

propose to say it. I merely say quite clearly that my conscience is absolutely clear on this issue. We tried to do our best in this case. The Crown Law Department did its best. I have complete confidence in the advice I have been given and in the attitude displayed by the officers of the department who participated in the case; I have confidence in their professional competence and I reject wholeheartedly and absolutely the criticisms which have been levelled.

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [10.01 p.m.]: I am not acquainted with the case in the same detail as the Attorney-General and the Hon. Lyla Elliott. However, I should like to point out to the House how important it is that we have people such as the Hon. Lyla Elliott who are able to unearth what appear to be injustices, and to have them investigated.

While I accept that the Attorney-General was sincere in his remarks and that he has done all in his power, as he sees it, to see that justice is done, I wish to take issue with his statement that no racial prejudice was involved. Nobody can say there has been no racial bias. No-one who is brought up in a society such as ours, where an affluent, dominant and privileged society is able to reap for itself the benefits of the land, while the indigenous Aboriginal people of this country are denied those benefits can avoid being brought up with some form of racial bias.

I believe we have seen it here tonight, with the sort of interjections which were made while the Hon. Lyla Elliott was attempting to put her case.

As for these allegations of emotionalism, there is nothing wrong with a good bit of emotion. However, the mealy-mouthed sentimentality to which we have had to listen tonight is something different.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What a shameful thing to say!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Just listen to Mr Pratt! We certainly heard plenty of this mealy-mouthed nonsense, when members said, "We have done all in our power to help the Aborigines." How noble they are!

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is only your idiotic thinking.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We have had to listen to all these denials; it was a sure indication of guilt.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Who denied anything? Be specific.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: This House and this State should be grateful for the Lyla Elliotts who come into the House.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What you have just said has undone all she did.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I think it is well to understand that, and be grateful to the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

As for the people in the north, I do not think they would be grateful for the way Mr Tozer has described them tonight as being absolutely without the ability to make mistakes. I know that the members of the Committee on Human Ecology would not like to be dumped together with a whole lot of patronising, self-satisfied, smug people saying that they have done everything in their power to help the Aborigines. Anybody with half a thought for the Aboriginal problem knows that it is a very complicated one, and will not be solved by simplistic statements of intent, and grouping together everybody in the north and saying, "We are all just the nicest people!"

The Hon. N. McNeill: What a shocking display that was!

The Hon. J. Heitman: I'll say—it is the worst I have ever heard.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 18th August, 1976

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

### QUESTIONS (44): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. **ROLEYSTONE SCHOOL**

#### *Toilets*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Could he advise when the toilet facilities proposed for completion in September at the Roleystone Primary School will be available for use by the pupils?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

8th October, 1976.

3. **RAILWAY STATION**

#### *Armadale: Bus Access*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware of the construction of a car park at Armadale railway station which has blocked the access road to the station?

(2) Is he aware that buses cannot now stop to allow passengers to alight next to the railway station?

(3) What immediate action does the Government propose to make the station more easily accessible to patrons arriving by bus?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) The present recognised bus stop at Armadale is approximately in line with the northern end of the station platform which means intending train passengers off buses require to walk by a foot-path to the south end of the parking area to gain entry to the station.

The arrangements for parking and bus interchange facilities at Armadale constitute a two stage development planned in conjunction with the Metropolitan Transport Trust.

The first stage involving expansion of parking facilities has been completed and the second stage, which is for provision of bus parking and turning at the northern end of the station, will proceed when funds are available.

To allow intending train passengers easy access to the platform the second stage contains provision for a maze type entrance at the northern end similar to that existing at the southern end. In view of the extra distance which passengers are required to walk from the existing bus stop it has been decided to install the maze type entrance now. Planning of the crossing is completed and physical work is about to commence.

#### 4. KWINANA HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Improvements, and Health Sister*

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

With respect to the Kwinana Senior High School—

- (1) (a) Since 1st January, 1970, on what dates were major contracts let with respect to construction of class rooms, laboratories, school hall, library, etc.; and  
 (b) in each case, what work was involved?  
 (2) (a) What facilities are required at a senior high school before a qualified health sister will be attached to it;  
 (b) does the Kwinana Senior High School fulfil these requirements;  
 (c) if "No" in what respect do they not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) and (b)—

8th July 1970

2 science laboratories—  
\$64 400

30th July 1970

4 classrooms plus pre-vocational centre—  
\$68 330

28th August 1971

Library—\$58 500

21st December 1972

Repair of fire damage—  
\$58 568

7th August 1972

One science laboratory plus staff room—\$31 236

2nd February 1974

Hall/gymnasium plus gas fired incinerator—  
\$243 708

29th November 1974

One science laboratory  
—\$32 560

- (2) (a) to (c) A school requires a medical centre before a health sister is appointed. Kwinana Senior High School does not have such a centre.

#### 5. ARMADALE-KELMSCOTT MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

##### *Full-time Medical Practitioner*

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

What action has the Government taken, or proposed to take in response to the petition of 2021 citizens—calling for the appointment of medical practitioners to the Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial Hospital—presented to this Parliament on 27th May, 1976, by the Member for Cockburn?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Medical services in Armadale and Kelmscott, including medical attention at the Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial District Hospital have long been provided by private medical practitioners. There are at present no plans to exclude such practitioners by the appointment of medical practitioners to service the hospital.

#### 6. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Additions*

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

- (1) Is it proposed to carry out improvements and/or additions at the Eastern Hills High School during 1976-77?  
 (2) If "Yes" would the Minister clarify?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. Additions and improvements have been listed for inclusion in the 1976-77 building programme of the Education Department.

When the General Loan Fund Estimates are presented to Parliament by the Treasurer, further details may be provided.

Guildford, Herne Hill, Middle Swan, Midland, West Midland, Upper Swan, Midvale, West Swan, Bellevue, Koongamia, Greenmount, Helena Valley, Swan View, Darlington, Glen Forrest, Parkerville, Mundaring, Mt. Helena, Sawyers Valley, Chidlow and Wooroloo?

- (3) What is the present enrolment for the schools mentioned in (2)?

7.

### SCHOOLS

#### *Swan and Mundaring Electorates: Enrolments*

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

- (1) What is the present enrolment at Governor Stirling Senior High School for pupils aged 8 to 12 inclusive?
- (2) What were the enrolment figures for all grades at the following primary schools as at 1st March, 1976—

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) As at 1st August 1976

Governor Stirling			
Year 8	....	....	255
Year 9	....	....	433
Year 10	....	....	367
Year 11	....	....	203
Year 12	....	....	129
			<b>1 387</b>

- (2) and (3)—

School	Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sp.	Total
Guildford	March	48	65	49	51	58	45	61	....	377
	August	44	63	47	53	57	43	60	....	367
Herne Hill	March	25	17	22	18	14	16	19	....	131
	August	27	19	21	17	14	15	20	....	133
Middle Swan	March	73	61	60	61	58	62	68	....	443
	August	75	61	54	52	50	54	65	....	411
Midland	March	30	33	27	41	33	52	33	....	249
	August	27	31	25	40	31	45	36	....	235
West Midland	March	9	8	9	....	....	....	....	....	26
	August	8	8	10	....	....	....	....	....	26
Upper Swan	March	20	24	13	16	17	16	16	....	122
	August	20	22	12	16	16	17	15	....	118
Midvale	March	63	50	50	41	56	45	38	22	365
	August	62	43	44	41	53	42	37	19	341
West Swan	March	9	10	8	8	6	7	6	....	54
	August	11	6	5	6	7	7	6	....	48
Bellevue	March	10	5	9	4	14	10	15	....	67
	August	11	4	9	3	13	8	14	....	62
Koongamia	March	43	50	53	35	53	35	57	....	306
	August	43	52	31	38	51	34	60	....	309
Greenmount	March	28	27	28	35	34	32	47	....	231
	August	33	29	27	34	30	35	47	....	235
Helena Valley	March	18	13	10	19	10	15	20	....	105
	August	18	15	10	21	10	14	18	....	106
Swan View	March	63	67	69	55	50	43	50	....	397
	August	62	68	74	57	52	43	49	....	405
Darlington	March	60	53	47	60	44	67	62	....	393
	August	61	58	53	62	45	69	63	....	411
Glen Forrest	March	39	32	32	29	33	20	24	....	209
	August	40	33	33	27	34	22	25	....	214
Parkerville	March	18	8	11	9	10	9	20	....	85
	August	18	9	10	9	8	10	16	....	80
Mundaring	March	34	40	23	26	27	37	31	....	218
	August	35	40	23	26	30	34	31	....	219
Mount Helena	March	69	51	68	36	56	40	60	....	380
	August	69	54	60	49	57	40	64	....	393
Sawyers Valley	March	5	3	5	4	3	7	3	....	30
	August	5	3	5	4	3	7	3	....	30
Chidlow	March	7	17	9	12	12	9	15	....	81
	August	8	16	10	11	11	8	13	....	77
Wooroloo	March	13	16	10	9	12	11	10	....	81
	August	12	12	10	9	9	12	10	....	74

## 8. FORRESTFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

*Enrolments*

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

- (1) What were the enrolment figures for Forrestfield High School as at 1st March, 1975 and 1976, excluding those students connected with the Swan View High School?
- (2) What is the anticipated enrolment for Forrestfield High School for the year 1977?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) March 1975: Year 8	....	181
March 1976: Year 8	....	230
Year 9	....	186
(2) February 1977, anticipated—		
Year 8	....	225
Year 9	....	239
Year 10	....	179
Total		643

## 9. EASTERN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

*Courses*

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

What courses or subjects are at present available to students attending Eastern Hills High School?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

**UPPER SCHOOL**

English  
English Literature  
Mathematics I  
Mathematics II  
Mathematics III  
Mathematics IV  
Biology  
Chemistry  
Human Biology  
Physics  
Economics  
Geography  
History  
Art  
Accountancy  
Home Economics  
Technical Drawing  
Sport  
French  
Stenography

**LOWER SCHOOL***Core Subjects:*

English  
Mathematics  
Science  
Social Studies

*Options:*

Metalwork General  
Metalwork Applied  
Grooming and Deportment  
Film Making

Photography  
Woodwork General  
French  
Woodwork Applied  
Home Making  
Outdoor Education  
Technical Drawing General  
Typing Personal  
Typing Vocational  
Food and Nutrition  
Metalwork F.F.  
Transport  
Clothing and Fabrics  
Art/Craft  
Home Handyman  
Vocational Art  
Drama

*Other Subjects:*

Human Relations  
Health Education  
Physical Education  
Music (Instrumental)  
Music (Choral)

## 10.

**SCHOOLS***Kalamunda Electorate: Enrolments*

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

What are the enrolment figures for grades 4, 5, 6 and 7 at the following primary schools—

- (a) Forrestfield;
- (b) High Wycombe;
- (c) Maida Vale;
- (d) Wattle Grove?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

School	Grades			
	4	5	6	7
(a) Forrestfield	86	91	97	79
(b) High Wycombe	66	77	72	80
(c) Maida Vale	46	46	39	46
(d) Wattle Grove	14	16	13	19

As at 1st August, 1976.

## 11.

**MUNDARING SCHOOL***Additions*

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

- (1) Is it proposed to carry out additions or improvements at the Mundaring Primary School during 1976-77?
- (2) If so, would the Minister clarify proposals?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. Additions and improvements have been listed for inclusion in the 1976-77 building programme of the Education Department.  
When the General Loan Fund Estimates are presented to Parliament by the Treasurer, further details may be provided.

## 12. MUNDARING SCHOOL

*Classrooms: Fees*

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

What was the total cost for documentation and consultant fees incurred under the previous proposal to add three classrooms to the present Mundaring Primary School?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The total cost was \$4 287.67 including architectural, structural and electrical consultant fees and disbursements.

## 13. MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

*Income Tax Group Certificates*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have taxation group certificates been provided to all sections of the Main Roads Department workforce?
- (2) If "No"—
  - (a) what sections or groups are yet to receive their certificates; and
  - (b) what is the reason for the delay?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) Wages staff.
- (b) A combination of unusual factors associated with the computerised processing system has now been overcome which should allow the certificates to be issued this Friday. Application for extension of time on behalf of these employees has been made to the Australian Taxation Office.

## 14. SCHOOLS

*Music Tuition*

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

- (1) (a) How many primary schools provide music tuition; and
- (b) would the Minister list the schools?
- (2) Is tuition provided by teachers appointed to the particular schools or is it by way of periodical visits to the schools by members of the Education Department music section?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) All schools offer a music programme.
- (2) Both types.

## 15. SCHOOLS

*Kalamunda and Mundaring Electorates: Teachers and Enrolments*

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

- (1) How many teachers, full time and casual, are appointed to the following schools—
 

Gooseberry Hill,  
Kalamunda,  
Walliston,  
Lesmurdie,  
Helena Valley,  
Darlington,  
Glen Forrest,  
Swan View,  
Mundaring,  
Parkerville,  
Mt. Helena,  
Chidlow,  
Wooroloo?
- (2) What are these schools' enrolment figures?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) As at 1st August, 1976—

School	Total Enrolment	Full-time	Part-time
Gooseberry Hill	372	15	One at two fifths time
Kalamunda	660	24	
Walliston	324	14	One at two fifths time
Lesmurdie	598	22	
Helena Valley	106	5	One at one fifth time
Darlington	411	15	One at two fifths time
Glen Forrest	214	8	One at one fifth time
Swan View	405	15	One at two fifths time
Mundaring	219	8	One at two fifths time
Parkerville	80	4	One at one tenth time
Mount Helena	393	15	One at one fifth time
Chidlow	77	3	One at one tenth time
Wooroloo	74	3	One at one fifth time

16. **PENSIONERS***Drivers' Licences: Free Issue*

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

- (1) Did he read the article in *The Sunday Times* this week under the heading "Licence Blow to W.A. Pensioners"?
- (2) If "No" will he please read it and comment?
- (3) If "Yes" would he comment on the reported attitude of the Road Traffic Authority with regard to the basic figure relating to pensioners' income for determining eligibility for the grant of a free motor vehicle registration?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) At present this matter is under consideration by the Treasurer.

17. **FRUIT FLY***Baiting: Eastern Goldfields*

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

- (1) Would he please outline what liability, if any, attaches to an occupier of premises in the Eastern Goldfields, upon which fruit trees exist, in the matter of spraying or baiting for fruit fly infestation?
- (2) Is he satisfied that proper control measures are being effected in the Goldfields area to combat fruit fly?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Under the Plant Diseases Act owners and occupiers of orchards are required to adopt the measures prescribed in the regulations to eradicate and prevent the spread of fruit fly. The prescribed measures include the frequent removal and safe disposal of fallen fruit and the application of baiting mixtures or cover sprays to the fruit trees.
- (2) Detailed information of the position in the Goldfields area is not currently available.

18. **REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR***Geraldton: Responsibilities*

Mr CARR, to the Minister Co-ordinating Economic and Regional Development:

- (1) Is it correct to interpret his answer to question 9 of 11th August last as meaning that the regional administrator in Geraldton will, in fact, have "clearly defined delegated responsibilities for on-the-spot decision making concerning local matters"?

- (2) If "Yes" will he please clearly define these responsibilities?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) From the series of questions on this and related matters asked by the member, it would appear that he neither understands the role of a regional administrator nor appreciates that the work of the officer concerned is something that will develop in a logical way as he becomes established in his role—working in close co-operation with all Government departments and instrumentalities, as well as the local authority. It is certainly not intended, nor is it desirable, to place the officer in the position that his activities are inhibited by too strict a list of delegated responsibilities at the start of his work.

The member can be assured with the experience in other areas and with the close contact that will be maintained, the officer will be in no doubt about his responsibilities as they vary with changing circumstances.

If the member has objections to the proposal, I suggest he declares them.

On the other hand, if he is genuinely interested in knowing more about the functions of the office, I will gladly discuss the matter with him.

## 19.

**DATA BANKS***Safeguarding of Privacy*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) To what extent has the Government acted upon the recommendations of the committee appointed to examine the question of privacy and data banks?
- (2) (a) Is it correct that the committee recommended that an individual could be informed of information held in Government files, concerning himself, except in certain circumstances; and
- (b) is one of these circumstances relevant to the revealing of information contrary to the public interest?
- (3) If "Yes"—
  - (a) will the Minister give an assurance that it will not be a cover to withhold Government information for political reasons or purely for the sake of convenience of Government departments; and

(b) will the Minister give his interpretation? 20.

- (4) What action is planned by the Government to investigate the question of privacy in non-Government areas, such as information held by credit-reporting agencies?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Government has adopted the report and is currently putting the recommendations into effect. The approval of the Presiding Officers of the Parliament has been obtained to utilising the services of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations as recommended.

All departments have been instructed by the Premier's Department to initiate administrative action to implement the relevant recommendations, including a review of standards of building security.

- (2) (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

- (3) (a) The recommendation of the committee was that where an individual is refused access to information concerning him which is held by the Government, the facts of the matter should be reported to the Parliamentary Commissioner, who should then make such inquiry as he deems fit as to the accuracy of the particular information and communicate to the custodian thereof such views as he has concerning the propriety of—

(1) refusing to disclose such information to the inquirer;

(2) retaining such information on record;

(3) using such information in any way that may prejudice the person concerned.

- (b) The protections the member apparently seeks are contained in the powers to be exercised by the Parliamentary Commissioner's committee as set out in the report.

- (4) The Government has agreed to the State's Law Reform Commission co-operating with the Australian Law Reform Commission in the latter body's present exercise to investigate and report on the whole area of privacy. The Government does not propose to take any action with regard to the matter of privacy in non-Government areas until a report is received.

## SCHOOLS

### Site Areas

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

- (1) How many primary schools have total site areas of more than four hectares?

- (2) Would the Minister list them?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) As this question involves considerable research the information will be supplied by letter once it has been compiled.

## 21. SWAN VIEW HIGH SCHOOL

### Enrolments and Stage 1

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

Referring to Swan View High School, will the Minister clarify—

- (1) Is it proposed for the school to cater for years 8 to 10 only or 8 to 12 years?

- (2) (a) What is the anticipated enrolment at the school for 1977; and

(b) would the Minister provide a breakdown of the figure arrived at?

- (3) In view of the fact that the construction is only the first stage of development, will there be adequate classroom accommodation to cater for both for first years 1977 and second years now attending Forrestfield High School?

- (4) What were the highest and lowest tenders received for the construction of stage 1 of the Swan View High School when previously called for in 1974?

- (5) What is the contract price for the construction of stage 1 of the school now under construction?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The school will cater for years 8 and 9 in 1977; this will be extended to year 10 in 1978. The question of senior high school status and the provision of year 11 and 12 courses will be examined in 1978.

- (2) (a) 392

(b) Year 8: 271; Year 9: 121.

- (3) Due to the combined intake of year 8 and year 9 pupils, some temporary accommodation may be necessary for 1977.

- (4) Highest: \$1 378 652  
Lowest: \$1 048 805.

- (5) \$1 457 617.

22. **SWAN VIEW SCHOOL  
AND HIGH SCHOOL**  
*Retaining Walls*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Why is it considered necessary to place a retaining wall around sand pads at the present construction stage of the Swan View High School, bearing in mind that no retaining walls are provided around the high sand pads at the present construction stage of the Swan View Primary School?
- (2) Does he consider that retaining walls are necessary at both schools?
- (3) If "Yes" will he ensure that they are positioned at the primary school construction site immediately?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Retaining walls to retain sandfill are necessary at the Swan View High School because of the site levels and space limitations occasioned by the number of buildings and recreational facilities provided on the site.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.

23. **STATE GOVERNMENT  
INSURANCE OFFICE**  
*Consultants*

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) How many different firms of consultants were engaged in connection with the State Government Insurance Office?
- (2) Who were they?
- (3) What was the cost of each?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) One.
- (2) Coopers & Lybrand Services.
- (3) \$7 850.

