Shire of Kwinana within the forthcoming financial year, will he provide a small site plan and elaborate in some detail?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The expenditure relates to the Kwinana wastewater treatment plant located on the west side of McLaughlan Road, Mandogalup. These works have been operating for some 5 to 6 years and have the capacity to serve the equivalent of 7 500 people.

The plant is being enlarged to provide a capacity equivalent to a service for 26 000 people.

The estimated cost of the work is \$2 395 000 and at the 30th June, 1976, a total of \$1 434 000 was required to complete the extension.

13. HEALTH

Care of Aged Persons: Policy

Mr WATT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Would the Minister state the Government's policy in relation to the provision of care for elderly persons?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The Government provides public hospital services and supportive services within the community and encourages charitable and private hospitals, nursing homes and other appropriate accommodation and services.

14. POLICE

Solicitors' Offices: Search

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has he taken note of the current controversy in the daily press concerning searches by police in solicitors' offices for files and/or documents relative to clients of the said solicitors?
- (2) How long has this practice been in use in Western Australia (please give date and occasion of the earliest recorded instance)?
- (3) How often has this procedure been resorted to since then?

(4) How often has it been resorted to this year—give particulars of—

(a) date of each occasion;

(b) whether files removed by police, or perused and/or copied in the solicitors' respective offices;

(5) (a) At whose instigation; and
(b) by whose direction,
in each case, have such searches been carried out at the offices of the solicitors concerned?

(6) (a) Under what statute, in each case;

(b) in what terms, in each case; and

(c) by what stipendiary magistrate or Justice of the Peace, in each case,

has the warrant issued purporting to authorise these invasions of a client's right to absolute confidentiality from his solicitor excepting where the solicitor is acting as an accessory to the client's offence?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The authority to conduct such searches has been contained in the Criminal Code since its inception.

(3) Statistics not kept.

(4) to (6) As a number of matters referred to in these questions are still sub judice I am not in a position to provide the information requested.

15.

RAILWAYS

Perth-Armadale Service: Overcrowding

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware of the possible overcrowding on the 7.28 a.m. train ex Armadale to Perth?

(2) If "Yes" is he further aware that the 7.39 a.m. train ex Armadale has sparsely occupied coaches?

(3) If answers to (1) and (2) are "Yes" would he be prepared to relieve the possible overcrowding on the 7.28 a.m. train by transferring a coach from the 7.39 a.m. train?

(4) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) No. The 7.39 a.m. train is made up of diesel rail car units, whereas the 7.28 a.m. train consists of saloon coaches hauled by a diesel locomotive. The rail car units would not be compatible.

(4) It is intended to place an extra saloon coach at present undergoing repairs on the 7.28 train ex Armadale as soon as the overhaul is completed. This is expected to be 20th November, 1976.

16.

POLICE STATION

Forrestfield

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

In view of the extensive housing development taking place in the Forrestfield area, will he advise—

(1) Is it his intention to build a police station in this area to cater for the needs of the residents?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) If "Yes" to (1) will he advise the location?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) Requests have been submitted to the Shire of Kalamunda for an area of land for "Police Purposes" to be included in a Town Planning Scheme being prepared by the Shire, for Forrestfield area, and bounded by Hale Road and Strelitzia Avenue.

17. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Engineers: Classification

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Is it a fact that the Association of Professional Engineers has recently objected to the classification of a number of senior engineering positions within the State Energy Commission?

(2) Is it a fact that these objections were on the grounds that the salary was too high for the duties and responsibilities of the position?

(3) If the answer to (2) is in the negative, what was the reason for the objection?

(4) Will he table SEC notice to staff 337/76?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) With the extensive reorganisation of the State Energy Commission, a number of classifications have been the subject of negotiation with APEA in order to decide on an appropriate classification.

(4) Yes.

With your permission, Mr Speaker, copies of relevant notices to staff are tabled.

The document was tabled (see paper No. 490).

18. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Engineers: Number in Class 5 and Above

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What was the number of engineers of class 5 and higher employed by the State Energy Commission or the State Electricity Commission at—

December, 1969;

December, 1973;

June, 1975;

the present time?

- (2) Are there new positions being advertised at the present time in this category?

- (3) How many engineers class 5 and higher will be employed when these new positions are filled?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) December, 1969, 14;

December, 1973, 73;

June, 1975, 82;

the present time, 86.

- (2) Most positions in the new Energy Commission organisation have now been filled at these levels.

- (3) Answers given in (1) include all new positions. It should be noted that in February, 1970, the APEA award was substantially amended. The numbers given are not comparable.

19. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Engineers: Number in Class 7 and Above

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What was the number of engineers of class 7 and higher employed by the State Energy Commission, or the State Electricity Commission at—

December, 1969;

December, 1973;

June, 1975;

the present time?

- (2) Are there new positions being advertised at the present time in this category?

- (3) How many engineers class 7 and higher will be employed when these new positions are filled?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) December, 1969, 9;

December, 1973, 48;

June, 1975, 48;

the present time, 50.

- (2) Most positions in the new Energy Commission organisation have now been filled at these levels.

- (3) Answers given in (1) include all new positions; it should be noted, however, that in February, 1970,

the APEA award was substantially amended. The numbers given are not comparable.

20. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Engineers: Salaries for Classes 5 to 14

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What are the present salaries paid to engineers of classes 5 to 14 respectively?

- (2) When were the new classifications 10 to 14 introduced for engineers?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Rate p.a.

Class	\$
5	17 454;
	17 874;
	18 291.
6	19 022;
	19 491.
7	20 245;
8	20 858.
9	21 472.
10	22 226.
11	23 038.
12	23 952.
13	24 967.
14	26 083.

- (2) The 5th July, 1976. The new classifications 10 to 14 replace two previous classifications which cover the same salary range.

21. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Branch Heads and Managers

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How many branch heads were there in the State Energy Commission, or State Electricity Commission, at—

December, 1969;

December, 1973;

June, 1975;

the present time?

- (2) What were their respective designations in each of those periods?

- (3) How many managers were there in each of those periods and what were their designations?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) December, 1969, 8;

December, 1973, 9;

June, 1975, 9;

the present time, 14.

- (2) December, 1969—

Staff and Industrial Officer,
Controller of Stores,
Secretary Accountant,

Power Production Engineer,
Manager Gas,
Country Transmission and Dis-
tribution Engineer,
Design and Construction En-
gineer,
Metropolitan Transmission and
Distribution Engineer.

December, 1973—

Staff and Industrial Officer,
Controller of Stores,
Secretary,
Finance Officer,
Power Production Engineer,
Manager Gas,
Country Transmission and Dis-
tribution Engineer,
Design and Construction En-
gineer,
Metropolitan Transmission and
Distribution Engineer.

June, 1975—

Staff and Industrial Officer,
Controller of Stores,
Secretary,
Finance Officer,
Power Production Engineer,
Manager Gas,
Country Transmission and Dis-
tribution Engineer,
Design and Construction En-
gineer,
Metropolitan Transmission and
Distribution Engineer.

the present time—

Principal Engineer Transmission
and Distribution,
Power Design and Construction
Engineer,
Power Stations Engineer,
Transmission Engineer,
Central Engineering Services
Engineer,
Principal Civil Engineer,
Power Systems Operations En-
gineer,
Power Systems Services Engin-
eer,
Subtransmission Engineer,
Power Development Engineer,
Staff and Industrial Officer,
Director, Data Processing,
Controller of Stores,
Secretary.

(3) December, 1969, 4 Managers—

General Manager,
Assistant Manager Finance,
Assistant Manager Generation,
Assistant Manager Supply and
Development.

December, 1973, 5 Managers—

General Manager,
Manager Generation,
Manager Supply,
Manager Finance,
Manager Gas.

June, 1975, 5 Managers—

General Manager,
Manager Supply,
Manager Finance,
Manager Generation,
Manager Gas.

At the present time, 7 Managers—

Manager Transmission and Dis-
tribution,
Manager Marketing and Gas,
Manager Finance, Administra-
tion and Secretary,
Manager Power Production,
Manager Power Design and En-
gineering Services,
Manager Personnel,
Manager Resources and Plan-
ning.

Due to the extensive reorganisa-
tion of the Energy Commission
after July, 1975, the names
"Branch Head" and "Manager"
have different meanings so that
numbers are not comparable.

22. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

*Officers: Managerial Level and
Above*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister
for Fuel and Energy:

(1) How many officers were there in
the State Energy Commission or
in the State Electricity Commis-
sion, of manager level and above,
at—

December, 1969;

December, 1973;

June, 1975;

the present time?

(2) What was/is the designation of
each?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) December, 1969, 4;
December, 1973, 5;
June, 1975, 5;
the present time, 10.

(2) December, 1969—

General Manager,
Assistant Manager Finance,
Assistant Manager Generation,
Assistant Manager Supply and
Development.

December, 1973—

General Manager,
Manager Generation,
Manager Supply,
Manager Finance,
Manager Gas.

June, 1975—

General Manager,
Manager Generation,
Manager Supply,
Manager Finance,
Manager Gas.

At the present time—

Commissioner,
 Assistant Commissioner Engineering,
 Assistant Commissioner Commerce,
 Manager Finance, Administration and Secretary,
 Manager Marketing and Gas,
 Manager Resources and Planning,
 Manager Transmission and Distribution,
 Manager Power Design and Engineering Services,
 Manager Power Production,
 Manager Personnel.

Commissioner and Manager Resources and Planning transferred from Fuel and Power Commission. Since the reorganisation of the State Energy Commission which resulted in the amalgamation of the old State Electricity Commission and the old Fuel and Power Commission the State Energy Commission has the dual role of State Utility and that of advising the Government on all fuel and energy resources and planning matters.

Due to the extensive reorganisation of the Energy Commission after July, 1975, the name "Manager" has a different meaning so that numbers are not comparable. To satisfy the member's commendable interest in the important matter of SEC organisation it should be noted just as one example that in New South Wales presently there are fourteen officers in the electricity utility sector of the industry only (which does not include advice to Government on energy matters) with salaries that are at least \$2 000 per annum in excess of the Commissioner for the State Energy Commission of Western Australia.

23. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Employees: Number

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What was/is the total number of employees of the State Energy Commission, or State Electricity Commission, at—

December, 1969;
 December, 1973;
 June, 1975;
 the present time?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

December, 1969, 3 158;
 December, 1973, 4 385;
 June, 1975, 4 777;
 the present time, 4 963.

24. MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Engineers: Number in Class 5 and Above

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

(1) What is/was the total number of class 5 engineers and higher employed by the Main Roads Department at—

December, 1969;
 December, 1973;
 June, 1975;

the present time?

(2) What was the total number of Main Roads Department employees at each of those dates?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) December, 1969, 30;
 December, 1973, 34;
 June, 1975, 36;
 September, 1976, 35.
 (2) December, 1969, 2 572;
 December, 1973, 2 889;
 June, 1975, 2 839;
 September, 1976, 2 986.

25.

MINING

Prospectors: Loan Fund Allocation

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) With reference to the General Loan Fund allocation showing the actual for 1975-76 and the proposed expenditures for 1976-77, item 5 Mining Development—assistance to prospectors—would he please explain how the sum of \$1 416 was expended in 1975-76 and how many prospectors were beneficiaries?

(2) (a) How is it proposed the amount of \$10 000 allocated for 1976-1977 is to be expended; and
 (b) how much is it expected each prospector will be entitled to receive per week from the allocation?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) \$1 416 was expended in 1975-76 in assistance by way of food ration orders issued to three prospectors.
 (2) (a) Assistance by way of ration, fuel and explosives orders;
 (b) on present rates \$17.50 per week in the northern goldfields and \$15.00 per week in the eastern goldfields, for food plus explosives and fuel orders when necessary.

An approach is being made to the Commonwealth for unemployed prospectors and miners to be permitted to go prospecting while drawing unemployment benefits

and a reply is awaited before further consideration is given to increasing the State's prospecting scheme assistance.

26. CHILD WELFARE

The Children of God Organisation

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

Is there in this State an organisation of a religious nature or purporting so to be known as The Children of God; if so—

- (a) is the said organisation based in the United States of America;
- (b) is the leader of the said organisation one known also as Moses David;
- (c) has he received complaints from parents of teenage children about the activities of The Children of God adversely affecting such children; if so, what is the nature of the activities complained of;
- (d) is it a fact that this organisation advocates one night marriages;
- (e) is it a fact that on joining, new devotees are made to sign over all their worldly goods and possessions to the organisation;
- (f) has the said organisation breached any provision of the Child Welfare Act—
 - (i) if "Yes" when and in what respect;
 - (ii) what offences have occurred;
 - (iii) what action has been taken by the department, and when?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (a) It is believed to be based in the United States.
- (b) Not known.
- (c) One inquiry was made at a departmental office seeking the telephone number of the Children of God and the inquirer commented that he thought his daughter might be with them as she was missing. He did not want to see a welfare officer and was advised by the receptionist to put in a "missing persons" report to the Police.
- (d) and (e) Not known.
- (f) (i) to (iii) Not to my knowledge.

27. MUJA POWER STATION *Upgrading*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) When was the decision taken to increase the generating capacity of the Muja power station from 240 megawatts to 640 megawatts?
- (2) What was the anticipated cost of the upgrading at that time?
- (3) What is the current anticipated cost of the upgrading?
- (4) Did the present Government defer the upgrading for approximately 12 months?
- (5) Because of the deferment, would the additional capital required to complete the project by 1978 be approximately \$26 million?
- (6) If not, would he indicate the anticipated extra costs involved?
- (7) What was the rate of growth of system demand for—
 - 1974,
 - 1975,
 - 1976?
- (8) What is the anticipated rate of growth of system demand for—
 - 1977,
 - 1978,
 - 1979?
- (9) Has the State Government approached the Commonwealth Government for a special loan to assist with the upgrading of the Muja power house?
- (10) If so, when were representations made?
- (11) Did the State Opposition request the present Government to approach the Commonwealth Government for special financial assistance?
- (12) If "Yes" what was the date of the original request?
- (13) Did the State Government make representations as requested?
- (14) If not, what were the reasons?
- (15) During the Tonkin administration were the two operating companies offered longer term contracts?
- (16) Did the companies elect to continue their current contract period?
- (17) What is the contract period currently being negotiated between the Government and the two operating companies?
- (18) Will provision be made in the contracts for the establishment of new deep mines?
- (19) If not, will he indicate why this provision will not be contained in the new long term contracts?
- (20) When will negotiations be finalised?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The 18th April, 1973.
- (2) \$87 million on an escalated basis.
- (3) \$170 million on an escalated basis.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) and (6) These questions are not clear, since, if sufficient funds were readily available, it would be cheaper to build the station earlier, thus avoiding some interest costs during construction, capital cost escalation and extra contract charges.
- (7) 1974: 9.6%
1975: 4.8%
1976: 6.8% } on a standard weather basis.
- (8) 1977 }
1978 } 7% each year.
1979 }
- (9) Yes.
- (10) June the 8th, 1976.
- (11) and (12) No record of such request can be located.
- (13) See answer to (10).
- (14) Not applicable.
- (15) Yes. Tenders for supply of coal as from the 1st January, 1973 were on the optional basis of periods of three and five years.
Western Collieries Limited tendered on the basis of a five year contract and the Griffin Coal Mining Company tendered only on the basis of a three year contract.
- (16) No.
- (17) It is proposed to complete long term coal supply contracts within the next few months and these are expected to be for periods of ten to fifteen years.
- (18) No.
- (19) Specifications are being prepared in order to call tenders for coal supplies from 30th June, 1978. The coal companies tendering will have the initial responsibility to decide which coal sources will form the basis for their tender offers.
- (20) No precise answer can be given to this, but it is expected that contract negotiations will proceed over the next few months.