24. **APPRENTICES**  
*Government Departments and Instrumentalities*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

How many apprentices surplus to the State's requirements were employed by State departments and agencies in 1975-76?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

State Government departments and instrumentalities had in training 1 262 apprentices as at 30th June, 1976. This includes 119 additional apprentices paid for by the Commonwealth and to be transferred to industry after training. An additional 17 apprentices suspended by private

industry have also been taken on by Government departments. There are no apprentices in training surplus to the State's requirements.

25. **CONSUMER AFFAIRS COUNCIL**  
*Membership*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Who were the members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st April, 1974?
- (2) Who were the members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st July, 1976?
- (3) Who were the deputy members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st April, 1974?
- (4) Who were the deputy members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st July, 1976?
- (5) What were the reasons for the replacement of members?
- (6) What were the reasons for the replacement of deputy members?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st April, 1974, were:

Professor A. M. Kerr  
(Chairman)

Mr J. A. Samuel  
Mr G. M. Chance  
Mr E. C. Benness  
Mr A. S. Rosenwax  
Mr W. F. Harry  
Mrs R. Coleman  
Miss P. F. Thomas  
Mr J. V. Lyall  
Mr E. Munch-Petersen  
Mr P. F. Cook  
Mr N. H. Hearn

- (2) The members of the council on 1st July, 1976, were:

Professor R. M. C. Lourens  
(Chairman)

Mr J. A. Samuel  
Mr G. M. Chance  
Mr E. C. Benness  
Mr J. R. Bunce  
Mr K. Simpson  
Mrs P. Silver  
Miss P. F. Thomas  
Mr J. V. Lyall  
Mrs H. P. Balfe  
Mr M. E. Burns  
Mr N. H. Hearn

- (3) The deputy members of the Consumer Affairs Council on 1st April, 1974, were:

Professor R. T. Appleyard  
Mr R. D. Nicholson  
Mr K. T. Marsh  
Mr J. R. Bunce  
Mr J. R. Millar  
Mr A. Wilkinson  
Mrs M. Howlett  
Mrs E. M. May



Mrs I. F. Barrett  
 Mrs J. E. Roberts  
 Mr M. E. Burns  
 Mr C. G. Hammond

- (4) The deputy members of the council on 1st July, 1976, were:

Professor A. M. Kerr  
 Mr J. R. Adams  
 Mr K. T. Marsh  
 Mr R. H. Liddell  
 Mr J. R. Millar  
 Mr A. Wilkinson  
 Mrs M. C. King  
 Mrs J. E. Roberts  
 Mrs D. Dettman  
 Mrs E. M. May  
 Mr P. F. Cook  
 Mr C. G. Hammond.

- (5) and (6) In some cases the changes were requested by the individuals for various personal reasons. In others, changes were made to give the council the benefit of new views from the various areas of representation from which the council is drawn.

## 26. CONSUMER AFFAIRS COUNCIL

### *Recommendations for Action*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) How many recommendations for action by the Government have been presented by the Consumer Affairs Council since 1st April, 1974?
- (2) What are the details of each recommendation?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Ten.
- (2) (i) Consumer Affairs Act
  - (a) Change of name
  - (b) Definition of goods to include land and interests in land
  - (c) Upper limit for Commissioner to act to be \$5 000
  - (d) Offence for any person to use the name of the bureau without authorisation.
- (ii) Door to Door Sales Act
 

Inclusion of all goods and services subject to certain exemptions, changes in permitted hours of calling, identification cards and cooling-off period.
- (iii) Consumer Education Funds
 

Allocation for financial year.
- (iv) Small Claims Tribunal Act
 

Establishment of tribunal.
- (v) Landlord and Tenant
 

Bond money and need for joint inspections at commencement and termination of tenancy.

- (vi) Dangerous Goods
 

Establishment of Products Safety Committee.
- (vii) Motor Vehicle Insurance
 

Endorsement of Law Reform Commission's report.
- (viii) Titles for Vehicles subject to Hire Purchase
 

System of vehicle registration to indicate hirer and owner.
- (ix) Harsh and Unconscionable Contracts
 

Legislation not be enacted.
- (x) Consumer Representatives on Builders Registration Board
  - (a) Consumers' representative be appointed to board
  - (b) Board be empowered to cancel or suspend registration of a builder
  - (c) Board be empowered to issue work orders.

## 27. TECHNICAL SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

### *Appointments*

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

- (1) Under what regulations are appointments made to technical school advisory committees?
- (2) How many members are permitted to be appointed to such committees under the regulation?
- (3) How many members are now appointed to the Midland Technical School advisory committee?
- (4) What criteria are used to determine the suitability of nominees for such committees?
- (5) For what reason was my nomination to the Midland Technical School advisory committee rejected by the Minister?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Appointments to technical school advisory committees are made under Education Department Regulations Nos. 253 and 257.
- (2) The regulations permit a maximum of 15 members.
- (3) Eleven members.
- (4) The principal of the school or college submits to the Director of Technical Education the names of persons considered by him to suitably represent the community within which the school is situated. He is required to have regard for two factors:
  - (a) That the industry and community generally is well represented.

(b) That the nominees, in his opinion, will make a contribution to the affairs of the committee.

- (5) It is considered that no reason need be given.

## 28. GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

### *Deferment*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Premier:

Will he list the various Government projects which have been deferred as a consequence of the Federal Government's financial restrictions?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

It is not practicable to provide such a list because, whether or not a project goes ahead depends on the availability of funds from either State or Commonwealth sources and the State Budgets are still being framed.

In due course, capital and recurrent programmes for this year will be presented to Parliament showing work planned and sources of funds including funds provided under Commonwealth programmes.

It will be apparent that if Commonwealth funds are restricted in some areas, less work can be done overall than would be the case if more money were available, but it is not feasible to identify each project so affected at this juncture.

## 29. TRAFFIC

### *Princep Street, Collie: Crossing*

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

- (1) When is it anticipated that the Princep Street crossing will be completed at Collie?
- (2) Will the flashing lights be operating when the crossing is opened?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) End of November, 1976.
- (2) Yes.

## 30. ROAD TRANSPORT

### *Commercial Goods Vehicle Licence*

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

- (1) What are the criteria used by the Transport Commission to determine charges for a 'Commercial Goods Vehicle Licence'?
- (2) Are different fees levied in different shires?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The class of goods and in most instances the distance travelled determines the licence fee levied

under the Act. The licence fee itself being determined having regard to the nature of the goods and their associated value.

- (2) No. Refer to (1) above.

## 31. GEOGRAPHE BAY ROAD

### *Rain Damage*

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

- (1) Is it correct that part of the Geographe Bay Road, Busselton leading to Wonnerup was washed away recently?
- (2) If so, will he advise the extent of the damage?
- (3) What amounts of money were spent upgrading the road and area last year?
- (4) Is the Government considering ways of finding a permanent solution to the problem?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Destruction of the road pavement, and removal of the road base, to varying degrees over 400 metres length of the road.
- (3) None. Only maintenance was undertaken.
- (4) The road is controlled by the Shire of Busselton.

## 32. VERMIN PROOF FENCE

### *Relocation*

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

- (1) Is he aware that a recent public meeting at Latham unanimously resolved that the existing vermin proof fence needs to be relocated to include properties to the east of the present alignment?
- (2) In view of the extensive damage to crops and pasture in the area, will the Government give priority to the construction of a vermin fence to include all present arable properties from north of the Wannara Road, south to the present fence on location 418 along the eastern side of Lake Monger?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Agriculture Protection Board is investigating modifications to the fence system in the East Perenjori and other areas.

33. **MEAT COMMISSION***Cool Storage Space*

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

- (1) What is the total cool storage space for beef, mutton, lamb and offal available to the Western Australian Meat Commission at—
  - (a) Midland Junction Abattoirs;
  - (b) W.A. Meat Exports, Robb Jetty?
- (2) Of the total capacity available as indicated to the answer in (1), what amount is available for the storage of beef, mutton, lamb and offal in each of the centres referred to?
- (3) What quantities of beef or mutton or lamb or offal have been received in W.A. Meat Commission cool storage at—
  - (a) Midland;
  - (b) Robb Jetty,
 from any other State in the months of June, July and August of this year?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Total freezer storage capacity is—
  - (a) 7 000 tonnes
  - (b) 6 900 tonnes.
- (2) Capacity is not specifically allocated to beef, mutton, lamb or offal.
- (3) (a) Nil
- (b)

	June	July	August
Beef	38 tonnes	16 tonnes	57 tonnes
Mutton	Nil	Nil	Nil
Lamb			
Offal			

At this time only 13½ tonnes of this beef remain in store.

34. **DROUGHT***Compensation for Stock Losses*

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

- (1) Does the Government propose to introduce a plan to dispose of and compensate farmers for stock of no commercial value from drought areas?
- (2) If "Yes" will he indicate the details?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) The present position is that the Commonwealth Government is currently considering a request by the State Government to finance a slaughter subsidy scheme for stock of no commercial value.

The plan is that stock be slaughtered and buried at selected areas under shire supervision. The

subsidy would be at the rate of \$5.00 per head for cattle (\$4.50 to the farmer and 50 cents to the shire) and 50 cents per head for sheep (40 cents to the farmer, 10 cents to the shire).

35.

**NANNUP HOSPITAL***Extensions*

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

When is it expected that work on the proposed extensions to the Nannup hospital will commence?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Although funds were approved for upgrading facilities at the hospital further consideration because of age and condition of the building elicited that it would be impracticable to proceed with the proposal to renovate and remodel specific substandard areas. Consideration is now being given to the replacement of these areas with transportable units, but it will be some time before new proposals can be discussed with the hospital board.

36.

**SWAN VIEW SCHOOL***Land Acquisition*

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

Referring to the proposed acquisition of additional land for the Swan View Primary School site—

- (a) is the Minister now in a position to assure me that the acquisition of the land will be finalised by the middle of September; and
- (b) what date does he anticipate the land will be available to the school and students?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) No. Negotiations are proceeding at present.
- (b) As soon as the land is acquired.

37.

**TELEPHONES***Uniform Call Charge*

Mr McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

Will the Government give consideration to recommending to the Federal Government that Telecom Australia undertake a thorough survey to ascertain whether a uniform telephone call charge throughout Australia would be a practical and acceptable system to adopt?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Representations have, in the past, been made to the Federal Government reference PMG (now Telecom Australia) to introduce a uniform charge for telephone calls throughout Australia.

Many reasons have been advanced why it is not possible to introduce a uniform charge. Most of these will be known to the member.

However, further representations will be made to the Federal Government at an appropriate time, requesting Telecom Australia to undertake an updated survey on the practicability and acceptability of a uniform telephone call charge.

I am not too sanguine about a result which would be satisfactory at this stage, but—as is the case with a number of other State-wide essential services—progress towards uniformity can be made if there is persistence, especially where volume is increasing in some areas.

### 38. SALES TAX ACT

#### *Review*

Mr McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

Will the Government recommend that the Federal Treasurer review the Sales Tax Act to remove the anomaly of sales tax being charged on goods at cost into store or warehouses at various centres throughout Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The anomaly of sales tax being charged on the additional transport costs of goods to country warehouses, has been the subject of representations to the Commonwealth Government on a number of occasions.

The most recent approach was from a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers for Industrial Development, who again asked that the basis of assessing sales tax be altered to omit these additional costs.

However, successive Commonwealth Governments have not been prepared to accede to the requests on the grounds that it would add greatly to the administrative difficulties of collecting the tax and may introduce other anomalies. This will not prevent us pursuing the matter further as opportunities occur.

### 39. PRIVATE RAILWAY CROSSINGS

#### *Abolition of Charge*

Mr McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he consider discontinuing the charge or rental on private rail crossings?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No. The annual charge is a maintenance fee which at present is \$7.50 per annum.

The charge is much less than the actual cost involved in replacing the crossing timbers and tamping and lining the track when replacement becomes necessary.

40. *This question was postponed.*

### 41. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

#### *Last Pay Period*

The SPEAKER: I have an announcement to make in regard to question 41. I advise that part (3) of the question contains an objectionable phrase which renders that part of the question inadmissible. I so rule that part (3) be not asked or answered in its present form.

I regret that earlier action was not taken when the question was asked without notice, and I suggest the question be reworded, and be asked either with or without notice.

Mr BERTRAM, to the Treasurer:

(1) On what date in June, 1976, did the last pay day occur for each of the following departments—

- (a) Education teaching and other staff;
- (b) Hospitals;
- (c) Railways;
- (d) Police;
- (e) Mental Health Services;
- (f) Public Health;
- (g) Public Works;
- (h) Country Water Supplies;
- (i) Agriculture;
- (j) Community Welfare;
- (k) Road Traffic Authority;
- (l) all others?

(2) What was the Education Department vote for salaries for year 30th June, 1976?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) Education—Teaching staff 17th June, 1976; other staff 24th June, 1976.
- (b) Hospitals—determined by respective hospitals either 17th June or 24th June, 1976.

- (c) Railways—Salaried staff 25th June, 1976.
- (d) Police—24th June, 1976.
- (e) Mental Health Services—Nurses and allied staff 17th June, 1976; other staff 24th June, 1976.
- (f) Public Health—24th June, 1976.
- (g) Public Works—Salaried staff 24th June, 1976.
- (h) Country Water Supplies—Salaried staff 24th June, 1976.
- (i) Agriculture—24th June, 1976.
- (j) Community Welfare—24th June, 1976.
- (k) Road Traffic Authority—24th June, 1976.
- (l) All others—generally—24th June, 1976.

(2) \$168 993 000.

- (3) In view of your ruling, Mr Speaker, I will not be able to give the very well-worded answer I had prepared as an appropriate reply to this part of the question.

The SPEAKER: That part of the answer will have to be struck out. I will direct the Clerk to take the necessary action. The third part of the question will probably be reworded and again asked of the Premier either on notice or without notice.

42.

#### NICKEL MINING

##### *Matte and Concentrates Production*

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Mines:

Could he provide the following information—

- (1) What is the tonnage of nickel matte presently produced by the Hampton smelter?
- (2) What is the maximum capacity of this plant?
- (3) How much matte is produced for Western Mining Company?
- (4) How much of this is exported through the Port of Fremantle?
- (5) (a) What is the expected quantity of matte that will be produced from concentrates from Agnew Mining Company's deposits;
- (b) would the entire tonnage be exported?
- (6) Is it anticipated that any nickel concentrate will be exported through the Port of Esperance from Agnew?

- (7) If Amax Endeavour commence mining at Forrestonia, will the company—
  - (a) be exporting concentrate; or
  - (b) will it be converting this material to nickel matte at the Hampton smelter?
- (8) What would be the expected tonnage of both exported from Western Australian ports?
- (9) What are the present ports of destination for matte—
  - (a) now produced;
  - (b) likely to be produced as a result of Agnew and Amax Endeavour's enterprises?

Sir Charles Court (for Mr MEN-SAROS) replied:

- (1) 47 000 tonnes of matte.
- (2) 48 000 tonnes of matte at concentrate grade of approximately 11.5%.
- (3) 39 000 tonnes.
- (4) Of the total production 41 000 tonnes is exported and 6 000 tonnes treated at the refinery.
- (5) (a) The company is considering a production rate which should produce approximately 12 000 to 15 000 tonnes of matte.
- (b) Yes.
- (6) Markets have not yet been determined.
- (7) (a) and (b) It is premature to expect any decisions at this juncture.
- (8) Answered by (7). Preliminary feasibility studies have examined levels of production in the order of 60 000 tonnes of concentrate.
- (9) (a) Fremantle.
- (b) Will depend on decision in regard to smelting and marketing of product.

43.

#### RECREATION

##### *Point Walter Camp*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) In respect of the Government's decision to embark upon a study to determine a programme for the progressive establishment of a metropolitan replacement for the Point Walter Camp—
  - (a) who will be responsible for conducting the study;
  - (b) what areas of the metropolitan area are to be considered by the study?

- (2) What is the estimated annual running costs of the Point Walter camp?
- (3) How many—  
 (a) students;  
 (b) organisations,  
 visited and made use of the camp facilities during 1974 and 1975?
- (4) What amount of Federal Government financial support was available for use on the camp for each year between 1970 to 1976 inclusive?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) Community Recreation Council in co-operation with the Education Department.  
 (b) Various areas will be considered including the Mussel Pool area and the Community Recreation Council's Sorrento Reserve.

(2) Year	Recurrent	Capital
	\$	\$
1973 (2nd half)	20 544	5 191
1974	48 885	29 082
1975	54 164	117 732
1976	40 000	—

(budget figure)

(3) Year	Number of People	Number of Organisations
1973 (2nd half)	2 905	28
1974	5 435	43
1975	4 983	41

- (4) Amounts referred to above in answer to part 2 are almost exclusively Commonwealth funds.

44. *This question was postponed.*

## QUESTIONS (7): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. IRON ORE

*Marandoo Project: Discussions with Japanese*

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) During the current visit to Japan by the Minister for Industrial Development, will he be discussing with the Japanese steel mills the possible development of the Marandoo project?
- (2) If not, will the Premier indicate the express purpose of the Minister's visit?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister for Industrial Development, Mines, and Fuel and Energy, while in Japan, will be discussing the whole of the iron ore projects, both existing and proposed, with the Japanese steel mills. Beyond that, I would not be prepared to go at this stage,

particularly as the Minister will be back in the course of a day or two.

## 2. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

### *Last Pay Period*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Treasurer:

In compliance with your suggestion, Mr Speaker, and in order to accommodate the Treasurer, I would like to direct a question to him without notice.

What was the actual expenditure by the Education Department for salaries, including the \$8 million, paid by him before the 30th June, 1976, which ordinarily would have been paid after the 30th June, 1976?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answering the question asked by the honourable member, which takes on a different complexion altogether from the question he put on the notice paper, I want to say the total amount is \$171 297 248.

That sum includes—and this is where there is some conflict in the question asked by the honourable member because he referred to \$8 million being placed in the suspense account—as previously explained to this Parliament an amount of \$5.882 million that relates to education. I am assuming that is the relevant figure the honourable member wants to know in respect of the \$171 297 248; that is, in respect of salaries accrued as at the 30th June, 1976.

An amount of \$5.882 million was accrued as at the 30th June, 1976, for the Education Department as its own separate share which together with the other departments makes up the \$8 million in suspense.

## 3. HOUSING

*Aborigines: Co-operation with Community Welfare Department*

Mr YOUNG, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Minister seen a report in today's issue of *The West Australian* relating to the reported refusal of the Western Australian State Housing Commission to co-operate with the Department for Community Welfare regarding Aboriginal housing?
- (2) Is the reported statement correct?
- (3) If "Yes", is the commission in the future prepared to accept direction from the Department for Community Welfare?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is substantially correct.
- (3) The proposal was originally made by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, and recommended that in any case of disagreement between the State Housing Commission and the Department for Community Welfare concerning the suitability of an Aboriginal tenant to occupy a house, the Housing Commission should be invited to accept the advice of the Department for Community Welfare.

The State Housing Commission has not been, and still is not, prepared to accept the direction of external agencies regarding who will reside in SHC managed houses. There is a basic principle involved, because the State Housing Commission occupies the role of landlord, and as such is obliged to accept final responsibility for management, maintenance, and the general performance of the tenant with regard to payment of rent, social behaviour, and standards of hygiene. The State Housing Commission readily accepts its social obligations and responsibility in these matters, and in so doing accepts the right to determine the final choice of occupant.

In determining this choice, however, the commission does, and will continue to have a close working relationship with the Department for Community Welfare, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the Aboriginal Advancement Council, the Aboriginal Advisory Council, the New Era Fellowship and other organised, identifiable Aboriginal groups. Such liaison and co-operation is necessary to implement consistency in standards of occupancy throughout Western Australia, and to ensure that whatever funding is made available by the Commonwealth Government for Aboriginal housing is utilised for the greatest benefit of the Aboriginal people.