28. NANNUP HOSPITAL

Extensions

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) Have funds been provided for extensions or renovations to the Nannup hospital in the 1976-77 financial year, and, if so,
(b) how much?

(2) If "Yes" to (1)—

- (a) what works are proposed; and
- (b) when will such works commence?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
(b) \$190 000.
- (2) (a) Repair and renovation programme to the hospital, including replacement of the kitchen, toilets and ablution areas.
(b) As soon as tender documents are completed.

29.

RAILWAYS

Bridgetown Depot: Transfer

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it still proposed by the Government to move the Bridgetown railway depot to Manjimup?
- (2) If "Yes"—
(a) when is it proposed that such a move will take place;
(b) has agreement been reached with the Railway Employees Union regarding acceptable compensation for the dislocations which such a move would cause?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) A firm date cannot be specified at present pending finalisation of agreement with the unions concerned.

30.

RAILWAYS

Bunbury-Manjimup Service: Delays

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the total number of hours delay to normal scheduled trains on the Bunbury-Manjimup line in each of the past three months brought about by having to wait on woodchip trains?
- (2) What has been the cost in each of the past three months through overtime payments to such crews having to wait on woodchip trains?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) If the information requested is essential to the member it can be provided but it will involve substantial research by Westrail and considerable cost. Special research will have to be carried out into each delay to ascertain what repercussive effects occurred, what action was taken

to overcome them, including whether crews incurred overtime or whether crew adjustments were made etc.

I would be reluctant to incur this expense and suggest that the member may be able to achieve his purpose by rephrasing his question.

31. **QUARANTINE OFFICER**
Port Hedland

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) (a) Have there been any periods in 1976 when a quarantine officer has not been on duty in Port Hedland; and
- (b) if so, what were the precise dates of these periods?
- (2) What is the average monthly number of overseas vessels which has visited Port Hedland in 1976?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The information requested is being sought from the Commonwealth Department of Health whose responsibility this matter is. I will advise the member when this information is available.
- (2) 34.

32. **ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY**
Motor Vehicles

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Minister please detail the model, type and registration of each vehicle under the control of the Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority?
- (2) Who has the use of these vehicles?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2)—

Toyota Commuter — UQS.314 — used by Ord Street Hospital staff.

Kingswood Sedan — XIH.465 — used by Administrator, Ord Street and Aston Hospitals.

Holden Station Wagon—UQJ.383 —used by Managing Secretary, Quo Vadis, and other staff as necessary.

Kingswood Sedan — XHX.649 — used by Secretary, Alcohol and Drug Authority.

VW Combi Van—UQL.790—used by Quo Vadis orderly drivers.

Kingswood Sedan—XGW.798— used by Carrellis Clinic and No. 6 Ord Street courier.

Toyota Coaster—UQS.687—used by Quo Vadis driver and other staff authorised by Managing Secretary.

Datsun Wagon—XJO.716—used by Administrative Assistant, Alcohol and Drug Authority, and other staff authorised by Secretary.

Chamberlain Tractor—670—UQR.081—used by authorised farm staff, Quo Vadis.

Nissan Truck—UQR.082—used by authorised farm staff, Quo Vadis.

Holden Torana—XIW.196—pool vehicle used by Chairman, Alcohol and Drug Authority, and authorised staff.

Holden Torana—XMT.857—used by Medical Director.

Datsun Utility—UQR.080—used by authorised staff, Quo Vadis.

All vehicles under the control of the Alcohol and Drug Authority are available to authorised staff.

33. **EAST VICTORIA PARK SCHOOL**
Contract for Construction

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the contract yet been let for the construction of the new East Victoria Park Primary School?
- (2) If not, can he advise when this is likely to happen?
- (3) (a) if "Yes" to (1) what is the contract price;
(b) who is the successful tenderer?
- (4) When is completion expected?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (3) Contract is about to be let.
- (4) July 1977.

34. **POLICE**

Solicitors' Offices: Search

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Regarding the search of confidential files located in Mr J. Steere's solicitor's office of Subiaco, will he please advise under what section of what Act police officers are permitted to carry out this search?
- (2) Is it a fact that actions of this nature permit police officers to become aware of confidential information and that this possibly constitutes an intrusion upon citizens' rights and privacy?

- (3) If it is a fact that the existing law permits these searches to be made, is the law to be amended to protect the fundamental rights of a solicitor's client and the confidentiality which is required under these circumstances?
- (4) If "No", why?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Section 711 of the Criminal Code.
- (2) Police peruse only specific documents described in the warrant.
- (3) Searches are permitted by existing law. No amendments to the law have yet been proposed.
- (4) The existing law is considered adequate.

35. MILK Quotas

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many dairy farmers are there in Western Australia without a whole milk quota?
- (2) Of this number—
- (a) how many of these dairy farmers have been recommended to receive a quota when available;
- (b) how many have not been recommended to receive a quota?
- (3) How many dairy farmers have withdrawn from the list of farmers recommended for receipt of a quota in 1976?
- (4) Is it intended that a further 51 quotas will be issued, and if not, how many is it proposed to issue?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) 225.
- (2) (a) and (b) Of the 70 licensed dairymen who applied for a quota, 51 were recommended and 19 were not recommended.
- (4) There is no firm proposal to issue further market milk quotas at this time but the Dairy Industry Authority will keep the situation under review.

36. ROADS AND FREEWAYS

Total Expenditure

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- In 1976-77, what is the total amount to be expended on—
- (a) roads in Western Australia;
- (b) freeways in Western Australia?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The amounts allocated for expenditure in 1976-77 are:

- (a) \$94 491 000;
- (b) \$8 083 000.

37. LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Portability

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Referring to question 19 on 5th October, 1976, will he advise—

- (a) the reasons for the delay in forming a committee to investigate the portability of long service leave in the building industry; and
- (b) what interests will be represented on the proposed committee?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) There is no intended delay in forming a committee. Early 1977 was suggested to give parties time to consider the matter.
- (b) Confederation of WA Industry, Master Builders Association, construction contractors, TLC, and appropriate unions and Government Departments and Instrumentalities.

38. KWINANA FREEWAY

Extension

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What work is being presently performed to extend the Kwinana Freeway?
- (2) Is the work or some aspects of it being undertaken by—
- (a) Main Roads Department employees;
- (b) private contractors?
- (3) If so, what are the details and what hours per day and per week are being worked by those referred to in (2) (a) and (b)?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Reclamation of two areas in readiness for construction.
- (2) (a) and (b) Yes.
- (3) Private contractors are supplying and spreading sand, dredging and sheet piling. The work is being supervised by Main Roads Department employees. Hours of work are 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday to Saturday but not necessarily for the full period. Saturday work only occurs where necessary to meet the programme and is at present largely confined to the dredging operation.

39. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT*Tannery at Northam*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is the tannery at Northam available for sale?
- (2) (a) If "Yes", who is the contactee for the above; and
(b) where is he located?
- (3) When the tannery closed, was proper care given to the existing machinery, especially the existing boiler, as I understand all machinery, etc., would revert to the Government when it became inoperative?
- (4) If answer to (3) is "No" would he take the necessary steps to protect the boiler machinery etc., so a prospective buyer would not incur additional expense to make the tannery operational?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The Receiver/Manager is Mr R. J. Armstrong.
(b) Armstrong, Matcham, Hughes and Ross, Public Accountants, Charter House, 184 Adelaide Terrace, Perth, WA.
- (3) Yes. The Department of Industrial Development will ensure that the existing machinery continues to be properly cared for.
- (4) Not applicable.

40. APPLE EXPORTS*Price Support*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Western Australian Government propose to make a price support payment to apples exported to the United Kingdom and EEC markets in the 1977 season?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" what amount per bushel will be made available by way of price support; and
(b) on what quantity of fruit?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) These matters are still under discussion.

41. TRANSPORT*Tourist Services*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the policy of the Transport Commission to carriers involved in tourism for—
(a) charter operation;
(b) tour operations?

- (2) How many carriers are registered as tour operators?
- (3) Would he give details by name of those tour operators having the opportunity to be Perth based and to conduct tours to the following areas of the State—
(a) south-west;
(b) goldfields;
(c) Geraldton area?
- (4) (a) Does the department have an advisory committee re tourist carriers, and if so,
(b) when was this formed; and
(c) who are members of the committee?
- (5) How is policy covering (1) (a) and (b) and additional licences formulated and granted?
- (6) What amount of fees have been collected from charter and tour operators in the last financial year?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (6) The information sought by the member in this question is not readily available in its entirety and some of it will take a little time to collate.
I will forward an answer to him as soon as possible.

42. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT*Bunbury: Advances*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

What significant advances in industrial development have been achieved at Bunbury during the life of the present State Government?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) The woodchip terminal has been completed and the project taken to the production stage.
- (b) An alumina shipping terminal has been constructed and exports have been commenced through Bunbury.
- (c) The inner harbour development has been taken through to the stage where it has been commissioned.
- (d) The particle board factory has been substantially completed.
- (e) Decisions have been made on coal contracts and major power station construction which bring security to the region and spin-off to Bunbury.
- (f) Expansion of Laporte has been undertaken.

- (g) Upgrading of railways and roads has significantly improved the transport capabilities of the region and with direct effect on Bunbury.

43. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Accounting: Centralising

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Is it a fact that all State Energy Commission accounting will be centralised in Perth?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The SEC accounting method is undergoing some changes because of the introduction of a data processing system. When country accounts are taken up by the computer, customer ledgers will be maintained in Perth and not in the main country district offices as before. The changes are not likely to affect the staffing of district offices to any marked degree but tedious repetitive work previously performed manually will be processed by computer.

The Commission has operated a centralised billing system for many years.

of assessing eligibility is contained in clause 16 of the 1973 housing agreement, which was agreed by the Tonkin Government.

The *Hansard* record of Parliamentary Debates for Tuesday, the 4th December, 1973, records the support given to this method of assessing eligibility for housing by the then Minister for Housing (Mr A. W. Bickerton) and also the criticism levelled at this provision by the now Deputy Premier on behalf of the then Opposition.

- (3) To qualify for purchase assistance under the present policy, the income criterion is—

Metropolitan, Country—
\$170.24 per week.

Kalgoorlie, Esperance—
\$215.04 per week.

Gascoyne, Ashburton, Pilbara, Kimberley—\$232.96 per week.

Plus \$2 per week per dependent child beyond the second.

The above criterion is subject to adjustment on a quarterly basis.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. HOUSING

Purchase Homes: Press Notice

Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Minister been made aware of a notice, relating to State Housing Commission rentals, which appeared in the *Wanneroo Districts Times* over the names of Brian Burke and Keith Wilson on the 15th October, 1976?
- (2) Is the information given in the notice, relating to the eligibility of applicants on the waiting list for purchase homes, accurate?
- (3) What is the eligibility criterion for purchase accommodation?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

I thank the honourable member for notice of the question the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. The implication that the Government has initiated a new policy, relating to the waiting list for State Housing Commission purchase homes, is completely inaccurate. No new eligibility criterion has been initiated by this Government, and the present method

2.

POLICE

Solicitors' Offices: Search

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Police:

Arising from the answer he gave to me to question 14 on today's notice paper, will he advise whether there has ever been an instance up till the last month when solicitors' offices have been raided by police for the purpose of gathering information provided to them professionally by their clients? The Minister stated that the Criminal Code has provided authority since its inception, but has it ever been used in order to raid solicitors' offices?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I have had no notice of the question and so will find it a little difficult to answer. However, I will do so to the best of my ability. As far as I know, in the past solicitors have been approached and have co-operated in connection with a particular crime or papers involved.

Mr Hartrey: They ought to be struck off the roll if they have.

Mr O'CONNOR: There are circumstances which I am not prepared to state here when there may be every right for certain action to be taken. However, if the honourable member wants a definite reply to the question, I will provide it if he puts the question on the notice paper.

3.

POLICE

Solicitors' Offices: Search

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Police:

The answer to parts (4) to (6) of question 14 is as follows—

As a number of matters referred to in these questions are still *sub judice* I am not in a position to provide the information requested.

Would the Minister please look at the parts (4) to (6) and tell me what it is he cannot answer and what matters are *sub judice* which prevent him from giving the information?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

It is in connection with some people before the courts at the moment on certain charges in regard to which one of the solicitors might be involved.

Mr Jamieson: The questions are not. What is the Parliament coming to?

Sir Charles Court: I suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition discusses the matter with the Minister concerned he might be surprised.

Mr Jamieson: You might be surprised if you knew what we know.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not have this cross-Chamber conversation.

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION: SECOND PART

Standing Orders Suspension

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.00 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be introduced without notice, to be passed through all their remaining stages on the same day, and all Messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day they are received.

In moving this motion I refer to the fact that over the years varying procedures have been adopted to expedite the passage of business in the latter stages of a

session, and these varying procedures have been introduced at varying times. However, I think it is well understood that the Government of the day usually takes action in this regard after the show week recess and at about the time the Budget is introduced into the Parliament.

For a number of years we have had a procedure which is slightly different from that contained in this motion, although the procedure contained in the motion did prevail in this Parliament for a long time. The other procedure followed was that private members' business was limited to the hours of 2.15 to 6.15 p.m. on Wednesdays, rather than completely suspending the Standing Orders as is proposed in notices of motion Nos. 1 and 2 on today's notice paper. However, I will content myself by dealing with the first motion at this stage and will explain the significance of the second one when I formally move it.

The motion is intended, as in the past, to facilitate the business of the House so that Bills may be introduced without notice and passed through all the remaining stages on the same day, and that messages from the Legislative Council may be taken into consideration on the day they are received.

Earlier in the session we took some action which has facilitated third readings and consideration of Legislative Council messages. We appreciate the co-operation we have received from the Opposition in that regard.

Under normal circumstances I would have moved this motion earlier but in view of the way business has been proceeding I felt it was not necessary until this stage. With the recess coming up next week because of the Australian Constitutional Convention it is necessary to pass this motion so that, particularly in the period after that recess, we will be able to facilitate the business of the House.

As is usual, I give the undertaking that we will not use the procedure unnecessarily but mainly to achieve the flexibility and increased streamlining of procedures which the motion will facilitate.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [5.03 p.m.]: The Opposition goes along with this proposition at this stage. It is needed to ensure that business between the two Houses is expedited.

We have had reasonably fast action this year due to the agreed procedure we adopted earlier, but this motion will assist even more. I am sure we will get along better with it and get away from here with fewer frayed tempers than there would be if we stayed longer to debate the problems we might have.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS: PRECEDENCE

All Sitting Days

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.04 p.m.]: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, 3rd November, 1976,—

- (1) Standing Order 224 (Grievances) be suspended, and
- (2) Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as on all other days.

I refer back to the comment I made in connection with notice of motion No. 1—that we have used other methods in recent years to cope with private members' business on Wednesday afternoons from 2.15 to 6.15 p.m. However, we have had a long run on private members' business up to this time and I felt it was reasonable to use the old system from now on.

I want to make this observation—which I have discussed with the Leader of the Opposition—and have it recorded in *Hansard*; that is, on Wednesday, the 3rd November—which is the first Wednesday after the recess, or a fortnight from today—it is proposed that private members' business will be given such part of the period from 2.15 to 6.15 p.m. as those who have private members' business on the notice paper at that time desire. Regardless of what may be on the notice paper, I will work out with the Leader of the Opposition the allocation of that time, which will be entirely in the hands of those who have such business on the notice paper which would normally be dealt with on private members' day.

I repeat that the period between 2.15 and 6.15 p.m. on Wednesday, the 3rd November, will be available as though it were a normal private members' day.

I also want to advise that while we have business on the notice paper today—

The **SPEAKER**: Mr Premier, pardon my interjection, but you will have to alter the times of sitting.