For the past two years Western Australia has led the States' requests to the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs for increased funding for Aboriginal housing and at the recent Housing Ministers' Conference I obtained the support of all other

State Housing Ministers to seek increased allocations for this purpose.

I would further add to the content of that answer. We also expect the community to accept that the State Housing Commission has the responsibility to consider the waiting list. So far as the obligation and the responsibility which we have to the community are concerned, when a property is occupied by an Aboriginal tenant there is also the responsibility to those who have no property at all in which to reside. So far as policy is concerned, at the present time, where anti-social behaviour is involved the commission will administer its policy as I have just outlined. The State Housing Commission will also take into account the fact that we have people on the waiting list who do not have a house at all and we will be doing everything we can to make certain those people are provided with dwellings.

#### 4. PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE CABINET

##### *Appointment*

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to the position of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, does the Premier intend to appoint a successor to the member for Scarborough or to make a new appointment?
- (2) If the Premier does not intend to do anything, would he indicate whether or not the Government has made a decision with respect to its intention to discontinue the position?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) There is no intention on the part of the Government to abolish the position of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet. The Government has no intention of making a replacement appointment at this stage.

#### 5. RAILWAYS

##### *Employees at Bridgetown, Manjimup, and Pemberton*

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

- (1) How many—
  - (a) Locomotive drivers;
  - (b) Firemen;
  - (c) Guards;
  - (d) Head shunters;
  - (e) Shunters;

are stationed in each of the following centres—

Bridgetown;  
Manjimup;  
Pemberton;

at the present time?

- (2) Following the reorganisation by Westrail after the railway depot at Bridgetown is moved to Manjimup on the 5th September, how many of each of the five categories of employees referred to in (1) will be stationed in each of the centres—Bridgetown, Manjimup and Pemberton?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

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

	Bridgetown	Manjimup	Pemberton
(1) (a)	10	1	1
(b)	9	1	1
(c)	8	—	—
(d)	1	—	—
(e)	1	1	—
(2) (a)	—	13	—
(b)	—	11	—
(c)	—	10	—
(d)	—	1	—
(e)	—	2	—

## 6. PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE CABINET

### Appointment

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

I would like to ask a further question on the same subject as my earlier one.

If the Government considers the position of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet to be a useful and important one, will the Premier explain to the House why he does not intend to appoint someone to that position?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In reply to the honourable member I want to say that this is a matter which is entirely the affair of the Government of the day and I have no intention of discussing it publicly at this stage.

## 7. TELFER GOLDMINES

### Industrial Dispute

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a dispute exists between the company constructing for Telfer Goldmines—Austin Anderson—and the trade union movement?
- (2) What action has he taken personally to resolve the dispute existing between those two organisations?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) No action has been requested by either party.

## DROUGHT RELIEF

### Government Assistance: Grievance

MR TUBBY (Greenough) [5.03 p.m.]: I would like to take the opportunity of this grievance debate to draw to the attention of the House the problems of the farmers in the drought-affected areas. A very large proportion of my electorate is affected, and with the exception of two shires which have declared a portion of their shires drought affected, all the other shires have declared their whole areas drought affected.

The drought is the worst known in this area which, as members know, is one of the most highly productive wheat-growing areas in the State. This season only about 75 per cent of the anticipated area was sown, and, of this portion, it is considered at least 80 per cent will be a crop failure. This is a tremendous blow to the farmers concerned as well as to country business people and the State as a whole.

I would like to indicate to members the costs which farmers are facing for the coming year. Most farmers will have to purchase their seed this year because of the crop failure, and at the rate of 60 kilograms per hectare, it will cost the farmer \$7 per hectare.

The fertiliser commonly used in the area is 18.18 Agram and this will cost the farmer \$18 per hectare for 120 kilograms. Fuel has been estimated at \$5 per hectare and repairs and replacement parts at \$5. This will mean a direct cost of \$35 per hectare to the farmer without taking into consideration labour and other overheads such as depreciation and so on. I ask members to bear in mind that farmers will have to face up to these costs in a complete drought situation with no anticipated income at all for the financial year 1976-77.

I anticipate that it will take at least five years for farmers to overcome the effects of this drought. There will be no wheat income this year and in my opinion farmers will need at least five years to overcome the terrible setback they have suffered.

In much of this area there is no stock feed whatever and stock numbers have been seriously depleted. In fact, in some cases all stock have been disposed of while in others just a few breeders have been retained. To retain these breeders it will cost the farmers \$10 to \$12 a head for sheep, and approximately \$50 a head for cattle, and we must remember that farmers will have no income coming in.

The financial position of the farmers will have a tremendous impact on the shire councils and rural businesses, including employees.



Another section of the farming community with added problems covers those farmers who operate outside the vermin-proof fence. Not only have these farmers to face up to a severe drought situation, but also their properties have been overrun completely by migrating emus. On the properties outside the protective fence, all fences have been flattened and ruined. Approximately 38 farms are involved in Northampton Shire and east of Perenjori, and to give members some indication of the income from these areas, nine farmers east of Perenjori produced approximately \$980 000-worth of grain last year.

I believe some consideration has been given to the resiting of the vermin-proof fence to protect these farmers. However, a great deal more consideration should be given to this problem, particularly when we take into account that these farmers pay taxes and rates as do farmers who have the protection of the fence.

Farmers generally in my electorate are very grateful to the Government for the speedy action it has taken. Within a week of areas being declared drought affected, the Minister for Agriculture toured the area. His visit was very much appreciated, as was his practical approach to the situation.

We have had also tremendous co-operation from the Minister for Transport who has organised express trains in and out of the areas. Road trains, which are normally very restricted as far as the south-west of the State is concerned, have been permitted greater access to assist farmers in drought-affected areas.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has three minutes.

Mr TUBBY: The Farmers' Union is pressing strongly for some form of subsidy to offset the costs involved in the slaughtering of stock. The opinion expressed by the union is that the Government would have been involved in some costs had the farmers been able to agist the stock. At the very least the Government would have been responsible for returning stock to affected properties at the completion of the drought. I feel some consideration should be given to this aspect.

Farmers are accepting this drought situation as one of the hazards of their occupation. They are not looking for handouts, but they are asking that people accept the situation and give help wherever possible. I would like to hear the comments of the Minister for Agriculture on this matter.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) (5.10 p.m.): I thank the member for Greenough for bringing to our notice the plight of the farmers in his

area. I assure him that the Government is very conscious of the situation in which the drought-affected farmers have been placed. It was rather fortunate for Western Australia that general rain fell last weekend, and while this will not be of great benefit to the people concerned in the area described by the member for Greenough, it has at least contained the drought to those areas already badly affected, and it will assure a season in a large part of the agricultural areas of the State.

I can well understand the problems besetting farmers in the honourable member's electorate. We are concerned about the amount of money invested in planting crops and fertilising the ground. I am informed by my officers that the fertiliser which has been applied will have residual value, and while this may be of little comfort today, it will be of some benefit when the season breaks, which I hope will be early next year.

We are well aware that most of the farmers in this area will have no actual income this year, but it is recognised that some will be in receipt of income from past grain pools. I do not say this in any derogatory manner, but just as a fact that some farmers will receive some income. I agree it will certainly not be sufficient to offset the loss they are encountering at this stage.

The Government stands ready to assist those who are unable to meet their normal commitments, and this is demonstrated by the fact that normal drought loans are available to farmers in need and those who are unable to obtain loans from their normal banking or stock firm sources. These loans will be at concessional rates of interest and there will be a repayment holiday plus an interest capitalisation for the first two years.

Mr H. D. Evans: Do you know offhand how many loans have been taken out?

Mr OLD: At this stage I am afraid I cannot give any accurate figures. While the limit of the loan is set currently at \$10 000, the Government in making the initial announcement made it clear that this amount was not to be taken as the maximum. If need can be shown, the amount of the loan will be reconsidered.

It is fortunate the drought has at least been relieved in some areas, and that a season is assured in others, because as the honourable member mentioned, stock replacement will be a problem. This problem will now be relieved to a certain degree.

The yardings at Midland Junction this week indicate that more people are holding stock. Monday's and Tuesday's yarding figures were down to 28 000 sheep, in direct contrast to the figures over the last five or six weeks. I was informed this morning that stock sales in four centres have been

postponed or cancelled. This indicates that people are prepared to hold their stock or to endeavour to agist it.

The honourable member referred to the emu-proof fence. I have had requests from people in the Latham-Perenjori and the Northampton areas in this regard.

This matter is under consideration by the Agriculture Protection Board. Incidentally, the board has done a great deal to assist farmers in that area to control the emus, and now men are available, work is proceeding quickly in an endeavour to evaluate the situation. A submission is to be put to the Government for the realignment of the fence, and certainly we will give it sympathetic consideration, when it comes forward.

In answer to a question today I said that the stock slaughter fee has been referred to the Commonwealth Government. It is well known to all members that drought relief measures must be approved by the Commonwealth Government in order to qualify for its assistance. Until we have the approval of the Commonwealth Government, we are unable to move. However, as I said, this matter is already before the Commonwealth Government, and an announcement will be made as soon as we receive a reply.

Members would be well aware, of course, that last week an announcement was made regarding further transport subsidies. Under certain circumstances, we are now prepared to subsidise 50 per cent of the freight for store stock going to market. I think this is a very real and acceptable subsidy to people in those areas. I can assure the honourable member the Government is well aware of the situation, and is keeping a close watch on it.

## NUCLEAR-POWERED VESSELS

### *Cockburn Sound: Grievance*

**MR FLETCHER** (Fremantle) [5.16 p.m.]: This is the first time I have availed myself of the opportunity to participate in a grievance debate. My grievance relates to the presence of a nuclear-powered warship in the Cockburn Sound area, presumably invited here by the Prime Minister with the support, no doubt, of the Premier. Nuclear power does not worry me as much as the prospect of that vessel being nuclear armed. I do not know whether it is, and we certainly will not be told. However, I do say it is just a softening-up exercise to make us accept visits by nuclear-armed ships to our coast.

In today's newspaper the Premier questioned the hospitality of the Fremantle City Council. That council was addressed by a very capable councillor on the matter of environmental protection. He was able to persuade a majority of councillors that this type of ship is a potential menace to our area. I consider it to be such, and that is the reason for my grievance. I did

have in mind asking a question on this matter today, but I did not as it is possible it may have been ruled out of order. I will read it out now, so that I can get my message across to the Premier. It is as follows—

- (1) Why has a nuclear, rather than a conventionally-powered American submarine been invited to Fremantle?
- (2) Could not the same degree of hospitality and international goodwill be afforded the ship and ship's company of any other conventionally-powered American Navy ship?
- (3) Did the Premier anticipate hostile demonstrations against the presence of the nuclear-powered *Snook*?
- (4) Being devoid of pending election issues, did the Premier hope to obtain electoral advantage from pro and anti controversy from the present vessel's visit?
- (5) Is the Premier aware that this visit and any future ones of nuclear-powered American warships, makes the member for Fremantle's electorate a nuclear target—even a pre-emptive strike—in the event of nuclear war, which could otherwise be isolated to the northern hemisphere?
- (6) Does the Premier not realise that any nuclear bomb aimed at a base which accommodates nuclear ships in Cockburn Sound would destroy the base and the adjacent heavy industry, Fremantle Harbour and annihilate the contiguous population including the constituents of the electorates of Fremantle and Nedlands?
- (7) Will the Premier please inform the House if such a price is not too high a price to pay for the perpetration of an economic and political system which grants so much to so few and so little to so many?

That is the question I would have liked to ask today. It is conceivable that it would have been ruled out of order, so I have taken this opportunity to get the message across; that is, that I take exception to the presence of this submarine.

Fremantle has a reputation for wonderful hospitality to all sorts of visitors from overseas in all sorts of ships; but not nuclear-powered warships. Perhaps if it were a nuclear-powered freighter it might be acceptable with some reservations. On that subject let me ask members whether they recall an incident in which a Japanese fishing fleet closed the entrance to a port and would not let back into the port one of their own nuclear-powered ships. Surely members read of that; it

received prominent cover in the Press. That situation pertained for weeks and weeks. The Japanese learnt the hard way from the awful slaughter that occurred at Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Our North West Cape is target enough without making Cockburn Sound and the lower west coast a target as a result of the casual behaviour of the Prime Minister and our Premier. That may or may not have been his objective, but I know that in the past elections have been won by members opposite as a result of controversy. Liberal Governments have separated the voting community in Australia; they have categorised us as either traitors or patriots over the Vietnam war, the Petrov issue, the prospect of invasion from China, and all sorts of issues like that. It is my suspicion that it was hoped this visit would create further dissension in the community which would be capitalised upon by our political opponents in the State and Federal Governments.

I mentioned earlier that I was not terribly concerned about the likelihood of a nuclear accident as a consequence of the method of propulsion of a vessel. However, I noted in *The Sunday Times* of the 15th August, 1976, the headline, "Nuclear leak fears from new reactor: serious defects increase dangers". The article is under a Frankfurt dateline, and states—

A routine inspection of the world's biggest nuclear power station at Biblis has revealed a number of serious defects.

The discovery of the damage coincided with the disclosure of plans to increase the reactor's storage capacity for spent fuel elements.

Further down, it says—

The trouble started with the discovery of 20 loose screws which, to the great surprise of the inspectors, had found their way to the heart of the reactor. Apparently loosened by constant vibration, they had fallen off a main coolant pump and been taken along with the coolant to the reactor's pressure vessel.

There is more, but I merely use that to illustrate the point. I hope the Premier is listening to me rather than the Deputy Premier, because this is a vital matter. If it could happen in Germany, it could happen in the Port of Fremantle. This is not the first leak that has occurred; it has happened throughout the world. It has happened in America, and I do not want it happening on our doorstep.

That is one aspect of the danger. What would happen in times of hostility if that submarine were sunk in our harbour? The member for Morley previously has explained to this House that the by-product of a nuclear reactor has, unfortunately, a life of 500 000 years. In effect, if that by-product were let loose into our harbour, our harbour and coast could be polluted

in that manner for 500 000 years. I ask members: Is that something to grieve about?

I heard a grievance this evening which had a Dorothy Dix flavour; no doubt it will appear in the Press because it had to do with the farming areas of this State.

Mr Blaikie: That is unfair.

Mr FLETCHER: However, whether or not that is so, I think the safety of Western Australians and of Australians is of much greater importance than much of the nonsense I have heard here during grievance debates.

There are times when we have to tell our distinguished visitors and friends that they are not welcome if they intend to arrive here in a certain type of vessel. As I said, I will not have reflections cast upon the traditional hospitality of Fremantle, as the Premier did in today's paper. That is something I take exception to, and it is something I grieve about in this debate. I do not care if they came here in wheelbarrows, they would be welcome; but they are not welcome in nuclear warships.

I ask that my grievance be noted; that is, that I have real concern about the behaviour of the Premier and the Prime Minister in inflicting this type of vessel upon the Port of Fremantle.

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier) [5.25 p.m.]: In answer to the grievance of the member for Fremantle, I must say that I, together with other members on this side, regret that he has seen fit to raise this subject. I would imagine that, on reflection, and especially as he is an ex-serviceman—

Mr Fletcher: And proud of it.

**Sir CHARLES COURT**: —he would have appreciated the fact that if we do not have a few friends around with the capacity to look after us at the present time and to join with our own forces we could be in a bad position, because we are more exposed than any other part of Australia. In fact, we are more exposed than most parts of the world. The cold, hard fact is that I have never heard a bleat from members opposite about the build-up of the USSR Navy in the Indian Ocean.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: We have not had one nuclear-powered submarine from the USSR. Talk sense.

**Sir CHARLES COURT**: No-one said anything about a nuclear-powered submarine from the USSR visiting Fremantle. What I was talking about—and I know it hurts members opposite—is that they never raise a bleat about the build-up of the USSR Navy in the Indian Ocean.

Mr Bryce: That is all in your twisted mind.

Several members interjected.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** It is quite obvious that members opposite are trying to exhaust my time because they do not want to hear the facts. I repeat that we did not hear a bleat from the other side about the tremendous build-up of the USSR Navy in the Indian Ocean.

**Mr Bryce:** What build-up?

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** It is a fact that the USSR has an ever-increasing amount of defence build-up in the Indian Ocean. I want to remind the member for Fremantle that, when he talks about the USN coming to this State in conventional ships, if we invited the Russians to come here they would be battling to find a conventionally-powered submarine because they do not make them any more.

I also want to remind the member that if a navy is to play any role in an ocean like the Indian Ocean, it must have nuclear-powered submarines and vessels—

**Mr A. R. Tonkin:** Not in Fremantle.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** —because such vessels can operate over tremendous ranges, and they fulfil a role entirely different from that fulfilled by submarines of years ago.

The cold, hard fact is that members opposite are in effect saying to the people of the world, "We don't care what strength the USSR gets in the Indian Ocean, as long as the USN keeps nuclear-powered vessels out of our port, be those vessels submarines or surface vessels."

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** I want to tell members opposite that the Government welcomes the USN visit to our port; we welcome it as do the great majority of people in Western Australia. We also welcome the fact that the USN sent one of its modern ships here. Let me say that if the USN wants to send a surface vessel here, I would be only too pleased to welcome it. In fact, I would prefer a surface vessel so that people can see it more boldly and clearly than they can see a submarine. It was my hope that the first nuclear vessel to visit this State after the lifting of the ban would be a surface vessel.

It is laughable for the member for Fremantle to say he would welcome a USN vessel here as long as it is a toothless wonder, an outmoded ship, or what he calls a conventional ship. The great navies of the world will not be building any more conventionally-powered submarines. As far as the Government and I personally are concerned, we welcome the fact that the Federal Government lifted the ban on nuclear vessels, and the State Government, together with the Commonwealth Government, has extended a welcome to USN nuclear-powered ships provided they conform with the very strict safety conditions that have been laid down.

The monitoring that has been undertaken in connection with this vessel must be unsurpassed anywhere in the world. I would imagine the crew of the submarine are shaking their heads and saying, "What is it all about? Here we have the safest form of ship it is possible to have, and we have all these people getting uptight and insisting on this great monitoring system."

We have this Commonwealth-State committee which is headed by the representative of the Director of the Department of Environmental Protection. To make sure that the public understand, it is not an engineer from the port authority, the harbour master or anybody of that kind who is the chairman of this committee. He is a man nominated by the Department of Environmental Protection. Under this Commonwealth-State committee very clearly defined rules are followed. I question whether any place in the world would adopt a more strict or sensible system of monitoring.

Another matter that members opposite seem to forget is that there is a crew on this ship who sail in it during their service life. They stay submerged, as is known, for very long periods. In fact, 70 per cent of their sailing time is spent under the sea. One cannot imagine men such as those serving voluntarily in that type of ship unless they knew it was safe. In fact America would not allow its servicemen to go abroad in a ship such as that if it felt there was any danger of it being unsafe.

**Mr A. R. Tonkin:** Why did people go to Vietnam? Did they think it was safe?

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** The honourable member sets himself up as an authority over some of the greatest scientists in the world. Would these crewmen go on a ship—

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are several members interjecting at the one time.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** This is hurting over there!

Opposition members: Ha! Ha!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** The crewmen themselves would not volunteer to serve in this type of vessel unless they knew it was absolutely safe.

Amongst other questions, the honourable member asked me whether I had expected hostile demonstrations. My guess was that those who would normally protest in this manner, and who pay to put in the newspaper advertisements addressed to me, would have sensed that there was such a strong and overwhelming feeling amongst Western Australians in favour of this type of vessel coming here that there would be a very bedraggled protest—which there was. I think some 35 people protested. I do not deny them their right to protest but I say quite categorically that

in the opinion of the Government the overwhelming proportion of Western Australians welcome the fact that the USN ships come here and that the US Navy has seen fit to send one of its modern vessels and not one of its clapped-out, so-called conventional ships which the member for Fremantle is asking it to send purely as a tourist gimmick.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has two minutes.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Another point the member raised was rather quaint. He asked whether I expected to get some electoral advantage from this matter. He is saying in effect that the overwhelming number of Western Australians wanted a ship here. As far as I am concerned, the ship was brought here because we, as the State Government, believe it is time that this nation took a more realistic approach to defence. We welcome the fact that this is the first Prime Minister who has taken a personal and positive interest in trying to get meaningful defence for Western Australia.