Sir CHARLES COURT: With respect, Mr Speaker, I am giving notice that on that day time will be made available, and it is my intention when we reach that stage to suggest, in conjunction with the Leader of the Opposition, a revised timetable for that week. I propose to deal with it on the basis of special adjournments until we have agreed on a standard procedure, because it might not be necessary to have a standard sitting time or to have the same times prevailing each week.

With the indulgence of the House, I was going to suggest we deal with any special adjournments after the recess and, if we can see the position clearly enough, suggest new sitting hours. I was assuming that by special adjournment the House

would agree to meet at 2.15 p.m. on Wednesday, the 3rd November, and make that time available for private members' business. That is the understanding I have.

The other matter I want to refer to relates to any private members' business which may come from the Legislative Council. I understand notice of some private members' business has been given in the other House and it might have to come down to this House if it is dealt with and passed in another place. I have given an undertaking to the Leader of the Opposition that should such Bills come down here they will be given a reasonable chance to be presented and debated in this House.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [5.07 p.m.]: Subject to the agreement which the Premier has very clearly entered into that private members' business which is now on the notice paper and that which is coming forward will be given a chance to be dealt with, we cannot tell from day to day when there will be a motion which needs to be dealt with, but once the suspension takes place that will be very much in the lap of the Government. I hold the Government to its good sense—that if there are any necessary urgency motions they will be dealt with, because if they were not it would look rather bad.

There are no such motions foreshadowed at the present time but one cannot predict the future more than a few days ahead when an election is approaching, and I suggest we may have to face up to some problems at the end of the session.

With those remarks, I support the motion.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [5.08 p.m.]: I assume the normal procedure will prevail; that is, if there are any unusual circumstances there will be consultation, bearing in mind that if the Opposition wants to express itself on a particular point it has more facilities available to it while the Estimates—both the loan estimates and the general revenue estimates—are before the House than it has at normal times. However it is understood that should there be any change of circumstances there will be consultation between the Opposition and the Government.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Censorship of Films Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), and read a first time.

2. Industrial Lands Development Authority Act Amendment Bill.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY

Establishment: Motion

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [5.11 p.m.]: I move—

- (1) That in the opinion of this House, a Waste Disposal Authority for the Perth Metropolitan Area should be established.
- (2) This action is needed urgently because—
 - (a) Our wetlands and river foreshores are under continual attack from sanitary landfill. These rare resources have been under constant attack for decades and should be preserved.
 - (b) The present disposal methods of noxious liquid wastes are hazardous and should not be tolerated in a modern city.
 - (c) The generation of needless waste not only exacerbates our disposal problem, but also results in irresponsible and wasteful misuse of scarce resources. Such an Authority should be empowered to investigate preventive action and make recommendations to the government as to the means whereby the generation of waste can be decreased.

In moving this motion I indicate that two studies have already been made on the subject of waste disposal—the Maunsell report of 1974, and the report by the professional division of the Public Health Department in 1974—and so far we have seen no action on them. It has been suggested in the Maunsell report that an authority be established under the administration of an existing Government department.

I believe one of the most serious aspects is referred to in paragraph 2(b) of the motion, which deals with the disposal of noxious liquid wastes. When we look at some of the noxious liquid wastes which are being disposed of daily in the metropolitan area, we find that at Bayswater, for example, sodium cyanide is being

poured on the ground, caustic bottle-wash water is being disposed of into the storm water drains in the Bayswater area at the rate of 1 700 gallons a day, and oil residues are being disposed of into a pond system in the same locality.

Twenty gallons of hydrochloric acid a day drain into leach drains at Belmont; pharmaceutical preparations are being poured into leach drains at Belmont and the quantity is unknown; sodium cyanide, caustic, and hydrochloric acid are being disposed of into ponds at Belmont, the quantity being unknown; sulphuric and hydrochloric acids are being disposed of into storm water drains at Belmont; and sodium biochromate is being disposed of into the storm water drains at Belmont at the rate of 2 500 gallons a day.

Sulphuric acid is being disposed of into leach drains in the Canning Shire; DDT, heptachlor, and other residues are being disposed of into soak wells and onto the ground in the Canning Shire. DDT and heptachlor are chlorinated hydrocarbons which are noted for their great stability; they do not break down very easily due to bacterial action and they accumulate in food chains. They are toxic to mammals as well as to other creatures, and chlorinated hydrocarbons quite rightly have throughout the world a name for being very dangerous substances; they can persist for very long periods. The quantity of DDT and heptachlor being disposed of in the Canning Shire is unknown. Concentrates of fungicides, insecticides, and herbicides—all of which have a great importance for the biota in the area—are being discharged in this way.

Sodium cyanide is being disposed of into a soak well in the Canning Shire at the rate of 40 gallons a day. Ammonium chloride and sodium biochromate are being disposed of into a leach drain in the Canning Shire at the rate of 5 000 gallons a week.

Sodium cyanide, chromic acid, zinc, nitric acid, and hydrochloric acid are going into ponds in the Canning Shire at the rate of about 8 000 gallons per day. About 9 000 gallons a day of sulphuric acid, chromic acid, and caustic are pumped over the ground surface in the Canning Shire. There is no estimate of the amount of sodium dichromate that is going into ponds in the Canning Shire. Five hundred gallons of sodium cyanide a day is going into leach drains in the Canning Shire. Up to eight million gallons a month of tanning and scouring wastes go into ponds in the Cockburn Shire.

I might digress here for a moment and refer to Lake Yangebup which appears to be quite dead, largely because of the effluent coming from the wool scour nearby. If members compare Lake Yangebup with Lake Kogolup, which is about half a mile away, they will see a great difference. Lake Yangebup illustrates what can happen to

wetlands when effluent from a wool scouring plant is pouring into it. One of these lakes is surrounded with dead trees; there is no sign of life, either vegetable or animal, and no grass growing. It is quite dead. Lake Kogolup, on the other hand, has a great deal of reed cover and over 20 different varieties of water birds have been sighted there. A number of trees are growing around the lake and the bush birds can find many nesting places on the land surrounding the lake.

So that is a very dramatic example of what can happen when one lake is receiving noxious wastes and the other is not. I might say that a question I asked about Lake Kogolup gave me one of the best laughs I have had since entering politics. I asked the Minister for Local Government why he had not referred the proposed industrial zoning of the land surrounding Lake Kogolup to the Environmental Protection Authority because the Environmental Protection Act requires that where there is danger of a deleterious effect on the environment through zoning, the Minister shall inform the Environmental Protection Authority of this.

The Minister had not referred this matter to the EPA, and when I asked why he had not done so he said that the proposed land zoned industrial would be higher than Lake Kogolup. Apparently this Minister is not aware that water usually runs downhill! He said that because the land was higher than the lake, the lake was in no danger. Of course, as was shown with Lake Yangebup, the opposite was true. Perhaps we should have a basic testing of the intelligence of people before they enter this place. I suggest that prospective members could be asked whether water runs downhill or uphill. That is the quite unreasonable way in which the Environmental Protection Authority is being evaded.

I have referred to what is happening at the present time in the Cockburn Shire. Sulphuric acid and chromic acid are going into soak wells and ponds in Fremantle. Phosphoric acid and sulphuric acid are going into soak wells in Melville.

An unknown quantity of sodium cyanide, potassium cyanide, and hydrochloric acid is going into soak wells in the City of Perth. Sodium cyanide is tipped onto the ground surface in the City of Stirling. Of course it does not stay inert; it will find its way to the water table.

An unknown amount of sulphuric acid is going into ponds at Subiaco. I might add that hardly ever are these ponds lined in a way that will make them impervious to the passage of a liquid.

So that shows the haphazard way in which we are disposing of our liquid effluent. As I say, the amount is not even known. We have received answers to questions in this place which seem to be in

contempt of Parliament or in contempt of the Opposition. I believe an example of this was the reply to a question asked by the member for Rockingham today.

I asked a question as to whether in fact quantities are not known and the answer I received was that the quantities are in fact known. I then referred the Minister to the Government's own report—the report of the Public Health Department—which states that the quantities are not known. We have this situation where people are making statements which do not square with the facts. I was told to read the report, but when I read the report it said that the quantities are unknown. That illustrates a contempt of Parliament and a failure to make a real attempt to give satisfactory and honest answers to questions. I find it quite staggering.

I will now move onto solid wastes. At the present time about two-thirds of the solid waste disposal sites are river foreshores or wetlands. When we look at plans for the future we find that 300 hectares out of 400 hectares for solid waste disposal will be wetlands or river foreshores, and so the proportion will rise to three-quarters. Under the proposed plan our position will be worse. I believe this is an intolerable situation.

At its recent conference the Australian Labor Party decided that wetlands to the south of Perth in the Jandakot area and wetlands to the north of Perth would be made into national parks. These are wonderful wetlands, quite close to the Perth metropolitan area. They would make marvellous playgrounds for passive and active recreation, as well as providing protection for water birds. The Moors who left their desert or near desert country and went to Spain produced wonderful fountains because they were fascinated with water. I suppose it is not until one has lived in a desert or a near desert that one appreciates water. The Moorish civilization of Spain and the establishment of marvellous fountains are well known.

In this country which is very dry and hot, we should jealously guard our wetlands, our lakes, and our swamps. To the south and north of Perth we have potentially excellent areas for passive recreation. One can walk or picnic in these areas, perhaps watch the water birds, or even indulge in active recreation such as water skiing. And yet what are we doing with these very rare and precious resources? We are destroying them at a rapid rate. It has been estimated that over the last 20 years or so, half of our wetlands on the Swan coastal plain have disappeared, probably due to drainage for buildings or agriculture. However, they have also been utilised for sanitary landfill, and even at this moment they are being used for this purpose. The ponds also are under attack at an accelerated rate because it is intended that instead of two-thirds of our

sanitary landfill area being wetlands or river foreshore, it will be three-quarters in the future. We have to stop this vandalism.

When speaking about flora the other day I indicated that the worst vandals are Governments. Governments do far greater damage to the environment than does a picnicker. Here we have a very good example of a Government being vandalistic in the way it is misusing our wetlands.

I looked at the area of the Swan River the other day and I spoke to a person who had lived there for a very long time. He indicated that the water birds had largely disappeared from that stretch and one of the reasons for this was that the river foreshore had been used as sanitary landfill. Of course the shallow water reed area where birds can nest with protection has gone.

Mr Blaikie: Whereabouts was this?

Sir Charles Court: Whereabouts was the river used for sanitary landfill?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: This was the Maylands peninsular.

Sir Charles Court: Was that used for sanitary landfill or was it part of a planned scheme to improve the amount of foreshore available and the use of the river?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: This was an actual landfill of the river foreshore which has raised the banks well above the water. It has got rid of the backwaters which were so suitable for water birds.

Sir Charles Court: I do not think it was sanitary landfill. Was not there an area where a scientifically-designed programme was implemented to improve the amount of river water available to the people around the peninsular?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I think the Premier is talking about the other side of the river.

Mr P. V. Jones: Do you mean the City of Stirling?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: No, I think this is on the Belmont side.

Sir Charles Court: A very extensive and much applauded programme was undertaken during the term of the Brand Government to improve the amount of river available and, at the same time, to improve the land use.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Yes, but some of these schemes are very misguided.

Sir Charles Court: This was a scientific scheme.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: For example, it was suggested that the Blackwood River should be de-snagged so that it would flow faster. It was believed this would be a great improvement. We can see what has happened to the Avon River at Northam and the other day the member for Avon told

us that a pool where some people had lost their lives some years ago and which was 40-feet deep is now just a sandpit. This is the sort of thing that can happen when proper studies are not undertaken. It is all very well to say, "We will improve the river", but action taken may not necessarily be an improvement at all.

Mr Blaikie: The de-snagging of the Blackwood River has never been recommended.

Mr Jamieson: It was not recommended for the Avon River, but the pressure of local authorities forced it.

Mr Blaikie: But the member referred to the Blackwood River, and I have some personal knowledge of it.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Whether recommended or not, some attempt has been made to obtain a better flow.

Mr Blaikie: Where?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I am not sure of the exact spot.

Mr Blaikie: You are certainly not sure, and quite frankly, I do not think you know what you are talking about.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I can show the honourable member the Press cutting referring to this de-snagging on the Blackwood River. I will confer with the member later, but I am sure that this idea was mooted.

Mr Blaikie: No, there was a scheme afoot for the Scott River, but it was never proceeded with—and that river flows into the Blackwood River.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It may not have occurred, but certainly a plan was mooted. I know that the Amateur Canoe Association of WA was very concerned about the plans for the Blackwood River. The honourable member may be right when he says it never happened, but I am saying that the scheme was mooted and it appeared in the Press. The stated objective was to improve the flow of the river.

The point I am making is that such so-called improvements are not necessarily improvements at all.

Mr Rushton: You would be far better advised than the people who made that recommendation! The de-snagging was recommended in certain cases.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It depends what one is after. Advice given by engineers would be quite different from advice given by ornithologists! Perhaps one is just after a super efficient drain.

Mr Rushton: We have a combination of specialists in the environment and in engineering and this gives us an opportunity to have recommendations evaluated.

Mr Jamieson: But you are the wonder boy of the age.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I am afraid that very often the engineering solutions to the problems meet only one set of requirements; they achieve only what they see as an end. Perhaps it may result in an efficient flushing out of the area, but that may not be acceptable to, say, the aquatic fauna or picnickers.

Mr Jamieson: In the case of the Avon River, the engineers advocated that nothing be done. Despite that, the local authorities insisted they do something, and exactly what the engineers predicted did happen.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: To refer back to the question of future areas of wetlands and river foreshores, we have plans listed for Bibra Lake, the river foreshores at Belmont, Bayswater and the Sandy Beach reserve, for a wetland at Jones Street, Osborne Park, and the river foreshore near Burswood Island.

Mr Rushton: Who has listed all these?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It is listed in the report of the Public Health Department.

Mr Rushton: Is it your opinion that they have not been examined thoroughly enough as yet?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I do not know; the department may have studied the matter. However, I do not believe this is what we should be doing to our wetlands and river foreshores. The department may have studied it enough to say there will be no leachate going into the river, but that is only one requirement. I do not believe we should be destroying our wetlands and river foreshores in this way. As I have already said, Western Australia is a dry and arid place, and according to the estimation made by Tom Riggert, we have already lost half of our wetlands on the Swan coastal plain. I believe we should put a stop to this trend.

Mr Rushton: Are you confident that our environmental expertise is adequate to back up the Public Health Department, and obtain the right result?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Quite possibly, the expertise is adequate; I am not in a position to say whether this is or is not the case. However, is it being heeded? I suppose when the Minister refers to "environmental expertise" he means the Environmental Protection Authority. When he obtains advice from the EPA, or tests from the Public Health Department regarding, say, leachates, how much weight is given to their opinion? I realise that the EPA is composed of pragmatic gentlemen who say, "We must work within the system." It is quite possible some environmentalists would maintain that none of these areas should be used for sanitary landfill. But what notice is taken of them?

I hope I am not maligning the EPA. However, some environmentalists would say, "Let us face it: We have to work within these constraints and in the next

20 or 30 years three-quarters of our river foreshores will be used for sanitary landfill." How do we accept the parameters? I am not saying we should accept that, say, using three-quarters of our wetlands and river foreshores for sanitary landfill is a reasonable parameter. I suggest that, within certain limitations, the parameters set by the environmentalists would be adequate for the safeguarding of our foreshores and wetlands but that, in fact, many environmentalists would maintain that we should not be using these areas at all. I am putting to the House that we should not be using our wetlands and river foreshores for this purpose.

Mr P. V. Jones: You mentioned a report which discussed future sites for development. What were they for? Did they relate to waste disposal or some other development?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Is the Minister referring to the possible future use of Bibra Lake and other areas?

Mr P. V. Jones: Yes. You said that developments were planned.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: These are future sites for sanitary landfill. Future sites are quite distinct from current sites. There was a proposal to utilise Kings Meadow adjacent to Guildford Grammar School, but this met with great opposition. The member for Swan probably knows more about this than I do. I do not know whether he would agree when I say this site was rejected because it was considered to be too close to human habitation. That is fine; I would not want to have such an area too close to human habitation. But would those people have been just as concerned if it had involved a proposal to utilise a wetland 10 miles away from the nearest human habitation?

Mr Skidmore: Yes.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I hope the honourable member is right. As I say, I am concerned that such an area is not established too close to humans, but that is only one consideration; I would like to see a total policy adopted relating to our wetlands generally. Other proposed areas were the foreshore at Lake Gwangara, the wetlands at Gribble Road, Gwelup, the river foreshore in the Wilson-Riverton area, the lake foreshore at Westfield Park, the Jandakot Lake foreshore, the river foreshore at Pyrtton and Eden Hill, the river foreshore at Bayswater-Bassendean and the Garvey Park river foreshore at Belmont. All those areas have been earmarked for future development, so the situation not only is going to continue but also is going to get worse.

Mr Rushton: What is the extent of planning for those areas? Is it a commitment or a proposal?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It is a proposal.

Mr Rushton: Yet to be examined?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It is being examined at the moment; they are listed for future development. If inertia continues and other alternative sites are not found, the waste will have to go somewhere.

Mr Rushton: But you are discussing these areas as if it were going to happen.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I am not saying that at all; I am saying it will happen unless alternative sites are developed.

Mr Clarko: Are you suggesting there is a plan to fill the wetland at Gribble Road, Gwelup, or that it should be saved?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: This is one of the areas listed as a possible future site for sanitary landfill.

Mr Clarko: I think you will find the City of Stirling rejected that site. That is what you hoped for.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That may be so, but where will the City of Stirling go with its waste? It has rejected one site; does it have any plans in train for the development of another site which, from an environmental point of view, may be just as bad?

Mr Clarko: As you would know, they went up another 15 feet or 20 feet at the existing Hertha Road site.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: This brings me, of course, to the possibility of baling and compaction so that a great deal of compression is achieved and far more waste can be packed into the same area. I cannot see how a local government authority—even one as large as the City of Stirling—would be in a position to carry out such an operation on its own, hence my motion to establish a waste disposal authority for the entire Perth metropolitan area. I believe that only with co-operation and co-ordination between the various local governing bodies will we be able to establish such an expensive facility as a baling and compaction plant which would serve the entire metropolitan area. But this is a technical problem. I am not saying it is the solution; it is only one possibility which could arise out of the establishment of a waste disposal authority for the Perth metropolitan area.

The Maunsell report refers to the increasing generation of waste on a *per capita* basis as a reflection of our increased standard of living. I know I am not being terribly critical of this report when I quote it in this way, because that is the way we usually talk. However, I should like to reflect for a moment on the way we tend to measure our increased standard of living. We measure it by talking about the amount of rubbish we leave behind us. But instead of using the term "increased standard of living" we should be referring to our increased level of consumption of material goods which is a different matter altogether.

I do not agree that there should be an increasing amount of rubbish of which we must dispose. If members read my motion, they will see I am not suggesting the establishment of a waste disposal authority which would be helpless in the face of an avalanche of rubbish, but an authority with certain powers, which could look at the other end of this problem and make recommendations to Governments as to where disposal should take place, or whether some preventive action should occur to prevent the accumulation of such massive amounts of rubbish.

In the United Kingdom the annual *per capita* increase of rubbish is something like 1 per cent, while in the United States of America it is as high as 5 per cent. The great difference between the two countries immediately makes us think these are not immutable rates of increase. In Tokyo, the rate has been 10 per cent, while in Hong Kong it has reached 7 per cent.

I believe the amount of waste being created is quite unnecessary, and a waste disposal authority would make recommendations to the Government with respect to this creation of waste. There is a deliberate creation of waste by our community. When one goes to the supermarket, one is given a whole pile of rubbish to cart home and dispose of. It is a criminal waste of our forests and other resources that so much rubbish is given to the customer to cart home and burn, or to dump in areas which are set aside by the local authorities and are gradually filling up our lakes and wetlands. Quite an unnecessary amount of household waste is produced by the average person. There would not be the same need for waste disposal if people converted a lot of their household refuse into compost.

The Maunsell report suggested that the total refuse increase for Perth should be of the order of 2 per cent. But I do not think we should accept that; in fact, we should start to work for a *per capita* decrease in waste creation. This is an issue which we must consider very seriously. People all over the world are concerned with the wasting of our resources, but it is not even as though we are using all those resources for sensible purposes. For example, very often a tube of toothpaste is packed in a cardboard container and then wrapped in paper as well; that is all quite unnecessary.

In one typical metropolitan catchment area, the Maunsell report estimates an increase of 65 per cent in landfill waste, without treatment such as compaction; yet that estimate was made at a time when the population increase in the area was only 29 per cent. By 1984 the total solid waste produced in the metropolitan area is expected to increase by 80 per cent against a population increase of only 42 per cent. We are not helpless people being

carried along without any free choice. We have the opportunity to challenge these predictions, and we can do it with sensible legislation. A waste disposal authority would recommend to Parliament the kind of legislation which would assist to reduce the creation of waste.

Mr P. V. Jones: Do you envisage the authority having power over local government bodies?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: No, I would think it would co-ordinate with local government; certainly, local government should be represented on it.

Mr P. V. Jones: But it would take over what they do now?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Not necessarily. For instance, it would not take over the house-to-house collection of rubbish; that would still be undertaken by the local government authorities. However, instead of the rubbish being carted to the various sanitary landfill sites, it could be taken to a central treatment plant, where various processes such as baling, composting, pulverisation, incineration, pyrolysis and so on could take place. However, I am not entering that argument now; it is a technical matter which would be resolved at a later date, perhaps even by the authority itself. It would be part of the initial planning role of the authority to recommend to the Government the kind of treatment plant which should be constructed. I believe that deals effectively with the treatment of solid waste.

I turn now to the question of liquid waste disposal. What we need is a central plant for the treatment of noxious wastes, such as the acids to which I referred earlier, which have been tipped onto the ground and washed by the rain into storm water drains and our groundwater, to enter our fruit trees and generally pollute our underground water supplies. This should not occur in a modern city.

It is quite remarkable that should happen. While I said the quantity of household rubbish did not have to increase *per capita* and we could solve the problem, I am not so sure that the same can be said about noxious liquid waste, because of the type of society in which we live. Although we might not think it is necessary, we will continue to have a high consumption of material goods; and therefore in an increasingly complex kind of society these noxious wastes will not disappear. Certainly action needs to be taken with respect to these types of waste.

The solid waste problem is different from the liquid waste problem. The solid waste problem is related to the destruction of our wetlands and river foreshores, and hence the rivers. On the other hand, liquid waste disposal also brings about destruction of water quality, but that has not been picked up. We seem to be ignorant, because sufficient research has not

been undertaken to determine to what degree our groundwater has been polluted by the hydrochlorides, DDT, acids, and scouring agents. Both types of waste disposal lead to environmental degradation for different reasons and on different counts.

Of course, this is not an attack on or criticism of local government. It seems quite clear that each local authority individually cannot solve this problem; the local authorities need to make a co-operative effort. If they can get together and establish an authority to be charged with waste disposal maybe there would be no need for this Parliament to act, but it is unlikely that we will find a large number of local authorities—among the 26 in the Perth metropolitan area—agreeing to this without some lead from us.

I understand that some local authorities are rather concerned that they may in some respects lose their autonomy, but we should be able to allay their fears on that count. Even if we have to use some kind of landfill method, it does not have to be to the same extent as under the existing method, because we can adopt baling or compacting methods. Such landfill method should not have to make use of our wetlands.

Surely quarries of various types can be used for this purpose. I am assuming that the environmental impact of landfill will be of much less consequence than the use of our river foreshores. Perhaps there is some hidden factor of which I am not aware. Surely the substitution of quarries and various types of dry and rocky tracts, for wetlands and river foreshores, should be investigated thoroughly.

What I am saying is that the Government should give a lead to the metropolitan area, because great damage is being done to the environment. The disappearance of our wetlands is quite obvious, but other aspects of the damage are not quite so obvious. We are not so aware of what has been happening, because we have not made the necessary studies to ascertain what has been done to affect water quality as a result of adopting the present method of noxious liquid waste disposal; therefore I suggest that members should give consideration to the need for the establishment of an authority, because time is running out and month by month the position is getting worse. We do not have all that much time on our side.

I urge members to support the motion.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I second the motion.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [5.50 p.m.]: The honourable member who moved the motion has furnished the solution to the problem by the words he used; he said that Parliament would have no need to act on this

matter if the local authorities co-ordinated to undertake this task. I can indicate to him that in recent times the local authorities have committed themselves to co-operating on this problem, and I will relate to him the proposals that are to be implemented.

My responsibility on this question is to answer on behalf of the Minister for Health who is charged with implementing waste disposal methods, and it would be more appropriate for him to respond to the motion. However, as I am responsible for local government I will undertake this task with pleasure.

In putting forward my comments I hope the honourable member will realise there is no need for him to take the motion further. As members will recall, the Government has given an undertaking to improve waste disposal methods, and the task is being carried out. Naturally the Government had to examine the position that obtained at the time it came to office, and to consider the various methods of waste disposal. The Government also has had to have a regard for the opinions of those carrying out the task.

I submit to the mover of the motion and to the House that what is taking place is honouring our commitment. On assuming office our Government requested reports to be prepared for the Perth metropolitan region in relation to community waste. A report was prepared by the Technical Advisory Subcommittee of the Department of Public Health. It recommended the establishment of an authority.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority also prepared a report which I am sure has been read by many members. At the time local authorities, which are responsible for collecting and disposing of waste, reacted to the form of statutory authority proposed. It was found on further examination that there was no need to create another statutory authority for this purpose, because the necessary authority already reposed in the Health Act.

So, attention was diverted to the best means of achieving co-ordination between the local authorities carrying out this task. I am pleased to say that on direction from Cabinet, studies were made on how best this problem could be handled. There has been a response from the local authorities. They have confirmed that they agree to the creation of the proposed organisation to undertake this task.

The existing Metropolitan Refuse Disposal Planning Committee is to be replaced by a committee comprising nine members, and that is the Waste Disposal Committee. The chairman is to be the Commissioner of Public Health, and there are to be two representatives from each of four refuse disposal zones. The chairman will have a casting vote.

Members who know a great deal about this subject are aware there are to be eight local government representatives—that is, two from each zone—and the chairman of the committee will be the Commissioner of Public Health. This committee is to be assisted by a technical committee of selected officers, who are experts in the field of community waste. The Chief Health Surveyor of the Public Health Department will act as chairman of the technical committee and as secretary of the main committee. The other suggested members, to be approved by the appropriate Minister, are to be the following—

- A senior engineer of the Metropolitan Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage Board;
- a senior planning officer of the Town Planning Department;
- a senior environment officer of the Department of Conservation and Environment;
- an engineer as representative of the Institute of Local Government Engineers; and
- a representative of the Australian Institute of Health Surveyors (WA Division).

The technical committee is given the power to co-opt other specialists if necessary.

The responsibilities of the technical committee would be to carry out surveys and investigations into problems relating to the creation, transport, collection, reception treatment, storage and disposal of refuse, rubbish and liquid wastes, and to prepare and furnish reports and results of these surveys to the main committee. As the member for Morley has said, this is what he is suggesting to some degree. He should be pleased that there is a body which will make recommendations to the Government, and effect modifications and changes in the handling of waste disposal.

The Government has acted in a satisfactory manner, and its efforts have been successful. This has resulted in the expression of goodwill by the local authorities to back a co-ordinating body which will develop and improve our present methods of waste disposal. This has been a most interesting exercise, in the sense that it is not easy to get 26 autonomous local authorities to come together on such a big issue, and to have them agree so readily to the work being carried out.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Have they all agreed?

Mr RUSHTON: As was conveyed to me, the advice is that the local authorities have agreed to back this co-ordinating body. There will also be power to create regional groupings of local authorities for this purpose, and these groupings will have powers in relation to the raising of finance.

This can be implemented under the provisions of the Local Government Act. This is in addition to what has been proposed by the central policy-making committee and technical committee. There will be opportunity for local authorities to combine and form groups, where there is need for an extra effort to be made to raise finance for carrying out this responsibility.

The mover of the motion was most anxious about achieving co-operation and co-ordination between local authorities to tackle this big task. In the few comments I have made I have indicated that the Government has achieved what he proposed.

To recapitulate what I have said, the Government on assuming office set about to review the situation that had obtained. We looked into the situation to see whether it was satisfactory. In addition, in-depth reports were prepared on the methods of carrying out this task. On a number of occasions Cabinet has received reports, and it has given an indication of what it prefers to see resulting. Finally the Government is anxious to bring about co-operation and co-ordination between the municipalities responsible for the undertaking of this task, so that the position can be reviewed as soon as possible and changes can be proposed where necessary. In fact the Government has moved to fulfil the commitment it made 2½ years ago.

I am pleased to say that this work has been done, and although I have not developed the subject to any great length I have a lot of material which I could have used. Having heard the mover of the motion say that what he was looking for most was co-ordination and co-operation between all local authorities in attending to this problem, I feel sure he will not want to press the motion any further, because as I have already pointed out the co-ordination has been established. That work is in line with the views which the mover of the motion has put forward. If we agreed to the motion it would indicate another approach to that which the Government has implemented.

By either the member for Morley not proceeding with his motion, or the House disagreeing with it, we would confirm that the Government has, in fact, attended to the question of waste disposal in a meaningful way. Local government is co-operating, and I am confident that with the participation of the Public Health Department through the Commissioner of Public Health—who will be chairman of the waste disposal committee—we will make advances. The committee will consist of eight members from the various zones of local government. The committee will have people available who will provide expertise and advice. In case additional expertise is required, this can be co-opted.

I say with confidence that progress has been made, and will continue to be made. I think members would agree that this is a positive way to tackle the question.

I feel it would be proper either for the proposer of the motion not to proceed with it, or we disagree with the motion, so that we do not confuse the approach to this question which the Government has in hand.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [6.02 p.m.]: I support the motion because I am vitally concerned with the time taken by the Government to take some action in an attempt to overcome the waste problem, whether it is solid or liquid.

I am unable to have the same hopes as the Minister for Local Government with regard to getting 26 local authorities to agree to go ahead with a scheme for the disposal of waste. In fact, I have in my possession a document put out by the Mundaring Shire. It refers to the minutes of a committee meeting held on the 8th April, 1976. Whilst I agree the meeting took place some months ago, the document certainly indicates a degree of uncertainty with regard to the proposal for waste disposal.

Before quoting from the document put out by the Mundaring Shire Council, I would like to relate to members the opinion of the people in my electorate, and give members an idea of what they think about landfill. The Minister is well aware that it will be difficult for local authorities to opt out of their responsibility to dispose of waste. Some local authorities consider that as long as they can stick the dirty stinking waste on somebody else's rubbish site, they do not have to worry. The Perth City Council dumps its waste on the Swan River foreshore at Midland. The dumping of that waste has a disastrous effect on the upper reaches of the Swan River.

Mr Coyne: It also creates good open space for sport.

Mr SKIDMORE: I will deal with that interjection right now, because the other night I was accused of not coming back to an interjection. Certainly, good open spaces for sport are created, but while we continue to adopt the attitude of the member for Murchison-Eyre we are simply saying we have more river flats to fill so let us not worry about subdividers having to provide areas for sporting facilities. The attitude seems to be that we should be commercialised; let us use all the land for housing blocks because we still have river flats to fill! That is a negative attitude.

The MRPA has failed to ensure that sufficient land has been put aside for sporting facilities.