Mr Bryce: Rubbish!

Mr McIver: Nonsense!

#### HOSPITAL LAUNDRY AND LINEN SERVICE

##### *Operations: Grievance*

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [5.33 p.m.]:

Mr Speaker—

Mr Bateman: That is rubbish!

Dr DADOUR: I have not started yet. The title of my grievance is "dirty linen, poor planning and industrial muscle". Less than two weeks ago there was a strike at the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service and within a few short days there was an acute shortage of clean linen in all our hospitals. This was an instance of industrial muscle being able to control our hospital services more effectively than if doctors or nurses had gone on strike. I refer to an article in *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 5th August. It is headed "Hospital union man halts linen". Part of the article reads—

The medical superintendent of Gairdner Hospital, Dr R. Kilgour, said that unless there was some relief within 24 hours from this morning the hospital might be forced to accept only emergency cases.

To me it is wrong that these people are able to halt such services and to wield such great power. I call that irresponsible. I do not care what they were striking about or what they were not striking about. The fact is that if doctors or nurses went on strike they would be held up to ridicule. But these people can blatantly do as they please.

Who started the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service? It was the Labor Government.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: It was the Government previous to this one.

Mr Bertram: Long overdue.

Dr DADOUR: It has given us a legacy that is beyond our comprehension. When we were in Opposition we warned that this sort of thing may happen as we have all our eggs in one basket. However, we are now saddled not only with the threat of industrial muscle but also with a very uneconomic and poor service.

There is always a shortage of linen in the hospitals and this service has engendered frequent complaints about the sub-standard work. It is uneconomic. The Hospital Laundry and Linen Service costs 61c a kilogram for clean, dry linen. Private enterprise will do the same job for 40c a kilogram. Secondly, the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service's initial bill for a 30-bed hospital is \$10 000 to buy the linen.

Mr Bertram: Did you inform the Government of this?

Dr DADOUR: The Labor Government introduced it.

Mr Bertram: Have you informed the present Government of this?

Dr DADOUR: The Government is aware of it.

Mr Bertram: What is it doing about it?

Dr DADOUR: The Labor Government introduced this and this is the legacy it has given us.

Mr Bertram: What is the Government doing about it?

Dr DADOUR: I am telling the House now. In private enterprise the initial outlay for linen is \$6 500 compared with \$10 000. The overall life of the linen within the linen and laundry service is 1½ years as against three years in private enterprise. So everything points at the moment to the fact that the linen service is not much good. On top of this, in spite of the high cost, we find that the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service is running at a loss. I tried to obtain figures for this year and they are not available, but in 1974-75 the loss was greater than \$200 000. So we have tip top prices, a poor service, a shortage of linen always and in addition the service is running at a loss.

Much of the initial equipment which was put into the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service has been found to be unsuitable and has had to be "flogged". We have had one failure after another.

The worst feature is that some of our teaching hospitals, when they changed to the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service, did not reduce their staff accordingly; they maintained their establishment. This meant that the wages and salaries that were normally paid to the laundry staff were still being paid because they had

been disbursed throughout the other departments in the hospital. This means that after paying salaries and wages we are confronted with a new item in the financial statements of the hospitals.

For instance, in 1974-75 we find in the Royal Perth Hospital's annual report that the linen service cost more than \$800 000. We are still maintaining the same establishment and we find a new cost item of \$800 000. That cost is for only 10 months, so goodness knows what it will be this year.

Some of the major metropolitan hospitals financed the building and equipping of this service with their loan funds over three years. Now the Government must pay back the loan and the interest on the loan; so there is a further loss. There have been continual complaints about the poor service and the standard of work and there is a continual shortage of linen in the hospitals.

I can well remember going to a social function at Princess Margaret Hospital last year. At that social function it was most noticeable that the beautiful white uniforms of the sisters were a yellow-brown colour down one side where the uniforms had been uniformly scorched.

The SPEAKER: The member has three minutes.

Dr DADOUR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This is typical of what we got from the shallow thinking and bad planning of the Labor Government when it was in power. As a result we have another monster and there is not one—

Several members interjected.

Dr DADOUR: Members opposite are screaming at the moment because they know they are guilty. We warned them at the time but they would not listen. This has cost the Government money in every direction.

Mr Bryce: Sell it! Give it away!

Dr DADOUR: I think this is one case in which the Labor Party was doing what it is always accusing us of doing, which is giving jobs to the boys. We have the high cost of the laundry, it is running at a loss, there is always a shortage of clean linen and often there is substandard work. We have the interest on the loan to pay back and there is no reduction in costs in some of the participating hospitals because they did not reduce their staff numbers. There is also the short life of the linen. The greatest ogre is that we have all our eggs in one basket. We are at the mercy of industrial muscle. I believe the only answer is to lease this monster to private enterprise.

Mr Bryce: That is the punch line!

Several members interjected.

Dr DADOUR: I do not feel that this is a lighthearted matter. I feel one of the most serious matters that one could bring

to the notice of the House is this supposed service that has come to be our legacy. The quicker we disband it or break it up, the better the situation will be. I am sure the only answer would be to lease it to private enterprise and then we will get a decent service at less cost.

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [5.44 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

Mr Bertram: A Dorothy Dixer!

Mr RIDGE: The Opposition might like to think that this is a Dorothy Dixer but I should say that unfortunately I was not told anything about the matter. However, I should like to point out that the member for Subiaco is quite correct when he claims that this monster of which he talks was in fact fashioned and built by the Labor Government despite the fact that the present Government, when in Opposition, opposed quite violently what it was trying to do.

If I recall correctly, the Government of the day introduced a Bill whereby various hospitals would be levied as a means of contributing towards the cost of these premises. The Bill was thrown out of the other place quite correctly and the Government of the day found other means of financing this service by utilising the minor borrowing powers of the various institutions which were going to put to use the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service.

The predictions made by the Opposition at that time have come true and I think they have been fairly clearly illustrated by the member for Subiaco.

There is good reason for concern. There have been shortages of linen and perhaps there are reasons for this of which I am not aware. Unreasonable demands have been made by the staff of the linen service and I understand a meeting will be conducted tomorrow to consider some of them.

Perhaps I should say that the honourable member's grievance is noted, and in doing so I should also say that he has painted a serious picture. There is cause for concern not just by the Government, but by all in the community because they are the people who pay for the service to which he is referring—a service which is not operating as effectively as the former Government believed it would. I do not know whether members opposite are happy with it. We certainly are not and if we can improve the situation we certainly will.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RIDGE: As I said, there is cause for concern. The predictions of the former Opposition have apparently come true and I can assure the honourable member that the Government will investigate these complaints and if there is a possible way

to overcome them and improve the situation so that less money will come out of the taxpayers' pockets, we will be happy to do this.

Mr Bertram: The quicker you do it the better.

## UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY

### *Government Action: Grievance*

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [5.47 p.m]: My grievance concerns the lack of action by the Court Government in its attitude to the future well-being of Western Australia, and especially its acceptance without murmur of the Fraser-Lynch disastrous economic policies.

Mr Shalders: Oh, come on!

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr HARMAN: As those policies apply in Western Australia no environment has been created for consumers to spend.

Mr Bertram: They are all unemployed.

Mr HARMAN: In fact what has happened is that because of the commitment by the Fraser-Lynch Government to a high level of unemployment the consumers in Western Australia are uncertain about their future. They have no confidence in the future and consequently instead of spending their money they are saving it; and members know what occurs when people do not spend money. Factories do not make goods, and men and women are unemployed. In addition the Fraser-Lynch disastrous economic policies have provided an increasing amount of unemployment in Australia and, in particular, in Western Australia.

The massive downturn in Commonwealth Government expenditure has led to private industry not being able to take up Government contracts which normally would be available. But because the finance has been cut off, these contracts are not available and therefore men are being dismissed. Secondly, because of the application of this so-called Fraser federalism Western Australia will have less money to spend in real terms in this financial year than it had previously. That will mean further unemployment in Western Australia.

Mr Bertram: And double tax.

Mr HARMAN: The Budget has already revealed that unemployment will rise by about 60 000 this year. In other words it will exceed 300 000 in Australia. We can guarantee that unemployment will also increase in Western Australia because of these policies and by Christmas we will have something like 30 000 people unemployed in Western Australia. The reason for their unemployment is the application of the new federalism and of Fraser's economic policies together with the lack of action by our State Government.

Mr Grayden: Absolute nonsense!

Mr HARMAN: Without a murmur the Government goes along with the Fraser economic policies. It is not concerned about the mass of people in Western Australia or the future of the young girls and boys who are at school this very day and will be leaving at the end of the year. This Government is not concerned one bit about them and the reason is that the same political party is in power in Canberra as is in power here. The State Government is not prepared to buck the political party in power in Canberra.

The other reason the State Government will not take action is that it has run out of ideas. It does not have an alternative to overcome unemployment in Western Australia. When we have this sort of situation we can easily guess fairly accurately what the future of Western Australia will be over the next few months.

Mr B. T. Burke: I would say it will improve in March next year.

Mr HARMAN: The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Anthony) made a speech at Broken Hill in June this year and at that time he clearly indicated the opportunities which would be available for resource development in Western Australia. We all know that the major trading countries of the world are emerging from their own recessions and that we can expect those countries, particularly Japan, to increase their orders for resources from Australia, particularly coal and iron ore and, later on, we hope, gas.

What will occur when these orders come in? I will tell members. Because the Fraser Government, assisted by the Court Government, has screwed the economy down so tightly that firms have not been able to invest and provide their factories with new plant, they have been forced to dismiss men and apprentices. Western Australia has no real trade training of any note at the present time. Therefore when the recovery does take place in the future our firms in Western Australia will not be geared to take advantage of it for the reasons I have just stated.

This means that we will be forced into providing instant technicians, instant mechanics, instant fitters, and so on. The only way we will be able to do this is to bring them in from other countries which means we will be forced to bring these people into Western Australia under contract for limited periods because we have not been able to do anything in the way of apprenticeship training or retraining of adult workers in Western Australia or any other State of the Commonwealth for that matter. That is what will occur when the recovery takes place. The reason is that this Government has not had the foresight to consider the problems which will occur when the recovery takes place, but is just sitting back hoping something will come out of the sky to solve the problems. Of course nothing will come out of the sky.

Once the recovery commences the business firms will not be in a position to respond immediately because the people trained in these areas will not be here. It will be rather difficult to train them immediately to take their place in the recovery and we will be forced to bring others in.

The SPEAKER: Did you hear me when I told you a little while ago you had only three minutes remaining?

Mr HARMAN: No I did not, Mr Speaker. This Government must take a stand.

Mr Bertram: No chance.

Mr HARMAN: So far the State Government has acquiesced in the Fraser-Lynch policies. The Fraser and Court Governments want a high rate of unemployment. For some reason I do not understand they believe that a high rate of unemployment will reduce inflation. However, it was pointed out in the Budget speech last night that a 12 per cent inflation rate is anticipated in this financial year. So I do not know how inflation will be reduced by unemployment.

What this Government ought to be doing is what it promised to do in 1974; that is, stand up to Canberra. It is obvious that this Government is not standing up to Canberra. It wants our future citizens of the State—the boys and girls at present at school and who will leave at the end of the year—to be receivers of the dole and not have the opportunity to go into some meaningful employment. That is my real concern and I think it is about time the Government took a stand on the matter.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) (5.55 p.m.): In answer to the grievance of the member for Maylands I want to say that if I had a handkerchief which was nice and clean and big enough I would send it to him to dry up those crocodile tears, because if there is anyone who should bow his head in shame it is he who supported the policies of the Whitlam Government and now supports the ALP policies enunciated at Federal level—policies which would give us bigger and bigger deficits, more and more inflation, and more and more unemployment.

The Commonwealth Fraser Government announced last night a Budget which I believe was a very responsible one made in very difficult times.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: If one looks at the Budget one will see that it not only gives incentive in an effort to get investment confidence back again, but also contains the very necessary machinery for indexation of taxation—personal income tax—which is a direct benefit to every wage and salary earner. On top of that it pays proper regard for the defence of the nation and for the people who are needy. It embodies all these things.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I remind members opposite that the Fraser Government inherited a deficit which was running at over \$5 000 million and had to take action, unpleasant though it was, to try to save this country from ruin and take the edge off that deficit.

When the year ended at the 30th June, 1976, the Fraser Government had taken the edge off the deficit. To do that it took the necessary stress and strain and was prepared to face up to the unpopularity that went with it. It has now brought down another Budget in a responsible way to reduce the deficit further. The Federal Government acted very responsibly in not trying to reduce the deficit too quickly because had it gone any further than it has it could have brought quite a lot of trouble in its wake.

I believe that the way the Federal Government has acted in an endeavour to reduce the deficit in stages over a period of years is sensible and responsible. One would have thought that those people opposite who are so concerned about unemployment would be singing the praises of a Budget which spells out very clearly a few incentives in an endeavour to get investment decisions made for the benefit of this State and country which are, above all, vital to employment and to the young people who are wanting meaningful career opportunities when they get their degrees and leave the various tertiary educational institutions.

However, we do not hear a word about this. The cold, hard facts are that in a realistic way the Commonwealth Government has spelt out these incentives to try to get petroleum exploration and development accelerated and all forms of mining accelerated and to try to get secondary industry reactivated again. The Federal Government acknowledges the fact that three-quarters of the job opportunities in Australia are created by the private sector. This is what the Whitlam Government would not accept until the bitter end when suddenly, when Hayden came on the Treasury scene, the Federal Government started to realise that business must be profitable and that the only way to create jobs was through private enterprise. However, it was too late. People would not trust that Federal Government any longer.

Then there was a change of Government, and the present Federal Government has introduced a Budget which I believe, given a chance to work, will in fact resolve the problems of unemployment and inflation. This will not be done overnight. When the Budget is introduced, no button is pressed and everything achieved instantly by magic. The pattern and groundwork are laid for the economy to start to work in a different way and in a different direction.



So my belief is that as from now people will start to look at Australia in an entirely different way.

Several members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members of the Opposition are dead scared they will do just that.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members of the Opposition are dead scared a few people will make the right decisions. They are dead scared we might get some very good investment decisions in the next few months and they will be so unhappy when the people of this State rejoice and say, "Thank goodness we have the Fraser Government in Canberra and the Liberal-Country Party Government in Western Australia to get things moving again!"

What have we seen by way of reaction from the other side of politics in Australia, including the industrial wing which is so closely interwoven with the political wing at the ALP level that one cannot tell one from the other? Have we seen any sense of responsibility since the arbitration commission at the Commonwealth level tried to sound a warning and get some co-operation out of the unions? All we have seen are demands for more wages. There has been no talk about productivity or about making us competitive. So on the other side at both the industrial level—the militant section of it anyhow—

Mr McIver: The left wing?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, the left wing, and in the ALP itself, which is now so extremely left that we cannot recognise it as what it used to be a few years ago—we see them demanding more money for less work. There is no future for the work force in that atmosphere.

We must have union leaders who are prepared to say, "Let us have a breather; let us catch up on productivity; let us get a bit of effort and performance so that we can become competitive in the market and sell our raw materials, be they food, fibres, minerals, or metals." It is about time members opposite stood up in their places and went to their various organisations—whether the ALP or the union movement—and said to those people, "It is about time we all took a good look at ourselves. It is about time we stopped screaming out for more wages and less work. It is time we caught up and became competitive and got on top of inflation." The amount of work available in Australia for the work force—and there is more to come—is limitless the moment we can get on top of this inflationary spiral and get rid of the militancy.

I completely reject the arguments of the Opposition. The fact is the Fraser Government brought down a Budget which is responsible. It gives incentive to the people who have to make investments, it

acknowledges the needy, it acknowledges the need for tax relief through indexation on personal income, and it acknowledges a number of factors which will contribute to profitability which again creates confidence. In all the circumstances, I think the Budget should be applauded.

The SPEAKER: Grievances have been noted.

## BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
2. City of Perth Parking Facilities Act Amendment Bill.
3. Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

## FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Third Reading

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Police) [6.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. T. H. JONES (Collie) [6.06 p.m.]: This measure to amend the Firearms Act was before the House last night. During the second reading and Committee stages I raised a question in relation to the amendment contained in clause 2(3) of the Bill, which reads—

An interstate group permit issued under this section shall not be granted for any period in excess of seven days.

It will be recalled that we on this side of the House felt the period of seven days was far too restrictive and recommended that one month be the permissible period for any bona fide group to remain in Western Australia for the purposes set out in the Bill.

I thank the Minister for agreeing to the Opposition's suggestion. No doubt he saw the merit in it and he has indicated that in another place he will have the Bill amended to provide that anyone coming into Western Australia under these conditions may be granted permission to stay for 28 days. I commend the Minister for giving consideration to the move initiated by the Opposition. We feel this is far more sensible. It will give the members of a shooting group more time to spend in Western Australia and will promote tourism in the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## LAW REFORM COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

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

### BILLS (6): THIRD READING

1. Stock Diseases (Regulations) Act Amendment Bill.
2. Cattle Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

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

3. Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Act Amendment Bill.

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

4. Alsatian Dog Act Repeal Bill.

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

5. Veterinary Preparations and Animal Feeding Stuffs Bill.

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

6. Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neill (Minister for Water Supplies), and transmitted to the Council.

### ORDER OF THE DAY No. 8.

#### *Postponement*

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [6.11 p.m.]: I move—

That Order of the Day No. 17 be taken before Order of the Day No. 8.

Question put and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 6.12 to 7.30 p.m.*

## LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [7.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It is a great pleasure for me to introduce this Bill to the House because the intent of the measure is to provide long service leave of 13 weeks—commonly referred to as three months—after 10 years' continuous service for certain workers in the private sector.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr HARMAN: At present these workers receive three months' long service leave after 15 years' continuous employment. Long service leave is practically unique to Australia. Some of the reasons for this will become obvious as I trace the history of long service leave in Western Australia.

Long service leave was first available to public servants in the Colony under the old Colonial Office regulations which provided for three months' leave on full pay after six years' continuous service. This type of leave was granted so that public servants could return to Britain for a holiday, or on furlough, as it was referred to.

On achieving self government in 1890, Western Australia continued to apply the Colonial Office regulations until in 1900 the Forrest Government, which was in office from 1890 to 1901, passed the Public Service Act which incorporated this particular regulation dealing with long service leave. So in 1900 State public servants had the benefit of three months' long service leave after six years' employment. This Act applied only to State public servants and not to wages workers employed by the State Government.

In 1902 the Public Service Act was amended so that public servants could have six months on full pay after 14 years, or three months' long service leave on full pay after seven years' continuous service.

It is interesting to consider the history of this particular legislation in 1902. An amending Bill was first introduced into the Legislative Council by the then Minister for Lands (the Hon. A. Jameson), in the James Government, which was in office from 1902 to 1904.

The amending Bill contained no amendment to the existing long service leave entitlement of three months' full pay after six years' service. The Bill passed the Legislative Council, but in the Legislative Assembly it was amended so that three months' long service leave would apply after 10 years, or six months after 20 years.

During the debate the Colonial Secretary of the time said, when referring to the existing legislation of three months' leave after six years—

I say unhesitatingly that Section 29 of the present Act is absolutely ruinous to the State.

This can be found at page 1144 of the *Parliamentary Debates for Western Australia* Vol. 21 of the year 1902.