Mr P. V. Jones: When you say that some local authorities will have an opportunity to opt out, are you referring to a co-operative scheme, or a scheme attached to a particular local authority?

Mr SKIDMORE: I have been speaking about the interjection from the member for Murchison-Eyre. I have been to the Swan Shire rubbish tip on numerous occasions. The purpose of my visits is known to the member for Scarborough, and I will inform members shortly of that purpose. Members will realise that it is not very pleasant to spend one or two hours at a rubbish tip. During my visits I was appalled at the type of rubbish being dumped there, alongside the river. I assume there must be some health regulations with regard to the depth of excavation so that the landfill will not be deposited below the level of the river. I assume also the idea would be to stop obnoxious waste reaching the water table and, eventually, finding its way into the Swan River.

I am aware that the member for Morley mentioned the elementary lesson of water finding its own level. When looking at the Swan rubbish tip I assumed that the landfill area should have been some three or four feet above the water level. However, it seemed to me that behind the tip the excavations to accommodate the waste were three or four feet below the level of the river.

As a result of recent legislation controlling pig swill, all the swill from the hotels and eating houses in the metropolitan area is now dumped at the Midland tip—in ever-increasing quantities. It is dumped and pushed over the side into the water. Members would be surprised at the type of rubbish which goes to that dump. It is sickening. The rubbish gradually disappears, but it must eventually affect the water table. The water eventually will be polluted. Sanitary trucks clean out sewage tanks, go to the dump, and just let the flood gates go. The sewage goes down to the pit. Veterinary surgeons take dead cattle to the tip, and push them over the side. I even saw three or four dead sheep, and dead dogs, pushed over the side. I am quoting instances of animals being disposed of at our tips.

It can be said that the landfill provides beautiful playing areas, but I am more concerned with the living than, perhaps providing an area for sporting activities. I believe the method to be a wasteful way of providing sporting areas, and it is one we should not countenance because of the cost involved. I wonder whether we can ever be sure that our present system of rubbish disposal is in the best interests of the health of the community. I doubt it very much.

I do not believe the present system of rubbish disposal is countenanced by the Public Health Department. I do not know what tests are carried out to ensure that nothing is wrong, but I will not be told that the dumping of dead animals, pig swill, and sewage at rubbish tips is the correct way to provide landfill; heaven forbid.

No wonder we need a waste disposal committee. Let us have a look at some of the areas of wetlands in the Swan Valley which have been filled. Before we polluted this wonderful country the river flats were flooded each year with a very small quantity of water. The river found its way to the sea without any great degree of flooding. However, as soon as we started to develop the land, and fill the low-lying areas on the foreshores, we backed up the headwaters of the Swan River. That, in turn, created local flooding in the upper reaches of the river, particularly at Bassendean, Guildford, West Swan, and Middle Swan. The moment a river is dammed it is obvious that the river must flood. If an area of 50 or 60 acres of wetlands is filled, that 50 or 60 acres of water has to go somewhere. It cannot go out to sea because of the back-up of the water, so it floods in the upper reaches and creates problems.

The next step is that the flooded land is filled in, and the water displaced from that area has to go somewhere else. That procedure continues until we finish up with a little tributary which becomes a raging torrent during times of flood. The result is that the level of the river rises six or seven feet, and the magnificent playing fields become flooded. That is a matter of fact. Water will find its own level. Filled areas which are supposedly below the flood level at the time of filling need not necessarily be below the flood level after the filling has taken place.

I suggest members should look at the areas which have been filled along Riverside Drive. It was thought, at the time, that the river would never flood above that fill. However, the result of that degradation is that during winter Riverside Drive does flood. That was never envisaged previously.

Mr P. V. Jones: How does the flooding of Riverside Drive relate to the motion under discussion?

Mr SKIDMORE: If the Minister had been listening—

Mr P. V. Jones: I was.

Mr SKIDMORE: —and if he were not stupid—

Mr Old: He is not half as stupid as you are.

Mr SKIDMORE: —he would know that I was using as an analogy the landfill in that area. I can recall when the area

alongside the river was a mud flat. The Minister may not be able to remember because he would not have been in the State at the time. The landfill which took place along Riverside Drive is identical with what is occurring at Midland. When the area alongside Riverside Drive was resumed it was assumed that it would not flood under normal conditions. The flooding which now takes place was not envisaged, nor is it envisaged that the Midland flats will be subject to flooding when they are filled.

There is a tendency for the upper reaches of the river to flood after a certain amount of landfill. That is the point I was trying to make. I certainly hope that the area being filled does not flood; I would like to think that it will not.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr SKIDMORE: I was developing the theme that I believe the landfill operation along our rivers tended to cause excess flooding in other areas which were not so developed, and this in turn created a situation where many shires have taken the easy way out and decided to fill these areas to stop flooding because of the filling done in another area of the river, and this, of course, has perpetuated a crime against the community at large.

On the question of landfill operation I mention the proposition advanced by the Swan Shire for the purpose of developing the area known as the King Meadow, which caused considerable discussion amongst the people. As a result of this the group concerned called a meeting for the purpose of discussing the question. The group was known as the Guildford Community Development Council.

The group called a quick and hasty meeting and it had only two or three days for preparation. I am able to say it was one of the most successful meetings held by the residents in the Guildford area for some time to hear reasons behind the shire's proposal that the King Meadow area should be a sanitary landfill.

The shire health surveyor put forward the point of view that he felt this was in the best interests of all concerned, because the area was subject to flooding; and that the people in the area did not have sufficient sports grounds for their children.

A remarkable thing occurred out of such thinking; the residents made it clear to the health surveyor and also to myself and the shire representatives who attended that meeting, that they were not greatly concerned about having a wonderful area for playing purposes, as distinct from the inconvenience in the first place of having a sanitary fill operation taking place alongside and adjacent to the residential area.

They were concerned with the fact that the adjacent area is situated near the primary school and the children were able to use the area of King Meadow for the

purpose of nature study and this they did; and on many occasions they continued to observe the area and were able to fulfil one of the objectives of practical teaching and learning. The parents and the school authorities made it clear they did not want any sanitary landfill in that area; they had no desire to see it turned into a huge rubbish tip, and certainly did not want destroyed in any way at all the facility of watching the bird life in the area.

Some 150 people voted on the issue and there was no dissentient voice; 150 people voted against the proposition.

While the member for Morley may have some misgivings I would say there is no doubt about the question of the sanitary landfill at King Meadow; I do not think it will be done because of the obvious reaction of 150 residents who packed the hall at the Guildford Primary School to express their alarm at the action being taken.

It was suggested that the Guildford Community Development Council was adopting an attitude of "It is okay as long as you do not put your rubbish on my doorstep; put it on somebody else's doorstep."

This was not so because arising out of their rejection of the proposed landfill for King Meadow was a very firm proposition—which was also unanimously supported at the meeting; at least there was no dissentient voice—that there should be a separate authority to look after control and organised disposal of the human waste.

This was to be put forward to the Swan Shire Council and my understanding of the Swan Shire Council is that there is a certain amount of resistance by the council to undertaking anything other than the landfill operation.

As the member for Murchison-Eyre so rightly said, it must be borne in mind that the Swan Shire has many hectares of sports land now available to it from landfill creations and it seems to be most reluctant to forego that sort of activity; but I would suggest as I have done in my previous remarks that the price we pay is far too high. The price we pay is the possibility of the outbreak of disease—and to see what I mean one has only to visit the rubbish tip of the City of Stirling where there are probably 1 000 of 1 500 seagulls that swoop on every piece of refuse that is placed on the ground. Having done so they carry the rubbish around for miles no doubt dropping bits as they fly and thus encouraging the possibility of the spread of disease.

This matter will not be resolved by our present landfill operation. The people of Guildford rejected the proposition and made it clear they did not want King Meadow interfered with; they were prepared to put up with its ups and downs

and its hills and dales, and if they wanted their children to play football, hockey, or soccer, they would move to the adjacent areas that were available for sport.

I mentioned earlier that I had secured a copy of draft legislation for the proposed statutory waste disposal authority which was discussed by the Shire of Mundaring, apparently, at a meeting on the 8th April, 1976. I understand this would have been sent to me as a matter of interest as some of my area does come within the Shire of Mundaring. The shire makes comment on the fact—as did the Minister—that there was the possibility of section 118 of the Health Act being used as a vehicle upon which we could adequately control the question of waste disposal. This would appear to be one aspect that was mentioned by the Minister, and I feel it would be one and the same thing; if it is not it does not matter very much, inasmuch as this was the proposal put forward by the Shire of Mundaring. One of the points that was raised was as follows—

For the purpose of co-ordinating the disposal of refuse, rubbish and liquid waste from a local authority, or two or more local authorities in combination, there is hereby established a body to be known as the waste disposal authority.

The comment made by the Shire of Mundaring is as follows—

Any such body should be constituted by Councils under the provisions of Section 329 of the Local Government Act. A clear definition of the word "co-ordinating" is required.

The proposal to establish a Waste Disposal Authority appears to refer to the metropolitan region but this fact is not stated in the Draft Legislation so as it stands it would seem the Authority would apply to the whole of Western Australia.

It goes on to discuss the position of the authority at that time. I realise this was six months ago and no doubt many more meetings have been held since then of which I have not been advised. But the outcome of that meeting and discussion of the Shire of Mundaring seems to be well defined along the lines indicated by the Minister for Local Government.

It was suggested there would be eight elected local authority members, though I do not know whether this has changed.

Mr Rushton: Two from each of the zones.

Mr SKIDMORE: What seems to worry the Shire of Mundaring is that it appears the representatives of the local authorities were going to be selected by the Minister. The expression of the shires surely would be that they would be the best people to put forward those whom they felt would

have the greatest interest in the problem and I hope when the authority is set up that the shires will retain the right to nominate in their zones their own representatives. I feel it would be a retrograde step if the Minister picked somebody who he thinks might do the job. No doubt he will listen to the submissions of the shire and the Shire of Mundaring feels that will be done. There seemed to be a doubt as to where the zones should and should not go. Arising out of that there is the concern I have about the scheme ever working, because we are not really doing what needs to be done.

The Government is hedging on the proposition by virtue of listening to the local authorities, and I am disturbed that I may be listening to the local authorities for the rest of my lifetime, because none of them has shown a great desire to tackle the question of waste disposal other than for the purpose I have already enumerated; to wit, landfill schemes.

I do not think we should wait for the local shires to make up their minds as to what they want and then find that basically we will have to bring down legislation in any case. I am very doubtful about the matter, and I am very sceptical because of the obvious interest of the shires not to look at the question of waste disposal other than to have it buried.

I am more concerned about the possibility of the waste being recovered and recycled. I have been approached by Mr Torrent of Scarborough to discuss an engineering project he had in mind relative to the retreatment and recycling of waste. I had a look at a model in his home and with the member for Scarborough I attended the office of the Minister for Industrial Development to see Mr Torrent's proposal. I am advised that Mr Torrent intends to continue with his proposal and he will develop a pilot plant which will recycle waste.

It seems to me more important to recycle waste rather than to have the co-ordination of the present waste disposal system. If this is what is intended I would be against it categorically, because it will perpetuate what is taking place in our community on the question of waste disposal.

If the authority is going to look at the question of trying to recycle waste on the undertaking of a central organisation, I will never be convinced that we will recycle waste in the metropolitan area merely by having a series of zones. It would appear there are to be four zones with two representatives from each zone and four recycling plants. To my way of thinking that is just not on.

I was hoping we may have had a little more information on the matter, because to suggest that four zones could operate satisfactorily, efficiently, and economically for the metropolitan area is not on.

Mr Rushton: The zoning is purely to get the members from each body for co-ordination and co-operation so that the Commissioner of Public Health will have specialised people giving advice.

Mr SKIDMORE: So it is the intention of the authority to look at the matter of recycling waste, as distinct from the present method of waste disposal?

Mr Rushton: It can do anything that is desired.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to think it would, but I am getting tired of waiting, because in my lifetime I have seen desecration of wetlands which have been filled in with rubbish around Herdsman Lake and Hertha Road, and I have seen the desecration of the river foreshore in the Bayswater area, and the desecration of the river foreshore in the Swan Valley. I feel I have not much more time to wait to see a really conscientious approach to waste disposal.

It has been suggested the motion should be withdrawn on the grounds that the Government has done everything possible in respect of the problem of waste disposal. I would like to turn to the Liberal Party policy as enunciated by the Premier for the period 1974-1977, and I refer to what is contained under the heading "Turning Waste into Value" on one of these un-numbered pages.

Mr Young: It is promises numbers 101 to 104; I remember it well.

Mr SKIDMORE: What does the policy say? It expresses pious remarks which have not been fulfilled in any way at all. It says—

One of the major problems of affluent societies is the enormous tonnage of waste to be disposed of in a way which does not despoil the community in the process.

That does not mean very much at all. One of the more pertinent parts of the policy is as follows—

We propose to investigate every possible re-use of waste in any form.

We have been waiting nearly three years for this Government to do something tangible, and all we have so far is the fact that, hopefully, it is getting the local authorities sorted out and, hopefully, it will get them to agree to some sort of plan in respect of which, hopefully, experts will convince them. Again hopefully, that plan would be in the best interests of all concerned. That is supposed to be co-ordination! It seems to me it is co-ordination by direction as distinct from co-ordination by the direction of the Government regarding the requirements.

I turn now to another promise in the "Turning Waste into Value" policy of the Liberal Party; and this is a promise contained in glossy terms in this platform

which was designed to delude people into voting for the present Government at the last election. It states—

We will send a small team of specialist investigators abroad to study new trends in the beneficial conversion of waste back into useful products.

Has that research been done? Have the people gone overseas?

Mr P. V. Jones: I will tell you.

Mr SKIDMORE: I hope the Minister will enlighten me, because up till now the Government seems to have been very silent on the issue. Another section of this platform designed to convince the population that it should vote for the Government at the last election because of what it would do in respect of waste disposal, is as follows—

We will set up in the Government laboratories a waste research section—mainly to gather all available information from round the world, but also to contribute significant local research effort.

Has the research section been set up in the Government laboratories to analyse the question of waste disposal from the point of view of health? It would indeed be interesting to hear the Minister say it has been set up. If he did say that, I would be the first to say, "Hats off to the Government; at least it has done something in the right direction; it has achieved a positive step, instead of expressing the nebulous hope that all the shires will come together." The Minister for Local Government surely is aware of the difficulty associated in getting all shires to agree on any matter, when each shire so jealously guards its right to take as much waste as it can from the metropolitan area to use for landfill; in the case of the Swan Shire, to turn wasteland into playing fields. Again, I say the price we will pay for this is far too high. The policy of the Government then states—

We expect to have taken significant steps towards waste conversion within one term of Government.

I say to the House that the policies of this Government have been forgone and have disappeared. I would like the Government to be able to tell me that it has taken significant steps towards waste conversion; but if a significant step is merely the hope that perhaps the local government authorities will accept some sort of plan which will be investigated by an expert committee, then I simply say that step is just not sufficiently significant and certainly does not satisfy me as being any sort of achievement in respect of the problem of the disposal of waste in the metropolitan area.

My hope is that the Government can achieve an objective that Government after Government has failed to achieve;

that is, to get local authorities to forget their jealously guarded right to fill in quarries, wetlands, and river foreshores as a method of rubbish disposal. That is the basis of my quarrel with the attitude expressed by the Minister.

The motion put forward by the member for Morley has many valid points and should be supported. It simply sets out to achieve what is in the best interests of the people of Western Australia in so far as waste disposal is concerned.

Referring back to Mr Torrent's proposal, I understand it has a great deal of merit and that the Department of Industrial Development is keenly interested in it and has expressed the opinion that it would certainly be a good way of recycling waste. Of course, it has some problems. Basically the method of recycling is that as the waste comes in it goes through a shredder which slashes open the plastic bags which seem to be the popular method of storing our accumulated waste at the moment. The waste is then spread on a huge moving belt perhaps 30 or 40 feet long by four feet wide. At that stage it is sorted, and this is the objectionable part of the process. Mr Torrent feels this is not as objectionable as it sounds, but I do not think I would like to do it.

Assuming we can get people to sort the waste, it is sorted into that which can be used and that which can be turned into poultry and animal feeds after enrichment with various proteins, and so on. The cookable parts of the waste go into a hopper where it is cut up very finely and deposited on four moving belts which take the matter through a heating process from where it is placed into another hopper and taken away for packing or enrichment. That is a simple description of the process, but it does have technical and engineering problems.

It is simply four belts travelling through the plant, and cookable matter is extracted and treated. Waste paper and other similar materials are shredded, sprayed with an adhesive, and then the matter proceeds to a press where it is compacted into briquettes. Then it is fed into the plant's heating unit. Mr Torrent is of the opinion that the tremendous amount of waste wood deposited upon tips would be sufficient to use in the furnaces which provide the heat necessary to cook the waste.

The recycling of other waste such as bottles and other incombustible materials which could not be made into briquettes could then be undertaken. It is even envisaged that glass could be ground up to become part of the poultry food. It seems to me it would be far preferable to remove it, but that is Mr Torrent's idea, and he believes in it sufficiently to be prepared to spend \$50 000 on it.

I hope his plan works, because it would be a simple method for us to dispose of

waste. We could set up small units at the local tips for the purpose of recycling waste.

The SPEAKER: The member has five minutes.

Mr SKIDMORE: I say what the member for Morley has proposed should be adopted by the House. I see no reason that the motion should not be carried. In respect of what the Minister for Local Government said, I feel I have already waited too long for some concrete proposal, and the member for Morley also feels he has waited too long. Certainly I am not prepared to wait until all the shires get together and agree. I want some action now, and if we support the motion we will get Government action as distinct from local government procrastination.

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Conservation and the Environment) [7.56 p.m.]: The Minister for Local Government referred to certain aspects relating to administrative procedures; I comment quickly on aspects of some parts of the motion regarding the generation of waste, and what has been achieved and is happening at present in respect of the examination of disposal portions. Considerable time was devoted by the member for Swan to the matter of river foreshores and the fact that nothing has been done legislatively to afford the protection he seeks. I refer him to clauses 24 and 25 of the Waterways Conservation Bill currently before the House.

Mr Skidmore: When that becomes law I will agree that you have done something.

Mr P. V. JONES: Therefore the member for Swan has no real authority to say nothing has been done—

Mr Skidmore: I did not say that.

Mr P. V. JONES: —because those clauses are there to provide that protection.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: How will they close all the sanitary landfill sites?

Mr P. V. JONES: I did not say they would. The member quite properly requested legislative protection for foreshores, and I am referring him to those two clauses in the Bill which provide for a commission to do exactly what he seeks. Most certainly that is necessary. To those who suggest nothing is being done, I am suggesting something is being done.

With regard to the Environmental Protection Authority offering advice to the various committees and bodies which have been established, that is an ongoing thing, and it has provided the departmental Wetlands Advisory Committee with the guidelines under which it should operate in

respect of the examination of wetlands, and the guidelines to which it should adhere in making recommendations.

Another point raised was the matter of industrial discharges. We would all strongly agree that is something which requires not only monitoring so that we know what is going on, but also legislative muscle in order that it may be controlled where required.

Mr Skidmore: It needs to be stopped—full stop.

Mr P. V. JONES: This is provided in legislation that already exists or is currently before the House. If we go back to the activities of the Swan River Conservation Board and the industrial committee of that body, as you would be very well aware, Sir, for many years the board has done a tremendous job in maintaining the Swan River in such a condition that it is a credit to the board.

I am not suggesting that efforts were made to malign it. I am just recording the fact that this body worked with industry and not against industry. It worked in harness with industry to ensure that whatever effluent entered the waterway was in a satisfactory condition and would not lead to a gradual increasing of the pollution. I think the evidence of fishing and other recreational activities which occur on the Swan and Canning Rivers is testimony to the work of the Swan River Conservation Board.

Some comments were made regarding what has been done by the Government about litter. It is all very well to have an authority, but what matters is the manner in which the authority does its work and, more importantly, the technical competence, skill, and method by which it handles the litter.

The Government has approached this matter in two ways. Firstly, it has provided funding and also encouraged industry to provide its own funding for this purpose. This is being achieved—it has already been partly accomplished—in conjunction with industry at State and Commonwealth levels.

Mr Skidmore: Surely industry should not be asked to provide funding. Should not industry be told to provide funding to stop its pollution? It happens in America that way.

Mr P. V. JONES: I shall provide the member for Swan with information as to exactly what is happening in America. The member asked what we have done and I am telling him. Through a body known as the Packaging Industry Environmental Council, which now represents approximately 95 per cent of the companies—

Mr A. R. Tonkin: It was established to fight legislation that may be brought down to stop, for example, nonreturnable containers. It is a lobby group.

Mr P. V. JONES: I am not talking about a lobby group; I am talking about a responsible industry body.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That is right—called a lobby group.

Mr P. V. JONES: It has put to Government a proposal whereby it taxes itself at the source of the material to provide, firstly, funding for the disposal of litter and, secondly, an examination of the products which are most acceptable to litter disposal machinery or methods to ensure that materials which are unacceptable will be gradually phased out. If that is not a responsible approach by industry to policing itself to ensure that it acts in a responsible way—

Mr Skidmore: How long has it been operating?

Mr P. V. Jones: It has been operating for some years. The approach taken by the packaging industry in this State is very responsible; and I am not talking about cardboard only but about bottles and all sorts of containers.

Mr Skidmore: Surely you will admit that over the years they have produced a proliferation of packaging of our goods which certainly, if this industry committee was working to its fulfilment and hoped-for achievements, would never have allowed plastic bottles, over-sized packages—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr P. V. JONES: In this State the initiative was taken to form a committee which had amongst its membership Mr Tamlin of the Keep Australia Beautiful Campaign, Mr Ken Dickson of Coca-Cola, Professor Kerr, and one or two others. The committee compiled a report for the Government on the whole question of litter and the manner in which industry could do what the member for Swan seeks; that is, tax itself voluntarily. The Government accepted the committee's recommendation.

The report is now before the Commonwealth Government because a determination of whether it is a tax or an excise is still required. Also at present we are seeking the co-operation of the other State Governments so that, because most if not all of the packaging companies are operating on a national basis, this taxing arrangement can operate at source.

I referred to Mr Dickson of Coca-Cola. He has produced various sorts of containers which are currently available in the United States. He has brought one or two out here. These containers, if accepted by the chemical processes for litter control which will be introduced here, will do away with nearly all the hazardous aspects associated with beverage containers and nearly all other bottles.

I have said "nearly all" because I understand that in its current form it will not be acceptable for milk. But for other

softdrink and alcoholic beverages there is no problem. As a point of interest, provided the cap of this container is made of aluminium the whole of the container can be recycled very economically.

Mr Skidmore: They can be recycled now if the manufacturers accepted their responsibilities on return.

Mr P. V. JONES: I am not disputing that.

Mr Skidmore: Why do we not put pressure on them?

Mr P. V. JONES: The member for Swan also raised the question of an examination of what has been done overseas. The Government has made contact at a personal level with the Bureau of Resources Recycling in the United States. That body is funded by industry as well as by other grants specifically to inquire into, advise on, and implement disposal methods and processes for municipal waste. The body is currently headed by Dr Rocco Petrone who for nine years was the head of the Apollo project in the United States. As a spin-off from that project some of the processes which have been developed for the recycling of municipal waste incorporate the use of materials and methods developed in the course of that project.

As far as implementing these processes is concerned, in July of this year, a municipal waste treatment plant began operations in Houston, Texas. It will process half of the municipal waste of that city. This will result in only 10 per cent of the processed municipal waste being disposed of by sanitary landfill.

Mr Skidmore: It shows the magnitude of the problem.

Mr P. V. JONES: That is correct, but here is something positive being done.

Mr Skidmore: It would have been very good to send these experts to have a look at it.

Mr P. V. JONES: How does the member know they have not been?

Mr Skidmore: I do not know. You said you were going to send them.

Mr P. V. JONES: I have discussed these matters with Dr Petrone and he has made considerable technical information available to the Government. The processing plant was a pilot plant. Now that it has proved to be successful the first commercial plant is operating and using this economical method. It is important to accept the fact that earlier methods of recycling waste were not entirely economical. The method which has now been developed and which is now in use is very economical when compared with other methods of waste disposal. Therefore, it will be operating over a wider area as soon as more plants can be built. The first plant processed only half of the municipal waste of Houston but is now being doubled in size in order to process the remainder.

Mr Skidmore: Do I understand that what the Minister is saying is that it is a question of economics for private enterprise to undertake as distinct from economics of government responsibility to undertake?

Mr P. V. JONES: I did not say that.

Mr Skidmore: I was beginning to draw that inference from what you said.

Mr P. V. JONES: Not in the slightest. The point is that economically if local government is to be the instrument for waste disposal—we are not talking about where it puts the waste but about collection and so on—the ratepayers are going to pay. The ratepayers are certainly entitled not only to the most efficient but also the most economical and environmentally acceptable method of waste disposal. I cannot see how any criticism can be levelled against that proposition provided we do not just sit back and say, "That is good enough, we will leave it at that level." Whatever new developments occur must be considered and implemented.

I refer now to the generation of waste which is mentioned in the third paragraph of the second part of the motion. I think we would all agree that generation of waste is the most important and insidious factor. As more and more people inhabit the earth the waste disposal problems increase, as the member for Morley has indicated.

The penultimate point I want to make concerns chemical waste. The Metropolitan Water Board, the Swan River Conservation Board, and the department have done some work on this problem and are continuing to do work in conjunction with some of the companies involved. The importance of the Metropolitan Water Board being involved has been mentioned by the member for Morley. I should like to assure him that the board is intimately involved in the protection of some of the sensitive regions of the metropolitan area to the degree that only last year certain areas were proclaimed as areas where no further building may occur because of exactly the problem the member has suggested.

My final point is in regard to coastal areas where rubbish disposal, either by sanitary landfill or dumping, may have occurred at the behest of local government authorities. I have indicated that the legislation which is now before the House will counter that problem in the river foreshore areas. However, there are other aspects of this matter. If the member for Swan looks closely at that proposed legislation he will notice that there is a clause related to local authorities or instrumentalities which may wish to utilise land adjacent to, but not necessarily on,

the foreshore, which use may have an effect on the waterway even though the land may be distantly removed. If it can be shown that such utilisation will have an effect on the waterway, that matter will also come within the ambit of the administration proposed by the legislation.

Mr Skidmore: May I inform you that I have read the Waterways Conservation Bill from cover to cover.

Mr P. V. JONES: Fine. Then the member would be aware of the provisions?

Mr Skidmore: Yes.

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [8.15 p.m.]: I would like to thank the member for Swan for his comments on the motion, but I am very disappointed in the contribution by the Government Ministers. For instance, the Minister for Conservation and the Environment suggested that the two clauses in the Waterways Conservation Bill will save the wetlands.

Mr P. V. Jones: I did not say that.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: And they will not.

Mr P. V. Jones: I was agreeing with the member for Swan that the two clauses in the Bill will help with the foreshores of the waterways about which he was speaking and with which he agreed.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I cannot help that. I do not believe they will close down these landfill sites and if not what relevance does that have to the motion? It is all very well to talk about Bills of that nature which may or may not be welcome. What we need is some action to ensure that the waste is put somewhere else, and such action is not forthcoming from the Government. In this case all the legislation in the world will not assist. That is why we believe there is a need for an authority for action at this particular time. We cannot wait while the Environmental Protection Authority has a few more meetings. We need action straightaway.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—15

Mr Barnett	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bertram	Mr May
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman
Mr Hartrey	

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grayden	Mr Stephens
Mr Grewar	Mr Thompson
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Tubby
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Clarko
Mr Mensaros	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Moller	Mr Ridge
Mr T. D. Evans	Dr Dadour
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Nanovich
Mr Taylor	Mr Sibson
Mr Bryce	Mr Young
Mr Jamieson	Mr Shelders
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Coyne

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

BILLS (2): RETURNED

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

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

2. Wildlife Conservation Act Amendment Bill.

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neill (Minister for Works), read a first time.

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [8.23 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to bring the procedure for illiterate voters requiring assistance for voting into line with that for the Commonwealth and all other States, in that the presiding officer will be the only person permitted to mark the ballot paper for that elector.

The Commonwealth, Queensland, New South Wales, and Tasmania all make a distinction between the voter whose sight is impaired, or who is physically incapacitated, and the voter who is so illiterate he is unable to vote without assistance. In each case the presiding officer is the only person entitled to mark the ballot paper for a person who is illiterate.

In Victoria and South Australia, the presiding officer is the only person who can mark the ballot paper for the voter for all categories of voters who require assistance, whether or not such persons are illiterate.

Western Australia is the only State in which the illiterate voter can, by permission of the presiding officer, select a person to mark the ballot paper for him. This was the result of the 1951 amendment to the Electoral Act, which was made mainly in order to permit a blind person to have his vote marked by a person selected by him, with the permission of the presiding officer.

The proposed amendment seeks to make a distinction between the procedure for assistance to—

- (a) an elector whose sight is so impaired, or who is physically incapable of voting without assistance; and
- (b) an elector who is so illiterate that he is unable to vote without assistance.

It is proposed that the elector whose sight is so impaired, or who is so physically incapable of voting without assistance, may continue, as at present, to request permission from the presiding officer to have a person appointed by the elector to mark his ballot paper for him.

However, where such an elector is unable to appoint a person to perform the required task, the presiding officer, in the presence of such scrutineers as are present, shall mark the elector's ballot paper according to instructions received.

In the absence of scrutineers, the presiding officer is empowered to mark the elector's ballot paper in the presence of another electoral officer.

Lastly, the Bill provides that where any elector satisfies the presiding officer that he is so illiterate that he is unable to vote without assistance, the presiding officer shall mark the elector's ballot paper according to instructions given by the elector. This is also to be done in the presence of such scrutineers as are present or, in their absence, in the presence of another electoral officer, or a person appointed by such elector if so desired.

The Bill is designed to obviate the possibility of irregularities occurring in the voting of illiterate electors.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr H. D. Evans: Before you sit down, could you tell me whether you had some understanding with the Leader of the Opposition to introduce the Bill at this stage?

Mr O'NEIL: Standing Orders have been suspended for the introduction of any Bills.

Mr H. D. Evans: I thought the fundamentals of courtesy might have been followed.

Mr O'NEIL: It is part of the usual procedure of the House. I apologise to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition if he is offended. It is purely a routine matter and has been done in the 18 years I have been here.

Mr H. D. Evans: If it had happened while you were over here we would have got to know about it on the instant.

Mr O'NEIL: If I have offended the Opposition, I apologise, but it is routine to receive a message and move the second reading of the Bill straightaway. It has been done for 18 years.

Mr H. D. Evans: There are still courtesies to be extended.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

EDUCATION

Appointment of Standing Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 6th October, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

In the opinion of this House, a Legislative Assembly standing committee on education should be established forthwith.

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [8.27 p.m.]: There is a great danger of this institution being known as a place of glory without power. We on this side of the House believe in the part Parliament should play in society and we continually reiterate there should be an effective committee system in this Parliament so that the Parliament can take its rightful place as a legislative force instead of being a rubber stamp for the Executive.

If this place continues to become irrelevant then I believe the day will come when this room, and the room inhabited by the other House, will become very fine squash courts. Indeed, I can visualise a very good argument for this being so, as there are adequate galleries here and large numbers of people could be crammed in night after night to see the excitement.