The amended Bill was returned to the Council and it was stated that the period set by the Assembly was too long—in other words, going from six to 10 years and three months' long service leave in the opinion of the Legislative Council in 1902 was considered to be too long.

As a compromise the Minister for Lands accepted an amendment of three months' long service leave after seven years' continuous employment. That further amendment was accepted by the James Government in the Legislative Assembly and has remained in force ever since. So we find that State public servants since 1902 have enjoyed the benefit of three months' long service leave after seven years' continuous employment.

The next episode took place in 1927 during the time of the Collier Labor Government, when quite a large number of major reforms were undertaken. Most members will be aware of those reforms which were made in all areas of administration. It was a most successful era of government in Western Australia.

However, in 1927 the Collier Government introduced by administrative action a system under which wages employees of the Government became eligible for long service leave of three months after 10 years' continuous service.

So there we have in 1927 the Collier Government approving of long service leave for the blue collar workers in the State Government of three months after 10 years' continuous service. That was 49 years ago. Again there was a rather unique situation, but one that was accepted at that time in 1927. The principle of long service leave did not flow to non-Government workers until 1958.

Attempts had been made by unions to have their particular awards amended by the Western Australian Arbitration Court, but unless the consent of the employer was obtained—as in the award governing employees at Yampi Sound iron ore mining site in the Kimberley region—the court consistently refused to alter such awards; and the stand, I might add, taken by the Western Australian Arbitration Court was consistent with other State industrial tribunals.

But in 1951 the New South Wales Labor Government legislated to provide for non-Government workers to receive three months' long service leave after 20 years' continuous service. Similar legislation followed in Queensland in 1952, in Victoria in 1953, in Tasmania in 1956, and in South Australia in 1957.

In September of 1957 the Hawke Labor Government in Western Australia introduced legislation to provide for 13 weeks—three months—long service leave after 10 years, commencing on the 1st January, 1951. This Bill was amended in the Legislative Council; and I might add that in those days the Australian Labor Party never had a majority in the Legislative Council, as members well know.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Unusual!

Mr HARMAN: The Hawke Government allowed the Bill to lapse because it claimed at the time that the Council had refused

to approve an election promise for which the Labor Government had a mandate; in other words, the Government had a mandate from the people, given at an election, to remove this discrimination between non-Government workers and Government workers. However, the Legislative Council on that occasion saw fit to ignore the mandate the Hawke Government had received from the people and in effect it rejected this move by the Hawke Government.

Sir Charles Court: And the Hawke Government breathed a sigh of relief.

Mr T. H. Jones: You're joking, aren't you?

Sir Charles Court: No, I am not.

Mr HARMAN: The Legislative Council went further on that occasion and amended the Bill by inserting a provision to allow the Arbitration Court to cancel any awards containing long service leave after a period of less than 20 years.

This Bill was passed but it excluded all Government and semi-Government workers and all workers employed under industrial awards.

Earlier, in April, 1958, the ACTU and the Employers Federation had agreed upon a national code of long service leave of 13 weeks after 20 years' service. As a consequence all industrial awards in Western Australia were amended accordingly by consent.

The next episode took place in 1964, when the Brand-Nalder Liberal-Country Party Government amended the Long Service Leave Act to provide for 13 weeks' leave after 15 years' continuous service. I might add that this Bill was passed by the Legislative Council.

In 1973 the Tonkin Labor Government endeavoured, in accordance with an election promise undertaking for which obviously it had a mandate from the people, to amend the Long Service Leave Act to provide for 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' continuous service.

I think we all remember the clear statement made by the then leader of our party, Mr J. T. Tonkin, when he stated quite clearly that he would remove the discrimination that existed between Government and non-Government workers in the particular case of long service leave.

The Labor Party won the election in 1971 and Mr Tonkin had a clear mandate from the people to do exactly what he intended to do, which was to remove the discrimination that existed between Government and non-Government workers.

That particular move was made in Parliament after the South Australian Dunstan Labor Government had passed legislation in November, 1972, to provide for 13 weeks—three months—long service leave after 10 years' continuous employment.

We know what happened to the amendments sought by the Tonkin Labor Government. They were passed by the Legislative Assembly but were rejected by the Legislative Council which inserted a provision which meant that if a decision were made by the Industrial Commission in respect of award employees that decision would flow to non-award private employees.

The Legislative Council chose on that occasion to ignore the many legislative precedents in this and other States in respect of long service leave.

The following is the current position in Western Australia: State public servants enjoy three months' long service leave after seven years' employment. State industrial workers—that is, the blue collar workers—employed by the Western Australian Government enjoy three months' leave after 10 years' employment. However, the Commonwealth public servants and industrial employees employed by the Commonwealth enjoy three months' long service leave after 10 years' employment. The non-Government workers in Western Australia are allowed to take three months' long service leave after 15 years' continuous employment.

However, not all non-Government workers in Western Australia receive the same benefit. Many employees—for instance, those at Yampi Sound, the coal workers, and workers on iron ore projects—now enjoy three months' long service leave after 10 years' continuous employment.

Therefore, members can see there is obviously a great deal of discrimination. State Government workers receive one form of long service leave, Commonwealth workers receive another form, and yet another form of leave is received by the non-Government workers in Western Australia who, in certain areas covered by awards, are the worst off.

The next point I should like to make is that in 1972, legislation was passed in South Australia providing for non-Government workers to receive three months' long service leave after 10 years' employment. This means the non-Government workers in Western Australia are at a disadvantage when compared with their colleagues across the border in South Australia. I do not believe one could advance a very good argument to suggest that the economy of South Australia is greatly different from that of Western Australia.

It is true, of course, that South Australia is blessed with an excellent Labor Government, led by Mr Don Dunstan; and it is also true that Government has initiated a great number of reforms which have benefited the people of South Australia—one of which, of course, is the removal of discrimination in respect of long service leave.

On that point alone, we in Western Australia have an obligation to consider very carefully what our attitude should be towards non-Government workers in this State, bearing in mind the conditions enjoyed by their colleagues in South Australia. I am sure members of this Chamber would not wish to see our workers in Western Australia continue to be disadvantaged when compared with their colleagues in our neighbour State of South Australia.

The matter goes even deeper than that, because this State and the Australian Government have agreed to ILO convention 111; in fact, this convention has been ratified by the Australian Government, and it is beholden upon our administrators to ensure that convention is observed. Article 2 of convention 111 states—

Each member for which this Convention is in force undertakes to declare and pursue a national policy designed to promote, by methods appropriate to national conditions and practice, equality of opportunity and treatment in respect of employment and occupation, with a view to eliminating any discrimination in respect thereof.

I realise it is possible to argue against implementation of this convention on a State-by-State basis because it might be said to relate to a national policy. However, it is equally arguable that, although it may refer to a national policy, it should be taken to refer also to particular States, and should be observed by the particular States.

If we—as the Minister for Labour and Industry has done—travel to Geneva and attend an ILO convention to give recognition to the fact that we have accepted and ratified certain conventions, there is an obligation upon us to ensure we uphold the spirit of those conventions. I believe that when members reflect upon their position in relation to ILO convention 111, they will come to the conclusion that some action must be taken to remove this discrimination, which affects a handful of employees in Western Australia to whom this Parliament has a direct obligation, because they are not covered by awards and cannot participate in arguments put before the Industrial Commission in respect of long service leave, but must depend solely upon the legislators to uphold their rights and the benefits which might accrue to them.

Finally, I wish to refer to a case which came before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in 1971, in which a number of unions together with the Commonwealth Public Service unions sought four weeks' annual leave. I refer members to page 285 of the November-December edition of the Industrial Arbitration Service publication, *Current Review*, in which

is contained the full decision handed down by the commission. I should like to quote three or four paragraphs of the part relating to the application put forward by the Commonwealth public servants, as it is very important to my argument. It states as follows—

The alternative case for the public service unions was for an extra weeks leave to be granted to them alone. They argued that they were the only employees in the community who had had no increase in leave in seventy years and in particular that to the extent that the general increase to three weeks in 1963 had been a distribution of national growth, it was one from which they had been excluded.

We think this overlooks one fundamental change which has occurred in respect of the fixation of salaries of Commonwealth public servants. In recent years the Commonwealth Public Service Board has made attempts to equate the salary rates of public servants with the "going rates" outside. Public servants have in fact received substantial benefits in salary from this, but, even if they had not, the philosophy remains the same, that of attempting to ensure that there is no marked difference between the salaries of public servants and their opposite numbers outside. If this is a proper philosophy for wage fixation, then it is also a proper philosophy for the fixation of annual leave.

That argument could be expanded to apply to long service leave. The decision of the commission continued—

As mentioned earlier we were referred to the strain imposed by both modern living and the nature of modern work. It was put to us that public servants (and other white collar workers) suffered more than the community generally but we do not think that this has been demonstrated.

Two States have made decisions to give preferential treatment to governmental employees. This is their prerogative as employers of labour and we do not criticise them for what they have done. However in our task of fixing minimum annual leave standards we feel unable to follow them in preferring governmental employees to employees generally.

The last paragraph is most important. It states—

On the material and arguments put in these proceedings we can see no reason why all employees, blue collar and white collar, whether in public or private employment should not get the same minimum annual leave.

So, in 1971, the commission stated quite openly it could not see any reason that there should be any difference between Government and non-Government workers in respect of annual leave.

In 1973, the Federal Labor Government introduced four weeks' annual leave for its employees. Immediately, an approach was made to the State Industrial Commissions, the first of which was in Queensland; the argument was advanced that there was no reason public servants should receive any more leave than non-Government employees. The Queensland commission very quickly found in favour of the 1971 decision which I have just quoted, and other States soon followed suit.

So, that is the philosophy behind the approach of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission; namely, that there should be no difference between white collar and blue collar workers in respect of annual leave. As one reads that argument, one sees the same philosophy can be extended to include long service leave and, indeed, other conditions which apply in employment generally.

Basically, that is the argument I present to the House. Firstly, we have a history in Western Australia of Parliament amending long service leave provisions in respect of nonaward employees. Therefore, we claim we have a prerogative and, indeed, a responsibility now to ask Parliament to amend the law to bring the non-Government employees in Western Australia into line with their fellow workers in South Australia.

At the same time, I argue on the basis of the ILO convention; there is a duty upon us as legislators to ensure that those conventions to which we have agreed and which we have ratified are upheld. Thirdly, I argue that in view of the 1971 decision of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that there should be no discrimination between Government and non-Government workers, whether white or blue collar, the same conditions of employment should obtain for such workers in Western Australia.

On those three grounds I make a strong appeal to the members of this House to bear in mind the proposition contained in the Bill. No doubt, we will hear from the Minister for Labour and Industry; probably not at the moment, but on another occasion. I think he is now concentrating in his seat! In time we will hear his argument presented to us.

It would be the same argument that was presented to us in 1973 when I tried to induce this Parliament to agree to the proposition of four weeks' annual leave for all employees. We heard the same argument adduced in the case of the long service leave legislation—that industry cannot afford to pay for these concessions. On every occasion that the Labor Party

has put up an argument for the introduction of reforms such as this one, we heard the same argument from the conservatives that industry could not afford to pay for the concessions.

There is no validity in that argument, because we have seen in the past similar reforms granted, and there was no serious effect on the economy of the country as a result. I anticipate the same argument will be put up again on this occasion. It is a futile argument, and history shows that it has no real basis. I hope the Government will not see fit to apply that argument in this case. It should learn from history that this is not a valid argument.

Mr Grayden: It will lead us to the position in which the United Kingdom finds itself.

Mr HARMAN: I have proved beyond doubt that I have put up a strong case for the Government to answer. Parliament should agree to the passage of the Bill, so that people, who have no other avenues of assistance and who must rely on their members of Parliament to take necessary action, will have this discrimination against them removed. By this means we will bring the non-Government workers into line with the workers in the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. Only a handful of people are involved in this proposition. I suggest we use this opportunity to make some dramatic changes to the legislation so that the people to whom I am referring will receive what I consider to be their just entitlement.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry).

## NUCLEAR PRODUCTS

### *Examining Committee: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 19th May, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

That the House condemn the suggestion that Western Australia should be involved in the re-processing of nuclear fuel or that this State should become a dumping ground for nuclear waste from overseas. The House is of this opinion because of—

(1) The extreme and often unquantifiable dangers to the people from such an industry including carcinogenesis and genetic mutations;

(2) The likelihood of the introduction of terrorist groups to Western Australia because of the value for their purposes of plutonium 239;

(3) The inability of technology to provide adequately for environmental safeguard.

The House further affirms that it will not be discharging its obligations to the safety and welfare of the public unless it establishes a committee to examine the consequences of such an industry and reports its findings to the Parliament and hence to the people at an early date.

MR MOILER (Mundaring) [8.04 p.m.]: This motion was moved by the member for Morley on the 12th May. It arose from the fact that the public of Western Australia were given the impression that the Premier was preparing to hold discussions with a group of Japanese who were coming to Western Australia. It appeared that such discussions were quite possible. It was suggested that Western Australia would be used as a dumping ground for nuclear waste.

One of the first interviews the Premier had on this question was broadcast on the "AM" programme on the 3rd May, prior to the moving of the motion by the member for Morley on the 12th May. Among other things, the Premier was asked—

But it has been alleged that if the plan goes ahead, the State would become a dumping ground for nuclear wastes, now does that worry you?

The Premier replied—

Look I don't know who says these things and I don't know why people bother to publish them. There is always someone around, particularly in the opposition as its constituted at the present time, trying to scare people, trying to strike fear into their minds instead of looking at the thing in a sensible way,—

Mr Watt: That sounds to be a fair comment.

Mr MOILER: To continue with what the Premier said—

—look we're a Government that wants to survive and we wouldn't agree to things that would be detrimental to people or detrimental to the environment or detrimental to the economy. Whatever happens, it will be on our terms and not on somebody else's terms.

I would like to spend some time in analysing that statement by the Premier. He said the Opposition was always trying to scare people and to strike fear into their minds.

The motion moved by the member for Morley, which the Premier opposed, suggests that members of Parliament should make a genuine attempt to obtain information so that they can assess their opinion on a major issue, based on advice available to them. How can it be suggested that the motion moved by the member for Morley would in any way strike fear in the minds of the people, or scare the people? What the motion proposes is

what the Premier has advocated we should be doing; that is, to look at the situation in a sensible way.

I stress that the Premier said at the interview—

We're a Government that wants to survive and we wouldn't agree to things that would be detrimental to people or detrimental to the environment or detrimental to the economy.

Here again the Premier said that the dumping of this waste within Australia would not be detrimental to the people or the environment. I suggest that no-one can say the dumping of nuclear waste would not be detrimental to the people and the environment.

A constituent of mine wrote a letter to the Press which was not published.

Mr Nanovich: Is he a Labor supporter?

Mr MOILER: He is not. Whilst in most respects he is quite an intelligent man, on the matter of political party support he acts quite dumb. He would be one who would support the Premier in many of his statements.

The Premier has been reported as saying, "We would not do anything in this regard until it was shown that it was completely safe." However, no-one has been able to show the Premier it is completely safe. I am quite certain that I would hold the opinion which is held by the vast majority of people that they would not trust the Premier to make the decision as to whether or not nuclear waste should be dumped in Western Australia. He would be the last person that the vast majority of Australians would entrust with this decision.

Mr Grayden: That is what you say.

Sir Charles Court: You do not happen to be the majority.

Mr MOILER: It has been pointed out to me by my colleague next to me that the Premier has made an interjection. I failed to hear it. I would appreciate it if the Premier would speak up loudly.

Sir Charles Court: I said it very loudly, and I say it again: You do not happen to be the majority.

Mr MOILER: I have never claimed that I was the majority. What I did say was that I would be voicing the opinion of the vast majority when I say I would not trust the Premier with this decision.

Sir Charles Court: You do not happen to be the majority.

Mr MOILER: I would not entrust this decision with the Premier. He would be the last person in the world to whom we would entrust it.

Sir Charles Court: I think that is fair comment from your side of the House, but not from the public who matter.

Mr MOILER: I shall emphasise the point I was making. In the last part of the interview of the 3rd May broadcast on the "AM" programme the Premier stated—

... there may be circumstances under which waste is disposed of which is completely safe and surely if there is such a way, not only us but any other country would do it.

If there is a completely safe way to dispose of nuclear waste Japan would not be wanting to dump it in Western Australia; and no problems would exist in England, Japan, and other countries processing uranium in regard to the dumping of waste.

I emphasise again that there is no safe way to dispose of the waste. Any Government which suggests that a safe way will be found in the future is making a wrong assumption. However, that was the implication of the Premier when he spoke to the motion. He said, "We do not have a solution, but we will find one. If we do not it is just too bad for future generations."

When the time arrives for a decision to be made, we believe it should be made on the understanding that all members of this House have been provided with every opportunity to assess for themselves the dangers, the benefits, and the other factors which could arise in uranium processing and development within Australia.

One of my constituents has handed me a file dealing with this matter, and this person has taken a great interest in uranium development. In that file is an article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* of the 18th January, 1976. It states in part—

It has been well stated by Alvin Weinberg, former director of the AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory:—

Mr A. R. Tonkin: He is an expert.

Mr MOILER: He is definitely an expert, and the Premier has suggested that we should listen to the experts. To continue with the article—

—"We nuclear people have made a Faustian bargain with society."

The member for Morley has referred to most of what the writer of the article stated. The point I make is that at the conclusion of his statement Mr Weinberg said—

The society must then make the choice, and this is a choice that we nuclear people cannot dictate.

Society, laymen, and members of Parliament like myself—if we are honest—will admit that we know very little about uranium processing and nuclear development. I venture to suggest that the Premier might be the only member in this House who would claim that he knew a great deal about uranium development.

It often happens that when one listens to the Premier one finds that he implies he knows enough about every matter to enable him to make major decisions. When one does not agree with what the Premier says, invariably he accuses one of being in the "Stop everything group", of being a fifth columnist, and of not knowing what one is talking about.

Even on the Tresillian issue—whilst I appreciate this might embarrass the Premier—when four members of his own party at long last showed some courage, or fear of being defeated at the next election, and came out and indicated they were not prepared to support the Premier, the Premier used his stock answer in saying that they did not know all the facts. When they disagreed with him he said they did not know all the circumstances, and obviously they were wrong in their decision.

Mr Bertram: Those four dissidents will vote for the Premier's amendment to the motion.

Mr MOILER: Whenever the Premier is stuck and unable to debate a point on sensible grounds; when he is unable to convince those who disagree with him that his facts are sound, and that he can prove his case, he resorts to attempts to degrade other people's knowledge.

Mr Grayden: You have been talking about the Premier for half an hour. Why not get back to the motion?

Mr McIver: He is doing all right.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MOILER: I assure the Minister for Labour and Industry that I do not know very much about uranium development, or nuclear fission. However, that is why I intend to support the motion.

Mr Grayden: You have not mentioned the motion; you have been abusing the Premier for half an hour.

Mr MOILER: I have been abusing his attitude, and I would emphasise that the Premier has been the only member from that side who has spoken.

Mr Grayden: You are still on the subject.

Mr McIver: He has stated what the Premier said. Members opposite are not strong enough to oppose the Premier, but the people will be at the next election. Let us have an election as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mundaring.

Mr MOILER: I point out to the Minister for Labour and Industry that the Premier was the only person who spoke from that side of the Chamber. The Premier said—

We condemn the first part of the motion—

In saying "We" the Premier is including all members on the Government side. To continue his remarks—

—moved by the member for Morley because he is virtually saying we are not prepared to talk to anybody . . .

Mr May: You will be battling to talk about him now; there goes your argument.

Mr MOILER: We are aware of the practice of making quiet interjections which can be heard only by *Hansard*. I can understand the Premier leaving his seat. I do not know how it is possible for the Premier to condemn a motion which, in part, reads—

. . . the House condemns the suggestion that Western Australia should be involved in the re-processing of nuclear fuel or that this State should become a dumping ground for nuclear waste from overseas.