We are concerned that this Parliament should legislate in fact rather than in name. I am not so concerned with the glory of the institution. We believe the place should have some power and we certainly do not want to have glory without power.

In this morning's paper we read that a Federal Parliament standing committee on environment has submitted recommendations for fauna protection and the elimination of smuggling of rare fauna. Where are the contributions from this Parliament and this Parliament's committees with respect to that subject? Are we to sit back and wait for other Parliaments to do their duties in a proper way and bludge on their expertise and advice and then introduce legislation?

I pointed out that during the time of the Tonkin Government this Parliament had seven Select Committees. During the time of the Court Government it has had one such committee, and that committee was the result of an initiative by a Labor member of Parliament; namely, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Blaikie: What committee was that?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It has been said we are trying to be experts or to take the place of experts. That, of course, is nonsense. We want experts to be in touch with

Parliament, and one way to do it is to have a system of committees before which experts can testify. At the moment expert advice is available to the Government, and Parliament does not have it. As a consequence, Parliament is not being treated seriously. Parliament is not a legislating body in fact.

It was claimed by the Minister for Labour and Industry during one of his more intemperate speeches that what we wanted was a Soviet system of Parliament. That showed that either he had not listened to what I said or he could not understand it. As a matter of fact, I said I wanted our Parliament to be modelled on the Westminster system, which in 1899 adopted committees.

In the time of the Whitlam Government and the present Australian Government we have seen Government back-benchers revolt and demand a more meaningful role. We should ask ourselves why our Government back-benchers have not revolted in a similar way and demanded a more meaningful role, and why they are content to be mere ciphers and dummies obeying the whims of the Premier of the State.

I remind the House that the WA State School Teachers' Union and the WA Council of State School Organisations are in favour of a standing committee on education. Many other bodies, including the Dale District Council of Parents and Citizens' Associations, have indicated they are in favour of a standing committee on education.

The Minister for Labour and Industry, who purports to represent the Minister for Education in this place, said—

Had the member for Morley been able to show that there is a continuing interest in various aspects of education . . .

Had I been able to show that there is a continuing interest! That was a remark of the Minister who represents the Minister for Education in this place. Had we been able to show there has been a continuing interest! There may not have been a continuing interest on that side of the House—

Mr Grayden: Where are all your members tonight? Why are they not all in the Chamber listening to you?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: What is the point in their listening to me? The Minister knows very well in a few minutes all members on the Government side will troop across and defeat this motion.

Mr Grayden: Because there are 81 members in this Parliament and they should be doing the work, not leaving it to committees which are outside this Parliament. We have been elected.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That is what I am saying. The 81 members should be doing the work and they are not doing it. That is the whole point. The Minister for Labour and Industry suggests that all my comrades who are working on committees should be dozing in a somnolent manner on the back benches, as the Government back-benchers are doing, and that there is some kind of virtue in sitting here listening when they know by the sheer weight of numbers this motion will be defeated. It does not matter what arguments we advance in this place; the Premier will use his numbers to defeat the motion. If the Minister for Labour and Industry thinks that sitting here in this place night after night, listening to a member of one's own party speaking, is somehow making a great contribution to the State—

Mr Grayden: Where are the Labor Party members? Are they down at the Trades Hall writing out their subscriptions to the *Tribune*?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The Minister for Labour and Industry is very rarely coherent but is even less coherent tonight.

Mr Grayden: Where are your members?

The SPEAKER: Order! Repetitive interjections must not be made.

Mr Skidmore: We have got the message from the Minister.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: For members of Parliament to come here and sit hour after hour listening to one person—

Sir Charles Court: Listening to you.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —is that an indication that in some way they are working? What we want is real work, not the appearance of it. We want a committee system so that the experts can come and give evidence to us.

Mr Sibson: Sit down and let our experts say something.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The Premier will not agree that this Parliament should work in any way. This Parliament is a rubber stamp and if it continues to be regarded as irrelevant we should turn this place into some very fine squash courts.

The Minister for Labour and Industry said the Labor Party should have a sub-committee on education, as the Liberal and Country Parties do. I want to make it clear—as he no doubt knows—that of course we have a committee on education in this Parliament, as we do in the party outside the Parliament.

Mr Grayden: If you are not prepared to do the work, why do you not resign?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: There is all the difference in the world between a parliamentary committee and a committee consisting of members of Parliament on a party level. The Minister for Labour and

Industry has shown contempt for the opinions of the W.A. State School Teachers' Union. He has shown contempt for all the parents and the P. & C. associations of this State. They have said they want a standing committee on education.

This Government will not allow the Parliament to operate efficiently because if it does it challenges the Government's right to a monopoly of power in this State.

Sir Charles Court: That is your fault, not ours.

The SPEAKER: Order! The debate has concluded.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—15

Mr Barnett	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bertram	Mr May
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman
Mr Hartrey	

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Sodemann
Mr Grayden	Mr Stephens
Mr Grewar	Mr Thompson
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Tubby
Mr Laurence	Mr Watt
Mr McPharlin	Mr Clarko
Mr Mensaros	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Moller	Mr Ridge
Mr T. D. Evans	Dr Dadour
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Nanovich
Mr Taylor	Mr Sibson
Mr Bryce	Mr Young
Mr Jamieson	Mr Shalders
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Coyne

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY Nos. 3 AND 4

Postponement

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.41 p.m.]: I move—

That Orders of the Day Nos. 3 and 4 be postponed.

Question put and passed.

NICKEL (AGNEW) AGREEMENT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [8.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill before the House is to ratify an agreement between the State and Western Selcast (Pty.) Limited

and Mount Isa Mines Limited which amends the Nickel (Agnew) Agreement Act, 1974.

The parties to the amendment agreement remain the same as those to the principal agreement; namely, the State and a joint venture comprising Western Selcast (Pty.) Limited (60 per cent share) and Mount Isa Mines Limited (40 per cent share). All negotiations were conducted with Agnew Mining Company Pty. Ltd., the operating company formed by the joint venturers.

Before I proceed with an explanation of the terms of the amendment agreement I believe it would be of interest to recount briefly the history of the project leading up to the request by the joint venturers for an amendment to the principal agreement to enable the project to proceed on a reduced scale.

The company first intersected ore in May, 1971. Subsequent drilling proved up several ore bodies of major world significance which today total 45 million tonnes of 2.2 per cent nickel ore.

In November, 1972, the company made final preparations for the decision to go ahead on the basis of a production rate of 30 000 tonnes of nickel in matte per year. However, in December, 1972, the first of several currency movements—revaluation of the Australian dollar—and the introduction by the then Federal Government of statutory deposit requirements on 50 per cent of imported capital funds prevented the joint venturers from starting operations. Despite these difficulties the Government urged the company to make firm plans to proceed and conclude an agreement with the State. This resulted in the principal agreement in November, 1974, the provisions of which included—

initial production from an open cut to give a quick cash flow while the shafts and decline were developed into the deeper ore;

a concentrator near the mine; flash smelter instead of an electric smelter near the minesite; and

a new town to be built approximately 10 kilometres from the mine and smelter to provide accommodation for a population of approximately 3 000 people.

In June, 1975, following consultation with the Premier the joint venturers made the following announcement—

The joint venturers had hoped that studies of the economic potential of the project would by now have indicated that subject to all necessary Government approval being granted a go-ahead decision could have been made about mid-1975.

Although the project appears to be technically possible, due to the effect of inflation on capital and operating costs in relation to the international price for nickel, the financial viability of the project has not yet been established.

In view of this the joint venturers have had to defer taking a decision to proceed but the position will be kept under constant review and design work is continuing.

In October, 1975, having expended almost \$20 million on exploration and studies, the joint venturers advised the State that the project was not economically viable under conditions then prevailing and a 12 months' extension of time was sought and granted.

However, discussions were continued between the State and the joint venturers and I prevailed upon the joint venturers personally during a visit to London in February this year to make every effort to revive the project, even if initially it had to be on a smaller scale.

It was through the initiative of this Government that the project has been revived on the basis of a smaller-scale operation which is viable under prevailing economic circumstances, particularly the high labour costs.

I hasten to add that adequate provision has been made for the venture to increase the scope of its operations and the volume throughput just as soon as economic conditions in Australia become more competitive and the international market place returns to more favourable levels.

Under the reduced project the initial production proposed is 10 000 tonnes of nickel a year in concentrate which will be transported south. This will be achieved by underground mining of a zone of massive sulphide mineralisation lying relatively near the surface, access to which will be by a decline from the surface. At the same time preparations will be made for the sinking of an exploration shaft to examine the structure of the disseminated mineralisation at depth. The minesite smelting to matte is for the time being cancelled.

To the point of production the joint venturers will be outlaying a capital expenditure of \$55 million, without allowing for escalation. During the following five years a further \$30 million will be required to complete the development of the mine and other facilities to sustain the predicted production rate.

The project will be producing concentrate by 1978 and will employ between 350 and 400 people.

This is a significant level of new employment for the goldfields and will, in a single project, substantially offset the

labour situation caused through the enforced closure of the Mt. Charlotte Goldmine in Kalgoorlie.

There are other obvious benefits which will accrue from an early start to this project.

It is the northernmost of the nickel prospects in Western Australia. Its very existence and the creation of new infrastructure which is involved is heightening prospects for the establishment of further projects in the region.

One of these under consideration is the Mt. Keith project which has been deferred because it is not viable on existing economics. These economics would be improved with cost-sharing on infrastructure such as railways and sub-regional community services and facilities.

The amendment agreement has been prepared with a view to altering as little as possible the terms of the original agreement.

I propose to deal in broad lines with the amendments contained in the Bill at present before the House and I will explain the reasons behind them.

Firstly, recital (b) is amended to permit smelting in the Agnew area or at such other site or sites as the parties may agree. This change allows smelting to be carried out for the joint venturers by Western Mining Corporation Limited at its smelter at Hampton near Kalgoorlie.

The definition of "mining areas" has been amended to refer to the "plan marked A1" in lieu of "the plan marked A". With your permission, Mr Speaker, I will table the plan.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 491).

As a result of extensive exploration already carried out, the joint venturers desired to upgrade the plan referred to in the principal agreement by deleting therefrom 186 of the mineral claims in the yellow areas and by adding 41 new mineral claims.

There is a requirement in new clause 6A for the joint venturers to continue to investigate the feasibility of increasing the annual capacity of the mining and treatment plant from 300 000 tonnes of ore to one million tonnes of ore, and to keep the State fully informed at least annually.

An amendment to the provisions dealing with "roads" in clause 11 was required. The joint venturers desired to alter the timing referred to in this clause to defer the construction of new roads and to allow the revised stage 1 of the project to utilise existing roads where possible. A deferral of road commitments by the joint venturers in this regard is not expected to inconvenience the Main Roads Department in either planning or construction.

As the principal agreement provided for rail transportation of matte it was necessary to provide for the present intention—by amending 12—to rail concentrates. In addition amendments were necessary in respect of the revised tonnages to be railed and the capital contributions to be made by the joint venturers.

The provisions in subclauses (1), (4), (6) and (8) of clause 12 deal respectively with transport of nickel containing products, advance payment of freight, improvement of the railway line, and notice of anticipated tonnages together with the first schedule which refers to railways. The appropriate amendments reflect the reduced scale of operations and the change in smelting from the minesite to Kalgoorlie.

The "water" clause—clause 14—in the principal agreement provided for a major developer using water from the Depot Springs water reserve which is located some 70 kilometres from the project site.

However, since 1972, Australian Selection (Pty.) Limited and more recently, Agnew Mining Company Pty. Ltd., have undertaken various investigations into the possibility of finding potable and raw water within the local area of the project site.

The water requirements of the project have naturally varied correspondingly with the reduced scale of operations envisaged.

The joint venturers believe that adequate supplies of water have been located within the mining areas and that now it may not be necessary to draw on the Depot Springs water reserve. However, they have stressed that the Depot Springs water reserve was located and proved at the cost of the joint venturers and that it may still be necessary for them to use this water source for all or part of their daily water requirements if the local sources should prove to be inadequate.

Therefore, it has been agreed that the State will reserve, until the 31st December, 1984, the rights for the joint venturers to apply for a licence to draw up to 20 000 cubic metres a day from this source.

It should be noted that the annual average daily water requirement of the joint venturers has been reduced from 28 000 cubic metres in the principal agreement to 20 000 cubic metres.

The water provisions in clause 14 have therefore been amended to allow the joint venturers to draw water from sources located within their mining areas, but at the same time to be able to apply for a licence to draw all or part of their requirements from Depot Springs until the 31st December, 1984, should such a need arise.

The actual wording of the new clause 14 is basically similar to that of the standard water subclauses now incorporated into other mining project agreements.

As I have already mentioned the principal agreement has been amended in respect of the definition of "mining areas". In conjunction with this amendment it was also necessary to amend the provisions in clause 16 which deal with mineral claims. These amendments are relatively minor and are intended to remove any possible ambiguity which may have arisen.

Under the principal agreement the joint venturers were required to commence their programme of exploration of mineral claims in the yellow areas after the expiration of the third year next following the "production date".

Provision has now been made for the joint venturers to continue to carry out their programme of exploration, which they had already begun prior to the commencement of production, and to report the results at yearly intervals after the "application date", which is the date application is made for a mineral lease pursuant to clause 15 (1).

It is to the State's advantage that early exploration should be encouraged—this amendment is reflected in clause 16 (1) (b).

The principal agreement—paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of subclause (1) of clause 16—required the joint venturers to surrender mineral claims totalling one-third of the yellow areas at the expiration of each of the fourth, fifth and sixth year next following the production. Provision has now been made for the joint venturers to surrender all or any of their yellow mineral claims at any time, but by the expiration of the fourth, fifth, and sixth year next following the application date they must have surrendered respectively one-third, two-thirds, and the total area of the yellow mineral claims. Again this provision secures the speeding up of exploration.

Finally, clause 16(2) of the principal agreement has been replaced by new subclauses (2), (3), (4) and (5) which retain basically the same obligations concerning incorporation of the surrendered mineral claims into the mineral lease, but with the added proviso that the joint venturers may apply to have yellow mineral claims incorporated at times other than the fourth, fifth and sixth year next following the application date.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

Message: Appropriations

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

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER ACT: RULES

Application to Authorities: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 16th September, on the following motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier)—

That pursuant to sections 12 and 13 of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, 1971, this House makes the following rules:—

1. In these rules the Parliamentary Commissioner's Rules, 1972, made by the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council on the 1st November, 1972 and published in the *Government Gazette* on the 10th November, 1972, as amended by the addition of a rule made by the Legislative Assembly on the 12th December, 1973 and the Legislative Council on the 13th December, 1973 and published in the *Government Gazette* on the 11th January, 1974, are referred to as the principal rules.

2. The principal rules are amended by adding after rule 6 the following rule and schedule—

7. The Act is hereby declared to apply to the authorities specified in the Schedule to these rules in addition to the government departments and other authorities specified in the Schedule to the Act.

SCHEDULE.

Builders' Registration Board of Western Australia constituted under the Builders' Registration Act, 1939-1975.

Land Agents Supervisory Committee of Western Australia constituted under the Land Agents Act, 1921-1974.

Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board constituted under the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, 1973-1974.

Murdoch University constituted under the Murdoch University Act, 1973-1976.

National Parks Authority of Western Australia constituted under the National Parks Authority Act, 1976.

Registrar of Building Societies holding office under the Building Societies Act, 1920-1970.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) (9.00 p.m.): An hour or two ago I was walking down a corridor in a building in the Terrace and I heard a news item which caused me to sit up and take notice in much the same way, I suppose, as an opponent sits up and takes notice when he is well and faithfully shirt-fronted by a Subiaco ruckman. As I recollect it, the news item was to say that the Leader of the Country Party (Mr Old) once again was telling the people in the country, whom he purports to represent but does not, that they had to fight socialism.