I fail to see how members in this House could not be in favour of a motion of that kind. We, on this side, certainly cannot follow that reasoning. As members of Parliament we should want to ensure that Western Australia is not used as a dumping ground for nuclear waste.

Among those learned gentlemen who certainly should know something about nuclear power and uranium development is Sir Macfarlane Burnet. In a recent article, he said—

. . . he believed that his views "must be held by every man with a realistic knowledge of the implications of major nuclear conflict and some understanding of the aggressive aspects of human nature."

Sir Macfarlane Burnet was a former chairman of the Commonwealth Radiation Advisory Committee. He most definitely was against uranium development. At a recent seminar of some sort—I am not quite sure of the occasion—Sir Macfarlane Burnet came out and spoke against uranium development.

Mr P. V. Jones: What do you mean by "uranium development"? What does it mean?

Mr MOILER: The mining and selling of uranium. Sir Macfarlane Burnet stated recently that Australia should not export uranium until such time as the major nations of the world came to an agreement on the control and the policing of the use of uranium in nuclear development. I think Sir Macfarlane Burnet is in a position to make a decision on whether development should take place. He did not understate the difficulty in obtaining such an agreement. He stated quite clearly that if agreement was not forthcoming no-one could ensure that nuclear war would not arise from nuclear development.

Mr Coyne: No-one can be sure, anyway.

Mr MOILER: So the member opposite accepts the fact that one cannot be sure. Sir MacFarlane Burnet suggests that until



we have a world-wide policing of the use of uranium we should not be a party to its use. We should not contribute to the dangers of such development.

Mr P. V. Jones: How are we contributing now?

Mr MOILER: We will be contributing.

Mr P. V. Jones: Then we are not contributing now.

Mr MOILER: It has been suggested that nuclear power reactors will be developed. Obviously, it would appear that many of the companies and the countries involved are aware that because of the high cost and the opposition to such development, there may be better ways of providing energy. The Royal Dutch Shell Co. has stated that it is beginning to question whether there is any commercial future in nuclear plants because of the capital involved and also on environmental grounds. That company, which has been heavily involved in the past, is seriously considering pulling out. The US Nuclear Power Company, the biggest in the world, is concerned with rising costs and the growing public concern with regard to safety, and it is beginning to question whether or not nuclear power stations are the answer to the energy problem, and whether or not it should be concentrating its efforts in other directions.

Mr P. V. Jones: What basis have you for saying that?

Mr MOILER: The basis for that statement is that in America the number of nuclear power stations is decreasing, and not increasing.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not so.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That is right; four were sold last year. The number is falling very markedly.

Mr Skidmore: Any further comment?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mundaring.

Mr MOILER: I claim to have a very limited knowledge of uranium development.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You are an honest man.

Mr MOILER: I have already said I accept that Western Australia will never have a nuclear reactor. However, that is no reason that we should contribute to nuclear development, and contribute to the danger to Western Australia by accepting waste from other countries. We will also contribute to world danger by entering the export market for uranium products.

The motion moved by the member for Morley continues—

The House is of this opinion because of—

(1) The extreme and often unquantifiable dangers to the people from such an industry including carcinogenesis and genetic mutations;

(2) The likelihood of the introduction of terrorist groups to Western Australia because of the value for their purposes of plutonium 239;

(3) The inability of technology to provide adequately for environmental safeguard.

The fact that there are no environmental safeguards has never been disputed by anyone in this House, and for anyone to talk about nuclear development, without adequate safeguards, it should be considered reckless. The motion concludes—

The House further affirms that it will not be discharging its obligations to the safety and welfare of the public unless it establishes a committee to examine the consequences of such an industry and reports its findings to the Parliament and hence to the people at an early date.

I do not understand how members opposite can claim there is anything wrong with that motion. Not one member opposite, except for the Premier, has attempted to demonstrate that he knows very much about uranium development. Members opposite are either so well informed that they do not need to speak to the matter, or they are stupid and are prepared to accept everything the Premier puts up to them. The Premier, when replying to the motion moved by the member for Morley, stated—

My advice is: let us get with it, but let us get with it on our terms. The only way we can get with it on our terms is to ensure that at least we talk to the people who have the desire, the capacity, and the need to develop these things.

Who talks to the people? Only the Premier, and perhaps one of his stooges, have done any talking to the group from Japan.

Mr Sodeman: Who did the talking when the Labor Party was in Government?

Mr Old: They all did.

Mr MOILER: The member opposite has emphasised my point. The Premier, and the Minister for Mines, do the talking for the whole of the Government. That was the case when deputations came here from other countries. If members opposite are stupid enough to believe that their Premier and their Minister for Mines are adequately informed to make a decision in a matter such as this, I am not surprised. It seems that the only two people who know anything about nuclear development are the Premier and the Minister for Mines. The Premier has said, "Let us have talks; we will make the decisions." The Premier claimed that the Government would not do anything to harm the environment or the economy. He is always considering the economy.

The Premier went further. He said—

So we want to get people here, people who have the knowledge, the desire, and the need for this energy. We want to talk to them and to hear about the new developments that are taking place.

He emphasised "we". That, of course, means the Premier himself and the Minister for Mines. If a committee were set up to examine the consequences of a uranium industry in this State, we could all hear about new developments and obtain the latest information on what is happening in the nuclear industry and the different countries throughout the world.

The Premier is telling us not to worry. He has the Government members well and truly regimented. He knows they will accept his view that it is good enough for the Premier and one of his Ministers to talk with anyone who may want to come here to deposit his nuclear waste. What the member for Morley suggests is that rather than the Premier holding these discussions, those of us who are interested enough should also be able to obtain any information we require before making a decision about uranium development.

I have certainly tried to emphasise my belief that we, as laymen—as the Premier has suggested—know little or nothing about uranium development. At least I am prepared to concede that point, but I would like to know more about it. I do not believe that facilities are available for Opposition members or Government backbenchers to find out everything they should know about uranium development before making a decision in this House. The member for Morley has moved a motion so that we can take steps to make this information more easily acquired by members on both sides of the House. It is an excellent recommendation, and I believe it should be supported.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [8.32 p.m.]: The main feature of this motion is in the last paragraph which calls for a committee to examine the consequences of an industry developing uranium in this State. It is significant that at the present time the Commonwealth has such an inquiry under way in regard to the Northern Territory. This tribunal, chaired by Mr Justice Fox, is investigating the environment and other aspects of the proposed Ranger development in the Northern Territory. It is also significant that the organisation known as Friends of the Earth is interested in the Fox inquiry. The Friends of the Earth organisation has an overt fear of the development of atomic energy. I do not want to place myself in the same category as members of that body, but I believe that such organisations in the community are good safeguards against those of us

who will, for the sake of industrial development or the almighty dollar, enter into an agreement for development for which we will be very sorry in the future, or for which generations coming after us will be very sorry. These organisations serve a very useful purpose.

**Mr Bertram**: Are they the fifth columnists?

**Mr JAMIESON**: Yes, I suppose the Premier would refer to these people as fifth columnists. At least, they would be fifth columnists to his development and progress, as he sees it. The Friends of the Earth is important because it reminds us that we can cause damage which we will not be able to undo at a later stage.

It is also interesting to note that the Friends of the Earth organisation has access to some interesting information through a benevolent person in the office of the Mary Kathleen project. This person forwarded a number of documents from the company and included personal notes setting out figures. It is interesting that Mr Rod Carnegie, Chairman and Chief Executive of Conzinc Riotinto Ltd., not so very long ago had lunch with the President of the ACTU (Mr Bob Hawke). After this lunch Mr Carnegie made full notes of what took place at the meeting, and his reaction to certain questions put to him was very interesting. I am reading from *The National Times* of the 16th to 21st August, which sets out the full context of this meeting in Mr Carnegie's memo to Mr Harding, who is CRA General Manager, Corporate Development, for that firm. He said—

I had lunch yesterday with Bob Hawke who stressed that the uranium issue would be a major political and union problem. He asked me what my own attitude was to the exports of uranium. I replied there are three separate aspects.

1. There would be no risk at all to any Australian in the mining, milling or shipment of yellowcake.

I can quite believe that. One does not have to know a great deal about science to know that there would be no danger to workmen dealing with this yellowcake, although I would like to point out that at one stage we believed mining asbestos did not cause any harm to anyone. However, some years later when we had cases of asbestosis cropping up, we found this was a severe scourge and it was worth while cutting out the production of asbestos to save lives and avoid other problems. I do not know whether all the medical ramifications have been examined, but I would say that this first paragraph seemed to deal with any aspect of radioactivity one might suspect to be present, and apparently it is not there at that stage.

Mr Carnegie then said—

2. Australia is part of the world and the products of nuclear reactors worry me in two respects.

Do not forget that this man is very important in the field we are discussing. He goes on to say—

(a) The possibility of terrorists getting hold of materials from which bombs could be made. I thought this was not very likely since easier targets for terrorism existed. It could be met by Australia emphasising that purchasing Governments take particular care to defend potentially fissionable material.

Let us examine this statement a little further. It is very difficult to know what will happen to this material once it is out of our care. As far back as the 7th August, 1972, at a meeting in Sydney, Mr M. C. Timbs of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission discovered he had a problem on his hands over the proposal to sell uranium to Taiwan. Australia had no bilateral safeguard agreement with Taiwan, and the uranium was eventually sold through an agent in America because we had such an agreement with America and Taiwan had a bilateral safeguard agreement with America.

This shows even at the top level of knowledge in this field, a great fear exists that control of such substances could be lost very easily and we could then be on the receiving end of something that was most undesirable. The memo continued—

(b) Radioactive wastes and their disposal. I said the wastes could not be proved to be safe but I assessed the risks as being less than those from road accidents and technology is improving all the time in the ability to handle.

Of course, the road accident toll is fairly heavy. I too believe that man eventually will conquer all the problems he foists on himself, but I feel we are attempting to move too quickly. Scientists did not succeed in splitting the atom until shortly prior to the last war. Much development took place during the war years, but this was very hasty development for defensive or offensive purposes. We are still in the aftermath of that period; we have not really caught up with ourselves and we do not know the damage that can be done. Mr Carnegie is a big man in the Mary Kathleen field, and he knows there is a risk. Finally he said—

3. Australia will need all the uranium exports it can get in the early 80s to pay for the oil imports.

This is what Mr Carnegie said to Bob Hawke, the President of the ACTU, while they were at lunch.

I have lunched with a few people lately, and I hope they are not taking notes of what I am saying. I do not think the

notes would read quite as well as this does and a transcript would not come out too well in a debate in Parliament. Discussions I have over lunch do not usually follow this line, but that was the choice of these two gentlemen.

It appears as though Mr Carnegie was prepared, in his own mind, to excuse any dangers that were inherent in the development of uranium in Australia under the veneer of economic necessity to have finance to buy oil in the 1980s. In effect, that is what he was saying. I do not think we can just wipe out our problems with a necessity such as that. There are other features to which we must give serious thought.

In moving this motion my colleague has highlighted the dangers. He referred to specific points, but finally he asked that the matter be examined. I have spoken to some of our American friends in recent days as I thought the attitude expressed by the Premier on the subject of atomic reactors and associated matters had caused some impetus in the objection to them.

I would like to refer to Mr Tamaki, the right-wing senator in the Japanese Parliament. Quite a long article appeared in the local Press about Mr Tamaki and his activities, and this article was then carried by the Press throughout Australia. Mr Tamaki is committed to the nuclear arming of the Japanese defence forces, and he has tried to commit the Japanese Government to this aim also. Under no circumstances would I be associated in dealing with such a person. He could be too dangerous to handle. We must bear in mind the opinion of the Mary Kathleen executive, who felt there was reason to believe that there are problems. He thought we could come to some sort of agreement, but could we really rely on such an agreement? Uranium could get out of control at some stage; it may be used to produce plutonium 239, and we would then be involved in all sorts of problems.

It is not only my colleague, the member for Morley, who makes a speciality of this subject; and one should not take the view that he has some bent or kink in respect of these matters. It is his desire to do this, and I admire him for it. It is not only the member for Morley who is sounding warnings, because if we look at headlines in the newspapers we find that in *The Sunday Times* of the 9th May, a leader article criticised the Premier for the attitude he expressed. Then we have a headline in *The West Australian* of the 4th May stating that the ALP takes a stand on nuclear waste—that is not unusual, because the ALP often takes a stand on matters of importance.

Then we see a heading in the *Daily News* of the 4th May, "Commonwealth alarm at N-plant"; and another in the same paper

the next day, "Horror problem of atomic wastes" and, on the same day, "Nuclear waste denied". The latter headline refers to the disposal of nuclear waste in Australia. In every case these articles have been written by or are the comments of experts.

In *The West Australian* of the 7th May we see the headline, "Court silent on visit". The Premier was asked whether Mr Tamaki's proposed visit would take place, but he declined to answer. Then in *The West Australian* of the 8th May we see another heading, "Physicists warn on N-waste". The article states that some of the State's top physicists called for the establishment of an independent body to safeguard nuclear treatment operations in Western Australia. The physicists warned that the Premier should not be prepared to accept nuclear waste. Then another heading, "Australia warned of energy problems" appeared in *The West Australian* of the 12th May. There are many more similar headings.

A Press release was issued on behalf of physicists from the Physics Departments of the University of Western Australia and the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and on behalf of physicists at Murdoch University. In that Press release nuclear dangers were stressed. These are important people, and we must take some notice of them.

I think the member for Mundaring said earlier that the Premier had said we must take notice of experts. Surely these people are experts in their field, and they have given us a warning. If we do not heed their warning now it may be too late to heed it later on.

Lest members may wish to interpret the policy of the ALP and to say it is completely opposed to nuclear power, as the Minister for Conservation and the Environment tried to imply by way of interjection earlier, I hasten to indicate that policy. It is probably best summarised by referring to an article in *The West Australian* of the 18th June, this year, when the Western Australian delegate to the Federal Executive of the Australian Labor Party (Mr McMullan) said that at the last annual conference—in January of last year—the party had decided its policy would be to work towards the enrichment of Australian uranium in plants built in Australia. He was dealing at that time with a motion which sought to prohibit the mining of uranium, and he said it would be difficult for the executive to interpret that uranium could be enriched without being mined. The Federal President (Mr Hawke) immediately ruled out the motion. That clearly states the policy of the Australian Labor Party; we will not be silly in dealing with new scientific means, whether they be in the field of uranium or in other areas. However, we do want to see things progress in an

orderly way and in such a manner that we may be sure that we do not live—or die—to regret what we have done.

I do not think there is anything wrong with a motion that aims to do just that, and my colleague has certainly framed his motion to say that he wishes to inform himself and, indeed, the public of Western Australia, regarding just how far we should go without further scientific proof that we are not overstepping the mark. It would appear from information that was leaked to the Friends of the Earth that Australia has a very high potential for the supply of atomic energy in the form of uranium. It would appear that we could produce something like almost one-third of the available uranium energy within the very near future. That would be within a couple of decades, and it might not be desirable at this stage for that development to occur.

As the Premier has said, sure these projects can get off the ground fairly easily because there is a good price for uranium and they can be financed more easily than some other mineral developments; but it is not always the dollar that counts. What counts is being sure that when we are earning the dollar we are not doing damage worth more than the dollar we earn.

So I suggest to the House that we play safe on this occasion and accept the proposition of the member for Morley so that we may be better informed and so that when we support a proposition in respect of the mining of uranium, or any other fissionable material—if there are any—in this country we are aware of what we are doing and are sure that the generations that follow us will be able to enjoy an environment as good as the one we enjoy today.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion moved by my colleague.

**MR P. V. JONES** (Narrogin—Minister for Conservation and the Environment) [8.51 p.m.]: In the course of the remarks made since the debate commenced, we must have been subjected to the most misleading lot of rubbish that we have ever had to put up with in respect of any motion. I will direct some remarks to one or two of the points which have been made. We have heard suggestions made about alleged leakages, and problems which have supposedly occurred—

**Mr A. R. Tonkin:** They are facts.

**Mr P. V. JONES:** —overseas in respect of certain facilities that have been constructed. However, because of the way the motion has been presented to this House, it presupposes that there will be no technological advancement at all, and that no advances have been made since these earlier installations were constructed.

**Mr A. R. Tonkin:** Earlier! Such as last year, and January of this year?

Mr P. V. JONES: Dr Weinberg has been referred to, and was quoted as making a certain statement. The statement quoted was made in 1972; surely that presupposes no advances have been made since then.

Mr Skidmore: Tell us if there have been advances.

Mr P. V. JONES: Reference has also been made to the declining interest of people in the United States in nuclear energy, and the generation of future energy resources by this means. In fact, Proposition 15 was referred to back in May. At that time a prophecy was made regarding what would be the result of that vote.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: An amount of \$3.5 million was spent on advertising.

Mr P. V. JONES: I was in California when that proposition was put to the vote, and by a vote of two to one the people supported the future generation of energy by nuclear means.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You know that advertisers will prostitute themselves.

Mr P. V. JONES: Nuclear energy was accepted as a means to provide the power that country will need. Did the acceptance of that proposition in any way deny the need for advancement in technology? The rigorous safety measures that are strenuously policed and increased—

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Are they? You are a naive little boy.

Mr P. V. JONES: I spent some time talking with the Sierra Club in San Francisco, which spent several million dollars on this matter. Its members accepted that in the long run this would be the means by which a considerable portion of the energy requirements of the United States would be generated.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Four were sold last year, compared with 35 two years earlier.

Mr P. V. JONES: In the United Kingdom it has now been publicly stated in a speech by Mr Wedgwood Benn, the responsible Minister of State for Energy, that by 1995 the basic energy resources of the United Kingdom would be generated by nuclear means and coal.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: They once said nuclear power would be so cheap it would not be worth metering it.

Mr P. V. JONES: Reference has also been made to solar, wave, and tidal energy. Five years ago the United States spent \$5 million on solar energy research; this year it is spending \$165 million. However, when the problems associated with the storage and transport of energy generated by this means are solved—and perhaps we can assume they will be—those means of power will provide only between 2 and 3 per cent of the energy requirements of that country.

The massive amount of money devoted at present to energy research in the United Kingdom is directed to wave power. Even there it is still recognised that this power can provide only a small and minimal amount of the energy requirements. In fact, as I have already said, it has been indicated by the United Kingdom that its major energy source during the latter part of this century will be nuclear generation and coal.

We are in the same position that we are in in respect of many environmental issues; that is, the Opposition is proposing a policy of fear. It is frightened to accept the challenge of the future.

Mr Moiler: You just accept what we tell you.

Mr P. V. JONES: It is frightened to accept the requirements of a world in which the population will double in 40 years.

Mr Hartrey: You will fix that; you will rub them out.

Mr P. V. JONES: We hear rhetoric which is just so much scientific nonsense, and when we strip it all away we come back to the same thing; that there is a policy of emotive fear. If the Opposition is not capable of accepting the challenge of the future, then we certainly are! If that means that we must plan for a future—bearing in mind that in all these aspects 1990 or 1995 is tomorrow—we will certainly accept that challenge. We certainly have no fear at all of talking with people, but that seems to be a problem with members opposite. Are they frightened to talk with experts who have been quoted? Are they frightened to put their professional expertise on the line and face the challenge of the future?

Quite clearly if we put our heads in the sand and do not accept that there are things we ought to be looking at, people with whom we should be talking, progress that needs to be made, and research that needs to be undertaken, then we are certainly not accepting the responsibility which we should accept if we are to be of any use to the community.

Mr Skidmore: Who said we on this side were adopting that policy?

Mr P. V. JONES: It seems to be a difficult problem for the Opposition to come to grips with matters such as this. I suggest that most certainly we must reject this motion because it denies us the opportunity to carry out our responsibility; that is, to plan to take note of what everybody else is doing and to make decisions for the future based on what we would like. The member for Morley said in his speech that we are a fortunate people. I could not agree more. That does not mean that we have not the responsibility of planning for the future to make certain that whatever the requirements of this State and this nation are at the end of the century, we are ready to meet them.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN** (Morley) [9.00 p.m.]: We can see why we cannot have any confidence in environmental protection in this State when we realise that the Minister who has just resumed his seat is in the pocket of the Premier. That is the kind of environmental protection that we will get from that Minister. We know that he came into the Cabinet over the bodies of two Country Party Ministers with principle and that he is acceptable to the Premier because he will do the Premier's bidding.

The Premier has had some talks with Senator Tamaki, an extreme right-wing senator from Japan. He claimed they were talking about their grandchildren, but in order to speak about their grandchildren Senator Tamaki brought a physicist from Japan! Does the Premier know of Abraham Lincoln's words about fooling some of the people all the time but not fooling all the people all the time? It is quite clear the Premier will not fool the people. When Senator Tamaki came from Japan to discuss his grandchildren with the Premier he brought an academic physicist with him so that they could better discuss the technicalities of their grandchildren.

Sir Charles Court: Do not distort the facts.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: Did not the Premier lunch with Senator Tamaki and did not Senator Tamaki bring a physicist here? When the Premier reveals what was undertaken at those talks—

Sir Charles Court: You would not believe anything because you would not understand, but I said publicly that I had lunch with Tamaki—of course I did—and I talked to him. He has a daughter here; he has a son-in-law here, and he has grandchildren here. Do you deny him the right to come and talk to them? He brought a physicist with him who talked to local people quite independent of me. I would not know what they talked about.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: There we have heard the Premier tell us what they spoke about. They spoke about their grandchildren!

Sir Charles Court: Would you like me to tell you? You will find it very exciting. You would not understand decent family gossip.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: I believe some deal has been made with Tamaki which will be revealed after the next State election. The Premier will not tell us what was said at that lunch until after the State election.

Sir Charles Court: I am telling you now.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: In 1970 the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Charles Court) said that by 1977 the nuclear industry would come to Japan. That happens to be after the next State election. I believe a deal has been made with Senator Tamaki so that when the

people wake up after the next State election, if they return this Government, they will find themselves faced with a ready-made decision. If after the next State election we have the same situation as in this Parliament, the Premier will have many dummies on his side in both Houses who will automatically vote for a Government measure. He will not agree—and therefore the Parliament will not agree—to a committee to examine these situations so that the Parliament can be informed. We will have the farce of matters being brought to the Parliament when in actual fact the Premier will have already made the decision long before the people go to the polls.

Sir Charles Court: Do not talk such nonsense.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: That is why I wrote to the Premier to ask him what he said at his luncheon and the Premier did not reply.

Sir Charles Court: What is this? I have replied.

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: The Premier did reply later, yes.

Sir Charles Court: Why do you tell such lies?

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: Mr Speaker, I ask for a withdrawal of the comment by the Premier that I tell lies.

**THE SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Morley has requested the Premier to withdraw the word "lies".

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, if it is your wish I withdraw the words.

#### *Debate Resumed*

**MR. A. R. TONKIN**: Perhaps the Premier could be excused for his comment. I did not mean that he had not answered to this date. If he had let me finish, I would have said that he did not answer my letter until I put out a Press release saying that the Premier had not answered my letter as to what went on at the luncheon. I was complaining because I think the people of Western Australia have a right to know.

Did the Press run the story? Oh no! They telephoned the Premier and within two days I had an answer to that letter. I can prove the dates by reference to my Press release and the date of the Premier's letter. That is the kind of easy armchair ride the Press gives to this Premier. If the member for Melville had been in the Premier's seat he would have been badgered day after day by headlines about secret deals with the Japanese. Every decent Western Australian knows what would have happened in those circumstances.

A deal has been made with Senator Tamaki that we will take his nuclear rubbish.

Mr Clarko: Have you any proof of this?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: After the next State election there will be proof. It will then be too late because the Premier may have control of both Houses.

Mr Clarko: Are you a seer or a prophet or something?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Senator Tamaki brought a physicist with him to discuss his grandchildren. I believe it is a very serious matter that we in this Parliament are denied information.

We have the situation now in which a nuclear submarine has come to this State, and the comment has been made that the crew deserve to come up after being submerged for some time. It is usually claimed that these men are chosen for their high degree of psychological stability, but a study made by Jonathan Serxner, a former US Navy doctor, writing in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* showed that 5 per cent of *Polaris* crewmen during a 60-day cruise, developed psychiatric symptoms needing treatment.

One petty officer suffered from acute paranoid schizophrenia and "heard" voices from heaven giving him messages. These are the people who have come into our harbour and who have their fingers on the nuclear button, and yet there is the suggestion that this is perfectly safe. We know that if there is a leakage of radioactivity from one of these ships we will not be told.

The Alcoa red mud lakes were leaking. How did we find out? We knew the answer and then asked the question. We had to know the answer before we could ask the question. Do members think that the Government will volunteer information about the leakage of radioactivity from a submarine or from any other ship or about any other leakage that may occur if a nuclear reprocessing plant is established? Of course it will not volunteer the information and we will have to know the answer—which is a very rare occurrence—before we can ask the questions. So it is quite clear that we will be kept in the dark about nuclear waste. This is the record of this Government—continuing secrecy.

As a matter of routine there is leakage of radioactivity from nuclear reactors; and this includes submarines or any nuclear-powered ship. The point is that there is a routine gaseous and liquid leakage. That is normal; it cannot be helped. It comes through pinhole-size apertures in the cladding. What is a safe release? It is claimed that that is a safe release.

Let us listen to the experts. The Premier always says that I set myself up as an expert. That is not so. What I do is listen to the experts; I am prepared to listen to the experts. Apparently they are all left wing, according to the Premier.

I have an impeccable opinion to quote. The advisory committee of the National Academy of Science's National Research Council on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation—known as BEIR—stated that the levels of emissions allowed by the Atomic Energy Commission were too high. Two of the top people in the Atomic Energy Commission, Drs Tamplin and Gofman, agreed and said that it was 10 times too high. They were of course classed as hysterical, which is how the Premier judges anyone who disagrees with him on environmental issues.

The AEC eventually admitted the force of their argument and reduced the safe level of emission by 100 times. After calling Drs Tamplin and Gofman hysterical and saying they were wrong when they wanted a tenfold reduction, the AEC actually went for a one hundred-fold reduction. How can we know that what the so-called experts say is a safe emission is in fact safe? We cannot be sure, which is the whole point.

George Wald, the Professor of Biology at Harvard—surely an impeccable United States University—and winner of the Nobel Prize for physiology in 1967, said—

Those of us who oppose nuclear power in its present form have nothing to gain thereby.

The sinister imputation that the Premier makes against such people is to call them fifth columnists. I should like to know who the fifth columnist is who is making a secret deal with Senator Tamaki and a physicist from Japan.

Sir Charles Court: There is no secret deal.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I challenge the Premier to prove there is no secret deal.

Government members: You prove that there is.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: After the next election, if the Government is again trusted with the Treasury benches, the people will wake up one morning to read *The Sunday Times* to find out that a secret deal has occurred. George Wald was no fifth columnist but he acquired the epithet of fifth columnist. He said, "We gain nothing at all from this opposition but a sense of patriotism in drawing attention to these matters."

Sir Charles Court: That is something you would not know.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That is something that is not understood or seems to be overlooked. People say that mankind would never have moved forward if we had not taken a chance at some time. Of course that is a fact. People seem to overlook that these nuclear wastes are not transformed, as all other poisons are, by bacteriological or chemical action. All other poisons are transformed into other forms which are less toxic. These substances have a decay rate that is mathematically exact. It does not alter.

Plutonium 239 has a half-life of 24 400 years. Caesium 137 has one of approximately 30 years. Strontium 90 has one of approximately 30 years. In other words, these substances are unlike any other substance that has ever been known to man previously because they are not changed in any way by bacteriological or chemical action. It has been suggested that plutonium 239 will be around for hundreds of thousands of years. It has been estimated that one gram of plutonium has the potential for 40 million lung cancers in aerosol form. That gives an idea of what we are dealing with. We are not dealing with anything which is comparable with any other substance in use.

It is believed that we may need fission power only for the next 50 years. By then we will have broken through with solar power or with fusion which seems to be a much safer form of nuclear energy. If we use fission power for only 50 years we will have these wastes around for hundreds of thousands of years. Is that not an extremely high price for our descendants to have to pay for up to a quarter of a million years in the future to provide 50 years of fuel for us? It seems to me that is not a very satisfactory equation.

We say there is no alternative to fission power, but we have never spent enough money on things like solar power. For instance the United States Air Force spent \$1 000 million trying to perfect a nuclear-powered bomb, but it did not work out and the idea was abandoned. Imagine if \$1 000 million had been spent on solar energy. If it had been we might be a lot further along the road towards solving this kind of problem.

With reference to the experts, I suggest the Minister for Conservation and the Environment should do some work on this instead of ringing one of his advisers five minutes before the debate and asking him for a couple of blasé generalisations. The Minister referred to the great progress being made. Let us look at what occurred in February this year. Have we progressed since then?

Mr P. V. Jones: Are you suggesting there is no progress?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: No. I am saying there is nothing in the evidence to show we are any further advanced worth speaking about than we were five years ago. Up till February this year Robert Pollard was a safety officer directing three reactors in New York. Who was he? He was not a janitor, but a nuclear engineer and in February of this year he resigned. Why did he resign? No doubt, according to the Premier, he was a fifth columnist. Mr Pollard said that one of the reactors—and 15 million people were within the danger zone—was an accident waiting to happen. That is what he said and he resigned from his job. What did he gain from that? He lost a job which was secure

and which had a great deal of status attached to it; but he just could not live with his conscience any longer.

The Minister talked about the California proposition and how they voted two to one against it. A few months ago there was a majority in favour of that proposition and the nuclear industry became scared and spent \$3.5 million in advertising thus changing that majority to a minority. It proved that Americans, like the Germans or people anywhere, are capable of being brainwashed.

Mr P. V. Jones: How much was spent by the other side?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The Minister can guess. He knows how much the Friends of the Earth would have. It is like the Ranger inquiry. The big companies had some of the best lawyers in Australia and the Friends of the Earth went in with no-one because they are penniless. They are the kind of people members opposite despise because they have not been what they call a "success".

Mr P. V. Jones: They spent nearly as much.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: They did not. There was very little advertising on the other side. That is the reason for the situation. We know there are advertising people who will prostitute themselves for the dollar. They will accept a brief from whoever pays. They are not interested in the truth and of course they turn majorities into minorities.

Mr P. V. Jones interjected.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I know, because I had not realised that the majority could be destroyed in that particular case. The polls did show the other way. I am now prepared to quote the latest poll and show that the situation changed and that in fact the result was two to one the other way.

Mr P. V. Jones: And the others spent only \$500 000 less.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Rubbish.

Mr P. V. Jones: It is not rubbish. It is a fact.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I ask the Minister, who has weighed in as the heavy expert on this matter, what do we do with a reactor after 25 years when it is finished? What do we do with it?

Mr P. V. Jones: You are the expert. Keep telling us.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: There is nothing that can be done with it. It cannot be dismantled because it is too highly radioactive. It is more radioactive than an atomic bomb. It is not possible to walk into the centre of an atomic bomb and work on it. It must be closed up and guarded forever. That is the situation and that is what must be done with



a reactor that is finished. We are not dealing with commodities which are similar to anything else.

Let us look at some of the accidents that have occurred. Sometimes it is said no accidents have occurred. This means there has been no spreading of radioactive waste over the countryside killing thousands. But let us look at the accidents which have occurred.

At Lagoona Beach near Detroit millions of people were within a 25-mile radius of the centre of a possible nuclear explosion but they were not warned of the danger of that fast breeder reactor. The Minister talks about up-to-date information. We cannot get more up-to-date information than that involving this fast breeder reactor.

The millions were not warned any more than this Government with its secrecy policy would warn us of any danger. The millions were not warned and luckily the accident that could have been a nuclear explosion did not occur.

At Windscale, UK, a massive leakage of contaminants caused thousands of gallons of milk to be contaminated by iodine 131. That has very much the same effect as normal iodine. It goes to the thyroid and children particularly are at risk. That happened in the United Kingdom.

I am not talking about what might have happened. That actually happened. Thousands of gallons of milk were contaminated. But the Premier said the experts know what they are doing.

At the Tsuruga plant cobalt 60 was released from cooling water into the surrounding bay and workers were exposed to radiation. That occurred in Japan.

The death occurred of two workers at a nuclear plant in Gundremmingen in West Germany when radioactive steam escaped from a burst valve.

Twenty leaks occurred in a Canadian reactor last year and it is still closed.

Three Japanese plants were shut down last year because of leakages.

In two reactors at the Japanese Mihama unit there was a deformation of fuel rods. If other factors had been present, it is admitted that there could have been a melt down. Japan does not have the technology to isolate the cause. In fact the Japanese Atomic Energy Commission has never tested the efficiency of emergency core cooling systems in reactors imported from the USA. Do members believe that if Japan does not have the technology to test its emergency core cooling system, we would have the technology?

In the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans drums, which were put there by experts, are leaking waste at this very moment.

What can be done with them? Who is the brave man who will do something about getting at those drums?

There was a fire at the refabrication plant at Denver involving two tons of plutonium. I already said that one gram has the potential to give 40 million people lung cancer. Let members work out how many grams there are in two tons. This fire involved two tons of plutonium and did not breach the roof of the building, but it could have breached the roof. The situation could have been that, if disseminated, one thousandth of a gram in aerosol form could cause lung cancer to thousands and would be dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years.

In the United States, by mistake a pipe conducting nuclear waste solution was connected to an employees' drinking fountain. I would like to see that occur up here! Yet the experts say they have it all worked out and that there is no worry!

In 1952 at Chalk River the core of a reactor was destroyed because an operator pushed the wrong button. It is all very well to say that developments have been made since those days, but we have not yet developed a reactor which will allow for human error. It is just impossible, as many experts have admitted.

In 1955 the reactor at the national reactor testing station at Idaho suffered a 50 per cent melt down during a test designed to simulate partial coolant failure. In other words, if the coolant is lost, in order to prevent a melt down, there is an emergency core cooling system. They simulated the loss of the coolant, and the emergency system did not work and a 50 per cent melt down occurred because the core became too hot when the coolant was removed.

It is possible for steel, concrete, and even the earth to be melted in this way. It will go right through the building. As yet, there has not been a complete melt down, but these are early days.

Tanks at Hanford were leaking for many weeks, but it is claimed that the water table has probably not been reached. Yet the Minister said that improvements are being made all the time. If this is so, why have workmen not gone to the Hanford tanks to drill to find out whether the liquid has reached the water table? They have not done so because the drilling could in fact increase the leakages. Therefore no-one knows whether the contaminated liquid which has leaked out of these tanks has reached the water table. Yet the Premier and the Minister say that the experts have it all worked out. Let them tell the Americans that!

I have referred to many accidents which have occurred. Let the Premier and the Minister tell the people involved in those accidents that everything has been worked out. It is just not true.

In 1961 three men were killed when a prototype reactor blew up in a burst of highly radioactive steam. The reactor was destroyed and the reactor building was heavily contaminated. The three men killed were not wearing any protective covering on their heads or hands and consequently their heads and hands were so highly radioactive that they had to be cut off and treated as dangerous waste. The rest of their bodies were sent home for burial. The heads and hands were buried as dangerous waste and have to be guarded for a long period until they became less dangerous.

In 1963 faulty welding—and who is to say that faulty welding would not be done in Australia?—in a tank of the Enrico Fermi fast breeder reactor caused part of the fuel to melt. The reactor has been shut down ever since.

The Minister told us that improvements have been made, but he now has suddenly lost interest in the debate as he is reading the comics or something.

Mr Skidmore: I did not know he had any interest in it.

Mr Clarko: A bit of your normal abuse.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That reactor has been closed for 13 years. Why has it not been repaired? Because the reactor is too radioactive to be repaired. If such wonderful technological improvements have been made, why has that reactor not been repaired? There is a tremendous amount of money tied up in it, so why has it not been repaired, especially if the experts know what they are doing and such technical advances have been made? Technical advances have been made, but not sufficiently to do anything about that situation.

In 1974 a 500-megawatt reactor near Toronto was shut down because primary coolant leaked through cracks caused by incorrect welding.

Brown's Ferry reactor, the largest nuclear station in the world, was put out of action for months because an electrician accidentally set fire to the electrical insulation making inoperable all five emergency core cooling systems. The emergency core cooling system is provided in case the primary coolant is lost or fails because of a fire. After that the experts around the world said it was impossible to construct anything to cope with fools. How is it possible to eliminate the human error?

Highly radioactive waste has been leaking for years from storage pits on the shores of Biscayne Bay in Florida. Once again workmen cannot go into the pits to inspect or repair them because it is too dangerous.

Those are some of the accidents which have occurred. I do not know to how many I have referred, but it must be a dozen or more. The experts have not solved these problems.

What protection of the environment does this State have when the Minister is willing to prepare a speech on the back of an envelope, and get up and make biased comments which do not square with the facts? How can we have any confidence that the Minister will stand up to the Premier on environmental matters?

Mr Bertram: He would not attempt to.

Mr Skidmore: He said that the issue is one of emotion.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We have been looking at the facts. I am happy to look at what the experts say. This Parliament should be in touch with the experts by means of a proper committee system. It is criminal that we do not do our job in a proper manner because we do not have the information. We have heard a Minister of the Crown, responsible for the environment, make comments for which I would award six out of 10 to a second-year high school child. That is the level of expertise to which we have access through the Minister.

Let us again refer to the experts. There were plans to build a 325-megawatt electric nuclear power reactor in the early 1960s at Bodega, which is 80 kilometres north of San Francisco on a site only 300 metres from the San Andreas fault which, as members know, is the infamous fault which almost destroyed San Francisco some time ago.

There were many objectors to that—no doubt hysterical fifth columnists, in the Premier's words—but it went ahead. When the reactor foundations were excavated it was found a fault ran right across the site. It was then abandoned. But no notice was taken of the objectors, although the reactor was within 300 metres of the San Andreas fault.

Let me read out what was said by an expert whom the Premier will respect because he has made a lot of money in his time. I am referring to Dr Donald Cook, Chairman of American Electric Power, the biggest electricity producer in the USA. He said the economics that were expected from electric power have never materialised and never will materialise. That is not from a Labor member of Parliament but from a highly successful American businessman in the field of power generation.

It was once said nuclear power would be so cheap it would not be worth metering. In the United States in 1973, 36 reactors were sold; in 1974, 27 were sold; in 1975, four were sold. This is the giant leap forward. Japan, too, has cut back its reactor building due to major breakdowns and leaks.

I believe we in Australia can expect cut-price reactors because the market has fallen off remarkably. Why? We talk about a reactor which costs an enormous amount of money and which has been

closed for 13 years. Hard-headed businessmen will think twice about that kind of thing. It is rare for reactors to be able to operate at more than 50 per cent capacity and they have to be closed down continually to take out material for reprocessing, which is what the Premier would like to take place in Western Australia.

Let us look at the Rasmussen study, which is the biggest study on nuclear safety ever carried out in the world. It comprises several volumes. The statistical method of calculation used in the Rasmussen study to determine the likely rate of failure was abandoned 10 years ago in the aerospace industry. Why? Because it grossly underestimated failure rates.

How can we sit back? We are supposed to be representing the people, and we say to them, "Don't worry, the experts are doing it. We are not going to worry ourselves about it. We will accept what the Premier says because he is in touch with the experts."

I will give an example of why the statistical method used in the Rasmussen study was abandoned. With the Apollo fourth stage rocket engine it was predicted there would be one failure in 10 000 missions; the actual failure rate was one in 25. This was the method used to determine the safety of nuclear reactors.