Mr Old: Correct.

MR BERTRAM: That is magnificent! I found that almost too much to believe, but I have been in this place and the political arena for some little time now and I quickly realised that was likely to be the case.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Will the honourable member at an early stage reassure me that he intends relating this discussion to the motion before the House?

MR BERTRAM: I would be delighted to give that assurance forthwith, Mr Speaker. Here we have a matter under debate which has to do with nothing other than the extension of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, and if ever there was a piece of socialist legislation, this is it.

You will remember, Mr Speaker, that the Hon. J. T. Tonkin fought roughly from 1959 to 1971 to achieve the appointment of a Parliamentary Commissioner or an Ombudsman for the State of Western Australia; it was a 12-year fight which was won when he became the Leader of the Government and Premier of Western Australia in 1971.

This motion is designed not to curtail that piece of socialist legislation but rather to extend it. This is being done by a Government, an important member of which is the very member who is telling the people in the country to have nothing to do with socialism!

That would be bad enough except that this is an habitual practice and calls for habitual reference, because credibility should have something to do with what goes on in this place. The Opposition is in a position where it has no alternative but to support this legislation, because it would be disastrous not to support it.

However, the Opposition is most unimpressed by the manner in which the Government is seeking by this motion to extend the powers of the Ombudsman. This is the second time within a few months that the time of this Parliament has been taken up with amendments to the Ombudsman's powers. If this Government were worth its salt, it would have dealt with the two matters in the one Bill at the one time, a month or so ago. Not only would it have been more desirable and a

more common-sense approach but also it would have been much more efficient and acceptable for the people for whom the Ombudsman legislation was designed; namely, the ordinary people in the street who, when they have a problem, want to know whether or not they can take it to the Ombudsman.

Currently, what the people do in many cases is to go to their member of Parliament or make an inquiry to their solicitor. For example, they may say, "I have a problem touching on the question of the trustees of public cemeteries under the Cemeteries Act of 1897. I am dissatisfied with the administration in respect of a matter arising under that Act. Can I take it to the Ombudsman? Give me an answer, yes or no." The adviser, member of Parliament, or whoever simply goes to the appropriate page of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act and says, "Yes, you can see that is one of the authorities to whom the Act applies. By all means, go to the Ombudsman."

That is straightforward and simple, is it not? But it will not be straightforward and simple in the future once this motion has been carried. As I say, we must support it because we want these powers of the Ombudsman extended wherever appropriate, and the departments listed under this motion are clearly departments which are within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman. However, in due course, what we will do when in Government is to put the house in order in an appropriate and efficient manner. When we want to amend the legislation, we will do it with one Bill at a time, not a string of them. What we will not do is introduce one Bill and half a dozen motions. The cost of this place is high enough without protracting time here by a sequence of measures when one will do the job.

I do not think I need touch further upon the fact that we are on this occasion extending a piece of socialist legislation introduced by a so-called Liberal Government which in fact is a conservative Government but which, somehow or other, does not seem to manage even a blush when it habitually comes into this place with socialist legislation. How much longer the people are going to swallow that nonsense is something I watch with interest.

Mr Young: Was every piece of legislation introduced by the former Premier socialist legislation?

Mr BERTRAM: Good gracious, no; a lot of it even the conservatives would have brought in.

Mr Young: A lot of it the conservatives agreed to. Does it mean it was all socialist legislation?

Mr BERTRAM: No.

Mr Young: Well, what have you been talking about?

Mr BERTRAM: A lot of legislation brought in by the Tonkin Government was unmistakably of a socialist character.

Mr Young: Was the Parliamentary Commissioner Act one of them?

Mr BERTRAM: My word it was—without question! Otherwise, why the 12 years' resistance?

Mr Young: What a brilliant application of logic.

Mr BERTRAM: If the member for Scarborough cares to look through the debate he will probably find that was the alleged most important reason.

Mr Young: I think you are wrong.

Mr BERTRAM: The honourable member hopes I am wrong. I will be delighted if he is right, but I think that is what he will find, because there was no logic in defeating it in the first instance. Now it has been introduced, the whole of Australia has adopted it.

As I pointed out, what should have happened is that instead of this motion being before this place now, wasting our time, it should have been included in the Bill, the second reading of which took place as recently as the 7th September, 1976. When we get oddities in this place, surely the first thing to do is to wonder why it is being done in such a way. I remember at the time that the progress of the Bill through this House was extraordinarily fast; in fact, it seemed to be almost obscenely fast.

It seemed almost as though the Government was in a ripping hurry to curtail in one respect the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman. At the time, I was very concerned because the Premier made no attempt to justify his Government's amendment to section 15 (1) of the Act. Having had further time to think on this matter, I now realise there are some excellent reasons that the Premier should have amended section 15 (1) of the Act, but since he gave no reason at the time, I had to work that one out for myself.

Having discussed that Bill, let us return to the motion. Section 12 of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act states as follows—

12. (1) Rules of Parliament may be made for the guidance of the Commissioner in the exercise of his functions and for the other purposes for which Rules of Parliament may be made under this Act.

(2) Subject to this Act the functions of the Commissioner shall be exercised in accordance with the Rules of Parliament made under this Act.

(3) The Rules of Parliament referred to in this section are rules that have been agreed upon by each House of Parliament in accordance with the rules and orders thereof.

(4) Rules of Parliament made under this Act shall be published in the *Government Gazette*.

(5) Section 36 of the Interpretation Act, 1918 does not apply to Rules of Parliament made under this Act.

Therefore, it is quite valid for the Government to opt to bring in the rules through this motion. All I am saying is that it should not have done it in this way, when it had a better way of doing it. It not only would have been more convenient but also generally more efficacious for those people who have to interpret, dispense, and advise upon the law to have done it by way of the Bill passed through this Parliament recently. Section 13 of the Act states—

13. (1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, this Act applies to the government departments and other authorities specified in The Schedule to this Act, and to any other government departments or other authorities to which this Act is declared to apply by Rules of Parliament.

So, there we have the power to bring it in by way of rule. However, there is nothing in the Act which says the Government could not or should not amend the Act. Some people may say it contains such an implication, but that really has no basis in fact, and cannot explain why the Government did not simply introduce a Bill to amend and add to the schedule. The schedule appears at page 23 of the parent Act, and commences as follows—

THE SCHEDULE

[Section 13.]

Government Departments and other Authorities to which this Act applies.

It then proceeds to list the various departments to which the Act applies. That is straightforward, simple and efficient, and has everything to commend it.

However, with the passage of this motion, no longer will the position be simple and straightforward. Now, we are going to have a different position. As members are well aware, certain rules have been made—and, I imagine, properly made—under the Parliamentary Commissioner Act. I do not need to make much reference to that at this stage, but there are in fact already in existence six rules, not one of which contains the names of departments or authorities to which this Act applies.

Now we are going to add to those rules a rule No. 7, which will add to the schedule. So, with the passage of this motion what will happen in the future will be this: When a member of Parliament who, in the normal course of events, is busy enough anyway, has an inquiry from a constituent as to whether that constituent may take a certain matter to the Ombudsman, the member of Parliament is going to find himself in a tricky situation.

He will pick up the Parliamentary Commissioner Act No. 64 of 1971—the principal Act—and he will pick up the other amendments which have been made to the Act,

the latest of which I have referred to and which was passed in this place only a few weeks ago and he will think, "I am fairly safe here. This person quite clearly cannot go to the Ombudsman because the schedule has not been amended." So, the constituent thinks he has had the chips in that regard and cannot approach the Ombudsman. He thinks he will have to do something else or be frustrated. I suggest that the average member of Parliament and the average legal practitioner could easily fall into that trap.

What they will have to do henceforth when some client or constituent wants to make representations to the Ombudsman, is to turn to the principal Act and the amendments, and to obtain all the rules made under the Act. That would be a nuisance, as well as a costly and time-consuming procedure. It will incur an unnecessary cost.

I suggest that in future members of Parliament and their constituents will have to become Perry Masons in order to find what the schedule contains. This will be the legacy of the amendment proposed in the motion before us.

Mr Shalders: You do not think that an inquiry will be directed to the office instead of the Ombudsman himself?

Mr BERTRAM: That is not the function of the Ombudsman. I do not think a legal practitioner should be required to approach the Ombudsman to find out about the law.

Mr Shalders: I am not talking about a legal practitioner but a member of Parliament.

Mr BERTRAM: The duty of the Ombudsman is to attend to the inquiries of the people. If we turn to his latest report we find that the Ombudsman is reasonably busy, and his importance to the community is substantiated by the large numbers of matters which are referred to and attended by him. What the honourable member wants the people to do is for them to ring the Ombudsman to find out whether they can make representations to him. When in fact they should not have to do that at all.

Mr Shalders: I did not necessarily mean to ring the Ombudsman direct, but his office.

Mr BERTRAM: A person should be able to find out about his position without that rigmarole. We as members of this Parliament have a duty to introduce a simple, front-door method. There is nothing much we can do about the motion before us because we on this side do not have the numbers. I believe the proposal contained in it is most satisfactory.

I am not questioning the ability of the Government to do it this way, because section 13 of the Act confers such power. I think Parliament has the right to amend the Act, and that has already been indicated by the fact that the Act was

amended earlier this year; and this is a socialistic piece of legislation, but has been amended by a Liberal Government.

If we can amend the Act, I put it to members we can also amend the schedule. If we cannot amend the schedule by making an amendment to the Act then my case disappears. I suggest that we can amend any Act and any schedule to that Act if we so wish.

The Opposition is baffled to find words to place on record its displeasure at the law being rewritten into the Statutes of this State in this manner. We have reached a stage—if not now I hope very shortly—where the people have a far better education than the people of 60 or 70 years ago had. They will reach the stage where, instead of going to lawyers for advice on straightforward matters, they have enough knowledge and ability to attend to those matters themselves. In this respect they should be encouraged. I agree that they will need to watch their steps, because a little knowledge of the law, as in anything else, can be dangerous.

Nevertheless, that is the direction we should be going. If we have a straightforward piece of legislation, why should we camouflage it or mess it up? I do not understand what the motion is supposed to achieve. It is a source of annoyance and indicates inefficiency on the part of this Government. I am at a loss to know what it is supposed to achieve, apart from creating a nuisance, incurring unnecessary expenditure, and causing general annoyance. It puzzles me no end.

In his introductory speech on the motion the Premier said he had listed in the motion the departments or authorities which have been recommended by the Ombudsman for inclusion. I asked him a question subsequently as to whether he had listed all of them. To that he replied, "No. There are a few others." It now turns out that the few others are the ones which in fact are already covered by the principal Act.

I need not go further into the description of those items. As I recall, it is clearly acknowledged and accepted now that both the Road Traffic Authority and the State Energy Commission are already covered, though perhaps not strictly under those titles or nomenclatures, and they fall within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman. So, in that regard there is no problem.

There was some doubt about the Dairy Industry Authority, but that doubt has also been overcome. I think the Premier in his introductory speech said that in fact there was no need to include a reference to the Dairy Industry Authority, because under rule 7 it would become part of the schedule. That has caused some people to doubt the inclusion of that authority in the schedule.

There is not much more I can say. As I have pointed out, the Opposition supports the motion because it has absolutely

no alternative to do otherwise. In due course when the boot is on the other foot and we introduce a Bill to amend the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, serious consideration will be given to amending the schedule in a different way so that the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman will be spelt out clearly and sensibly.

By that means lawyers, members of Parliament, and other busy people will be able to read the Act quite easily. When they come to the schedule and insert the amendments into it they will have before them the whole schedule. They would not have to make the long trip to the Government Printer to purchase various *Government Gazettes*, such as those for November, 1972, December, 1973, and December, 1976, to find out what they ought to be able to find out by a more simple and efficient means.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [9.25 p.m.]: The member for Mt. Hawthorn finds no fault with the schedule, and he has explained to the House quite properly that instrumentalities like the Road Traffic Authority and the State Energy Commission are covered by the existing Statute. I appreciate the fact that he is satisfied with the explanations that have been given; therefore his sole argument surrounds the question of how we add to the rules.

I invite attention to the fact that the Government has no alternative to effect a change in the rules than by doing it in the way set out in the motion. The reason is that we are bound by a Statute for which the member for Mt. Hawthorn, as Attorney-General in the previous Labor Government, was responsible.

I invite the attention of the honourable member to section 13 (1) of the Act which provides as follows—

Subject to subsection (2) of this section, this Act applies to the government departments and other authorities specified in The Schedule to this Act, and to any other government departments or other authorities to which this Act is declared to apply by Rules of Parliament.

We look to section 12 to find the provisions governing the rules of Parliament.

That is the honourable member's law, because as Attorney-General at that time he was responsible for introducing it. In fact, he personally made the submission to Cabinet for the introduction of the Bill. It provided that whilst the original Bill set out the departments in the schedule, all future amendments and additions would be effected by rules of Parliament.

Mr Bertram: Could be done that way.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is not a case of "could be done". The only way in which that can be done under the Statute in its

present form is by adding to the rules. The provision does not use the word "may"; it states—

...and to any other government departments or other authorities to which this Act is declared to apply by Rules of Parliament.

The provision is quite mandatory.

For that reason when the Government decided to include other instrumentalities it followed the course laid down in the principal Act. I suggest that had we produced a Bill on the basis of amending the schedule and the Act, to make it obligatory in the future for all amendments to be effected by amending the schedule to the Act instead of the rules, the honourable member would be castigating the Government for pulling a fast one and for trying to alter the drafting of his original legislation.

Whilst I personally believe that the present procedure is a clumsy one, it is only clumsy because the member for Mt. Hawthorn and the Government in which he served drafted it in its present form. At the moment the Government can see no purpose in amending the legislation so as to make it obligatory in future for all amendments to be effected by amending the schedule to the Act.

I can only assume—that is the reason I followed the debates closely—that the reason it was to be dealt with by the rules of Parliament was that it was felt that Parliament which was making the rules could effect amendments by resolutions passed in this House and transmitted to another place. By this means Parliament, as distinct from an ordinary Statute, would be laying down the rules in a document which over the years would become much more comprehensive, and no doubt eventually would incorporate the items in the schedule.

There are two alternatives. The first is to abandon the present system of adding departments and authorities to the rules—in other words, virtually to abandon the rules altogether except for procedural matters—and making it obligatory to amend the schedule to the Act, or alternatively bringing down an amending Bill to Parliament.

Personally, I can see some difficulty in doing the latter and, therefore, for the time being the Government has decided that, in accordance with the present Statute which we inherited from our predecessors, and which was presented in July, 1971, by the then Attorney-General—now the member for Mt. Hawthorn—in the Tonkin Government, we will follow the procedure laid down. Perhaps we will give the matter some thought later, but I see difficulties if we try to depart from the procedure laid down. At the time there was very good reason for introducing the rules-of-Parliament system as distinct from amending the schedule.

I thank the honourable member for his support of the motion.

Question put and passed.

Resolution transmitted to the Council and its concurrence desired therein, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

SECURITY AGENTS BILL

Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the Council is as follows—

Clause 34, page 23, line 2—Delete the word "bankers" and substitute the following words—

"the manager or other principal officer of a bank or other financial institution".

Mr O'CONNOR: Subclause (8) of clause 34 commences—

The Manager or other principal officer of a bank or other financial institution...

It was suggested in another place that paragraph (b) of subclause (7), appearing at the top of page 23 of the Bill, should include a similar provision.

I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman and he agrees that the inclusion of the provision will improve the Bill. Therefore, I move—

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr McIVER: The Opposition fully agrees to the amendment, for the reason stated by the Minister. We appreciate it will further clarify the legislation.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 21st October, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.