Let us look at the prediction of failure rates in the nuclear industry itself and get away from the aerospace industry. With major multiple fractures it was predicted there would be 25 failures per one billion billion reactor years—1 000 million times 1 000 million reactor years. What actually happened? There were 15 failures in less than 1 000 reactor years. How absurd! What kind of a statistical error is that? This is the Rasmussen study. These were experts who made the predictions. It was, of course, a whitewash job.

In regard to common mode failures, such as major fires, it was estimated they would occur once every 1 000 billion years. A major fire has already occurred at Brown's Ferry in Alabama, where an electrician started a fire. That occurred in less than 1 000 reactor years, whereas the prediction was once every 1 000 billion reactor years.

The other concern is terrorism. It is quite clear that a terrorist with one gram of plutonium could hold a city to ransom. He would not have to think about making a bomb. He could not do so anyway, with one gram; he would need four kilograms. However, he could threaten a city by suggesting he would contaminate the water supply, which is very easy to do. That is a problem which will occur, and there have already been two terrorist attacks on nuclear reactors last year, one in France and one in Germany. They have not yet resulted in major nuclear explosions.

We believe this Parliament should begin to operate effectively. We believe a committee of this House should hear from the experts on all sides. Let us hear from the pro-people like Baxter and Titterton; let us hear from those who have doubts. I am very serious and sincere in saying that otherwise there is no point in keeping this Parliament open. There is no point in this place pretending to be a forum when in fact it does not do all it can to ensure it is informed and knows what it is talking about. A committee would not turn us into instant experts but if we have to legislate in technical areas it is up to us to obtain the advice given to the Government. After all, the Government listens to experts, but that advice is given in secret. The people do not know what it is. Departmental advice to Cabinet cannot be the subject of questions in this House. We have been told many times the public will not be told what the experts are saying.

When the Premier comes here with a Bill he says, "We are going to do this." We can ask questions but we do not know what expert advice has been given. That is bad enough when we are talking about a freeway or a dam, but what about this kind of thing, which is unlike anything else? Should not the Parliament have the right to the information? If the Parliament does not get the information we are just stooges of the Premier; no matter what the Opposition does it has not the numbers.

All the people on the Government back bench are aspiring to get into the Cabinet, and all know the Premier chooses the Cabinet. The parties at present in government do not have a democratic election as we do. Members know they must do the right thing by the Premier, otherwise they are not likely to be chosen for the Cabinet. So what will they do? They will cross the floor wherever the Premier directs them. The Premier is like a policeman directing traffic—this side for this motion and that side for that motion.

We therefore believe we should have proper information and we should have a committee system. If we do not have it, we should save the people money by not pretending to be legislators. We should admit the government of the State is in the hands of a small select group—the Cabinet—meeting in secret. The deliberations of this Parliament are open to the public and the Press.

I am not sure my colleagues will go so far, but I am quite sincere in saying if we cannot make Parliament into a proper forum so that it legislates from knowledge instead of accepting whatever the Government suggests, the Parliament should be closed down because it will have outlived its usefulness. We know the institution of Parliament started back in the 13th century and at times it has performed a very useful role; but if our role is only to give our imprimatur of respectability

to the decisions made by the Cabinet, we should question whether Parliament has outlived its usefulness. I do not believe it has. I believe this Parliament could work properly if it had a proper committee system, as every other Parliament in the world has.

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member has five minutes more.

**Mr A. R. TONKIN**: This is a matter of great moment. We take our duties as legislators seriously. The people must consider whether they are getting their money's worth from Parliament, and whether the legislators in name are legislators in fact. If we are found wanting, like the dodo and the dinosaur we will become extinct because we will have outlived our usefulness. We must adapt to a changing world. We have a very complex world in which to move. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that we inform ourselves of these complexities so that we can legislate from a position of strength. Otherwise, we must seriously question whether the Parliament should continue in its present form.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—17

Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr May
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr McIver
Mr Hartrey	

(Teller)

#### Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Shalders
Mr Crane	Mr Sibson
Dr Dadour	Mr Thompson
Mr Grayden	Mr Tubby
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Young
Mr Laurance	Mr Clarko
Mr McPharlin	

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Davies	Mr Mensaros
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Rushton
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr Moller	Mr Stephens
Mr Barnett	Mr Sodeman

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading: Defeated*

Debate resumed from the 26th May.

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [9.45 p.m.]: This Bill proposes to enable 18-year-olds to vote in local government elections, just as they can in elections for the State and Federal

Parliaments. I think it is high time this situation is adopted, and we should support it. There seems to be no reason in this day and age that members opposite should not support the proposition.

At one time the complaint was always that the ratepayers paid most of the money required by local authorities, but local government records now show that more than 50 per cent of what they spend comes from sources other than ratepayers. Indeed, I have always maintained that even a child who buys a lolly in a shop pays something towards the rates of a business concern. So when people buy things they contribute to the local authority of the area, despite the fact that the local authority receives handouts from both Commonwealth and State Government sources.

As the local authorities receive handouts from the general revenue of Governments, that means the money comes from the taxpayer; so the 17-year-old who licenses his motorcar also contributes. Surely, no matter where the money comes from, we should be prepared to indicate to the people of the State that it is time we challenged the franchise conditions of local government elections.

This Bill clearly does that. It sets out to indicate a new eligibility; it puts forward other proposals in respect of the first-past-the-post principle, and voids the Borden method of multiple elections which is currently applied. I think the move is worth-while and one we should not discard lightly. It is time we made these amendments to the Local Government Act so that young people may vote and accept their responsibility in local government elections, just as they accept their responsibility in State and Federal elections.

There appears to be no reason that persons who are already charged with the responsibility of voting for the State and Commonwealth Parliaments should be regarded as not sufficiently intelligent to vote for local government elections. That being so, the member for Cockburn has suggested amendments to make voting eligibility in this State more or less uniform in respect of all spheres of government. At the moment too much confusion exists between council and other elections, and once young people know they are eligible to vote at all elections they will be more likely to accept their responsibility.

For many years now most States of Australia have had some form of voting powers for non-ratepayers, and now most of them have adult franchise with various qualifications for absent ratepayers; but it is time the people who vote for the Parliaments of Australia also voted for the representatives of the wards of the various local authorities.

Therefore, I support the Bill. I hope members give it consideration and do not discard it, and that they bear in mind the fact that a great deal of the finance of local authorities now comes from sources other than the ratepayer. The Bill has my full support.

**MR TAYLOR (Cockburn) [9.51 p.m.]**: This measure was introduced to give the Government an opportunity to consider its attitude to the electorate and to demonstrate to the electors that it is, as it indicated it would be in the election policy of the Premier, a democratic Government which seeks the support of the people.

The Bill undertakes to do three things. Firstly, it seeks to give a vote in municipal elections to every person within a municipality. It does this by making the criteria for those who are eligible to vote those which apply to State and Federal elections. Secondly, it undertakes to remove plural voting, something surely which should be acceptable to members of any democratic institution at this time. Thirdly, it undertakes to change the system of voting from what is now called preferential voting to what may be described as first-past-the-post voting. The latter is the principle which I thought would receive the greatest response from the Minister concerned, but he rejected it out of hand just as he did the other two.

When one puts forward to this House a proposition which offers to all of the people of a State the opportunity to vote for one of its Parliaments—and local government is a Parliament—and that proposition is rejected, one wonders where we are going. The principle of one-vote-one-value was put forward in this country as long ago as 1850. It was fought for at that time, and it actually won the day in a State Parliament in the 1850s. Plural voting was first abolished at or about that time. Progress has been made since then in State and Federal Parliaments, but 100 years later we as a Parliament—and we are responsible for local government; it is our Act—are still prepared to sit here and continue a system under which property counts for more than individuals. How can we tolerate that?

How can we take it when the Minister puts forward a proposition that a person should not have the right to vote if he does not help to pay for the affairs of the instrumentality? That is the comment the Minister made in reply to the introduction of this Bill. Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. has no vote for the State or Federal Governments, and yet it is probably the biggest contributor of finance to both levels of government in most States. Pensioners and others who do not pay tax have a vote in State and Federal elections. That is the system which has been operating for 75 years in the Commonwealth, and for even longer in the States.

Yet when a proposition is put before this House for consideration that we should apply that principle to local government it is rejected. We have a situation in my electorate where Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. has a number of votes at local government elections, and some pensioners have none. There was not a voice on the other side that took the Minister to task, and so we are to retain this system. Therefore companies will continue to have not one vote but perhaps a number of votes, and people in the area who are usually the third person in the household—a single adult or an elderly person; invariably only two people in a dwelling are eligible to vote—do not have a vote. There is no comment from members opposite.

**Mr Young**: Local government is all about property, whereas State and Federal Governments are all about people.

**Mr TAYLOR**: That is a quotable quote. "Local government is all about property."

**Mr Young**: Infinitely more so than State and Federal Governments.

**Mr TAYLOR**: I made the point that local government is really at the grass roots when it comes to participation by people, and the Minister agreed with that. He said this is the level at which people have the greatest say and where they can best manage their affairs. It is a proposition he has put forward on every platform from which he speaks, yet the member for Scarborough tells us it is a level of government which is more concerned with property.

**Mr Young**: The principal responsibility of local authorities is to maintain the area, and the principal responsibility of Federal and State Governments is to make laws in respect of the day-to-day management of people's affairs.

**Mr TAYLOR**: That is an attempt at rationalisation. On that basis one could say that Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. and the other industries at Kwinana surely should have a vote for the Federal Parliament, because the taxes they pay will be used to defend them by the provision of defences at Garden Island.

The Minister made no attempt to counter the argument that there should be one-vote-one-value; that is, that all persons in an area should have a vote. To give an example, he said within this Bill there is no qualifying period of residence, whereas a period of one month is required for State and Federal elections. There is nothing in my Bill to say what the period of residence should be, and so the Minister took me to task and said there were inaccuracies and anomalies in the Bill and that so much was wrong with it that it would have to be thrown out. He said he would give examples, but the only statement he made with reference to the one-vote-one-value principle was that I did not specify a

residential period in my Bill; that is, I did not specify the period for which a person must reside within a municipality before he is eligible to vote. The Minister said that meant people could come in and flood the electorate a few days before the roll closed. That is the only reason he gave for rejecting that principle.

This is a principle enunciated throughout the world throughout history, and most certainly it is one which operates in respect of two tiers of government in this country; yet the Minister's only argument against it was that some of the technicalities in my Bill are not correct.

Mr McPharlin: You are suggesting giving the vote to everyone. Do you also suggest that everyone should pay rates or a tax?

Mr TAYLOR: I am suggesting that all the occupiers of houses are people and are residents of their community. That principle is accepted in the State and Federal spheres, and I am putting it to the House that it should be accepted by this Chamber in respect of local government; that is, an elderly pensioner living with his or her son or daughter and who pays no rates—although the son or daughter does—should have a vote. That is what this Bill is all about. It is not a large number of people involved at all.

Mr Young: If a child buys sweets in a shop he is contributing to the shop-keeper's rates—

Mr TAYLOR: You are quoting the Leader of the Opposition who interjected with that very comment.

Mr Young: If I buy a can of coca-cola and I pay for some steel in that can I ought to get a vote on the board of BHP?

Mr TAYLOR: I am not saying that. I am not saying that because I now work in Perth I should get a vote for Perth. I get a vote where I live. That is all this legislation is asking for—that a person should be eligible to choose his representatives in the area in which he lives.

The second proposition is that there should be only one vote. That is another principle that has been espoused for many years in many ways. As I indicated in my second reading speech, it was good enough for the Brand Government belatedly to apply it to the Legislative Council a few years ago. I did not have the opportunity to look up the speeches made on that occasion, but I should like to see the reasons given for it because whatever those reasons were they would apply to this legislation. If we are going to have one vote in other tiers of government why do we have multiple voting in local government? Is there an answer to it?

In Victoria there is an Act, I understand, before the Governor for signature which will delete plural voting in Victoria. In Queensland local government elections each elector gets one vote, according to a source in my possession. In New South Wales each voter has one vote but there

is a restriction on the number of people who can vote so not all get a vote. South Australia has now moved to eliminate plural voting. But not Western Australia. Until the legislation before us now is passed we will continue with the same system of multiple votes. That is democracy at its best? They are presumably the same reasons that electorally put Kwinana in the city and Kalamunda in the country. So one-man-one-vote is out and plural voting is out, and the Minister gave no reasons at all!

The Minister's comment about that is that it is being considered in a total review. If that is not the type of statement one has heard in this place over many years, I wonder where we have heard it. He said that at this point of time the disparity is practically nonexistent. Presumably it is all right to retain plural voting because it is now practically nonexistent!

Mr Hartrey: Since when?

Mr TAYLOR: Yes, since when? It certainly occurred on the Saturday before I introduced this Bill. It was operating in the elections for the Lord Mayor of Perth when up to eight votes were being exercised by some groups—not necessarily people—because a Government member has already accepted that local government is associated with property rather than people!

Mr A. R. Tonkin: What a disgrace!

Mr Young: It is not a disgrace because the principal role of local government is to take care of the general physical area. It is not sovereign.

Mr TAYLOR: I appreciate the comments being made by the member for Scarborough. The latest quote is that local government is not sovereign. Is that a reason, because their future is in the hands of this House? That is accepted. Here we are trying to do something for it. We are the only ones who can do so. Local governments cannot legislate for themselves in this respect. Certainly they are not sovereign but this House is and we have an opportunity here and now to change the system.

Other comments were made by the Minister. He seemed to spend more time on the first-past-the-post system than on any other matter. I appreciate that in any system of counting there are several ways of interpreting things and one usually likes the way that will advantage oneself but I could not accept the proposition which the Minister put forward. He said that he did not think it was right that where there were four candidates, one getting 35 per cent of the vote, one 25 per cent, one 21 per cent and one 19 per cent, the person who got 35 per cent should be declared the person elected. Of course, using his figures one could put it another way and I agree that this is only one way of interpreting such figures.

It means that the group which voted for the person with 35 per cent and had their candidate defeated at best would have a candidate against them who received 21 firsts, 19 seconds and 11 thirds, or 11 people who voted for a man second last. By any weighting of votes that is an anomaly. The Minister said that this system is wrong and it has to be a preferential system where, as I say, third votes can be firsts.

Historians and politicians have argued over and over again about the first two propositions in the Bill. I do not see that there is any other way of impressing upon members the desirability of having one vote and the first-past-the-post system and I shall not weary the House very much longer with my arguments.

Before I conclude I should like to quote one or two other comments from the Minister's speech, which is worth reading at any time. He said—

... and the next moment the Opposition is trying to destroy local government. It is suggested adult franchise should be introduced.

We are trying to destroy local government because adult franchise should be introduced! How does anyone work that one out?

Sir Charles Court: What he meant is that you are trying to destroy its character.

Mr TAYLOR: It depends on the definition of "character".

Sir Charles Court: The nature of local government.

Mr TAYLOR: The Premier is perfectly correct. There is no doubt that this proposed legislation attempts to change the character of local government but in the same way as Sir David Brand's legislation changed the character of the Legislative Council for the better by changing certain aspects of it to give one-vote-one-value. By giving everybody on the electoral roll a vote we could certainly be changing its character for the better.

The Minister said—

Adult franchise, of course, has no relationship to the responsibility of ratepayers.

That is another good quotable quote! This follows the theme of the member for Scarborough. Adult franchise has a relationship to the responsibility of electors federally or Statewise, but the Minister reminds us that it has no relationship to the responsibility of ratepayers! Therefore, we should not have adult franchise!

There was then an interjection and the Minister said—

We are talking about adult franchise, where people will be having a vote in everything that goes on.

What a terrible principle!

Mr Hartrey: How shocking!

Mr TAYLOR: One wonders. The Leader of the Opposition then said—

Is there anything wrong with that? The Minister said—

There is when one does not have any responsibility for paying for what one does.

There is the answer. That is why BHP, Alcoa or any other company has a vote while those who live with relatives, or the local policeman, or the local high school teacher living in a schoolhouse, do not get a vote.

In another interjection the member for Morley asked whether this gives a vote to every person and the Minister said—

It does not give a vote to every person. It takes away the autonomy of local government . . .

So one-vote-one-value takes away the autonomy of local government! I agree with the comment made by the Premier when he said that this proposed legislation will modify the character of local government.

The Minister said that this Bill—and anybody who has read the Bill will smile at this—seeks to remove local government and replace it with regions. One-vote-one-value will take away local government and replace it with regions! He said—

This measure is a camouflage to take over local government. It is a vehicle to provide for the dominance of minorities and less influential people.

What a beauty that one is! This Bill, one-vote-one-value and one vote—not multiple votes—is a camouflage to take over local government and is a vehicle to provide for the dominance of minorities and less influential people!

How can one argue against statements like that made when speaking to legislation? The Minister said that local government was grass roots government, and with that I agree.

The seventh quote of the Minister was—

This is something we on this side of the House treasure, because it allows the people to have a voice in local communities.

Later on he said a person should not have a vote if he did not pay for it. Yet he made the statement that this was something that members on the opposite side of the House treasured because it allowed people to have a voice in local communities.

That is what we on this side are asking members to support in the Bill before us; that is, to give the little people, the less influential people, and the minorities a voice in local communities.

Sir Charles Court: That is without making any contribution?

Mr TAYLOR: If I had to give an answer I would say, "Yes, without making a contribution." I have indicated that although pensioners make no contribution in taxes, they have a vote; and that students of 18 years of age make no such contribution but they also have a vote; yet those who make the greatest contribution to the revenues of the State and the Commonwealth—the large industries—have no voice. The Premier has said that if a person resides in an area of the State or the Commonwealth he should have a vote, so why not at local government level?

Mr Old: Besides the pensioners will anyone else be affected by this?

Mr TAYLOR: The Minister was previously the chairman of a local authority, and he knows the answer.

Mr Old: Why did you mention them?

Mr TAYLOR: I made mention of the pensioner, because invariably he is the third person in the household. I used the illustration of the pensioners and students, because in most instances they are the ones who now do not have a vote and who would gain the vote under this measure.

The final quote of the Minister was—

It takes away the rights of the small person to maintain his vote and to dominate the individual.

The Bill contains three propositions. The third one as to whether the electoral system shall be based on first-past-the-post or preferential voting is not as important as the other two. It is not one which we on this side would necessarily contest at this time.

However, the other two propositions are fundamentally important. The first is the principle of full adult suffrage, and the second is the nonplurality of votes. Those are the two issues on which the House should make a decision.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—17

Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr May
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr McIver
Mr Hartrey	

(Teller)

#### Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Mr Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Shalders
Mr Crane	Mr Sison
Dr Dadour	Mr Thompson
Mr Grayden	Mr Tubby
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Young
Mr Laurence	Mr Clarko
Mr McPharlin	

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Davies	Mr Mensaros
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Rushton
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr Moller	Mr Stephens
Mr Barnett	Mr Sodeman

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 19th August, 1976

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

### SUPPLY BILL

#### Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

### QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

#### 1. WATER SUPPLIES

##### York: Dislocation of Traffic

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that yesterday the main street of York, Avon Terrace, was barricaded off by the Public Works Department and a trench was dug across the roadway to effect water main connections?
- (2) Is he aware that yesterday was York race day and the busy visiting traffic as well as local traffic was denied vehicular access to the shopping area, causing tradespeople to lose anticipated custom especially catered for?
- (3) Is he aware that neither the York Shire Council nor the Main Roads Department, Northam, were notified that this exercise was to take place?
- (4) Is he aware that the Main Roads Department is proposing a lowering of the crown of Avon Terrace and is conducting a survey within the next fortnight of the particular section referred to and that future MRD proposals could well have a bearing on the depth of any pipes already laid or proposed to be laid?
- (5) Why does not the PWD liaise with other departments to ascertain convenience of operation to all concerned?