

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 23rd August, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (35): ON NOTICE

1. CROSSWALK

Geraldton-Mullewa Bypass Road

Mr. SEWELL, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that residents of South Rangeway have been refused by the Main Roads Department in their request for a guard-controlled crosswalk on the Geraldton-Mullewa bypass road at Rangeway?
- (2) As extreme dangers exist because of the fast moving motor traffic and as there is a large number of children who have to cross this road to attend the Rangeway primary school and the convent school, will he have the question of a crosswalk over this road examined with a view to having a guard-controlled crosswalk provided?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Main Roads Department has not refused a guard-controlled children's crossing on this road. Responsibility for recommending to the Minister for Police the provision of such a facility lies with the Geraldton Town Council who are the traffic control authority. The Main Roads Department believe that the council have decided not to proceed with the proposal for a guard-controlled children's crossing in this locality.
- (2) The Main Roads Department officers consider that such a facility would be appropriate. However, it is not within the department's authority to initiate action. It is the responsibility of the Geraldton Town Council.

2. WATER SUPPLIES

Waggrakine-Glenfield Extension

Mr. SEWELL, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Will he say when stage 4 of the Waggrakine-Glenfield extension of a domestic water supply will be approved?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Stage 4 work has not been included in the 1972-73 loan programme.

Consideration will be given to listing in the 1973-74 loan programme but this will be dependent on overall works priorities.

3. ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Mandurah: Depot and Office

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Electricity:

In view of the continued growth of Mandurah and district when can it be expected that the State Electricity Commission will establish a permanent depot and office there?

Mr. MAY replied:

An area depot is permanently located in Mandurah now and a permanent building will be provided when finances permit. An office is not planned for Mandurah.

4. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Mandurah: Office

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

In view of the volume of work being undertaken by his department in Mandurah can it be expected that the department will establish a permanent office and department in the town?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I have already given my approval for the establishment of an additional district office of the Public Works Department to administer expanding departmental activity in the area north of Waroona to Mandurah.

Arrangements are in hand to locate this facility in the centre of the area at Pinjarra.

5. HOSPITALS

Acquisition of Buildings

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Further to his reply to part (1) of question 26 on 17th August when he said that "need" was the criterion employed by him when recommendation is received to purchase properties for a hospital, would he elaborate on his answer?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

I find it difficult to elaborate. Before approval is given to any proposal to purchase property, the need must be established and funds available. If the Member desires any further information, I would be pleased to endeavour to assist him if he could be specific as to the information he requires.

6. KALAMUNDA, KEWDALE, AND COMO HIGH SCHOOLS

Upgrading

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are the three high schools, Kalamunda, Kewdale and Como, at present teaching fourth year students?
- (2) Will these schools be upgraded to include fifth year students in 1973?
- (3) If (1) and (2) are "Yes" why was not Como high school included in the list of schools shown in answer to part (3) of question 20 on 16th August?
- (4) What is the anticipated enrolment of Como high school for February, 1973?
- (5) How many sixth grade students are at present enrolled at the following primary schools:—
Midvale, Koongamia, Bellevue, Greenmount, and Swan View?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) The decision to upgrade Como was made late in 1971, and although the school has enrolled 4th year students in 1972 it will not officially achieve senior high school status until 1973.
- (4) 774.
- (5) Midvale—76.
Koongamia—56.
Bellevue—11.
Greenmount—25.
Swan View, February 1972—40
(August return not yet available).

7. WATER SUPPLIES

Toilet Flushing: Vacuum Method

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) In the overall plan to conserve water, has thought been given to the amount of water used by the flushing method of getting rid of biological waste either into septic tanks or sewerage mains?
- (2) If so, has the Government studied the Swedish invention by Dr. Lilienthal called the "vacuum method" which empties toilets effectively with less than one-fifth of the water currently employed?
- (3) If not, could this method be investigated both in Sweden and Israel with a view to promotion for the purpose of water conservation in Western Australia?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. This system is currently being installed in the mining township of Shay Gap.
- (3) Answered by (2).

8.

HEALTH

Acupuncture Clinic

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Did he see in the *Sunday Times* of 20th August, 1972 an advertisement advising the establishment of an acupuncture clinic at Canning Bridge Arcade, Applecross?
- (2) If so, is any action contemplated under the Health Act to prevent its operation?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter will be investigated by the W.A. Medical Board.

9.

SCHOOLS

Sex Education

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

- (1) Has a starting date been decided upon for the commencement of the experimental course in sex education for primary schools?
- (2) If so, what is the date?
- (3) How many primary schools will be involved in the scheme?
- (4) What staff will be used?
- (5) Will the studies be in school time or after normal school hours?
- (6) Will the course deal with attitudes and social mores as well as with clinical details?
- (7) What means will be used to assess the outcome of the scheme?
- (8) What role will parents play in the course?
- (9) Will other social issues be dealt with in conjunction with the sex education course?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) September, 1972.
- (3) Three schools have been approved for 1972.
- (4) The normal staff of the schools concerned.
- (5) In school time.
- (6) Yes.

- (7) The evaluation methods and procedures are still under consideration.
- (8) Parents will be required to give written permission for a child to attend the course and they will be kept informed of progressive developments.
- (9) No.

10. MOTOR VEHICLES *Car Distance Gauge*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the recently patented (U.S.A.) car distance gauge "which helps motorists to estimate the safe interval from the car ahead"?
- (2) Will the Minister investigate desirability of encouraging the implementation of such a device in the local market?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The matter will be investigated when sufficient detail becomes available.

11. HEALTH

D.D.T.: Restrictions on Use

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

- (1) In view of the recent decision in the United States of America to ban the use of D.D.T. for most purposes, has the attitude towards the use of this toxic substance been reviewed recently by the Western Australian pesticide advisory committee?
- (2) What restrictions are presently placed on the use of D.D.T.?
- (3) How many samples of food are tested monthly for D.D.T. content?
- (4) What is the composition of such samples?
- (5) Is there any attempt to give geographical spread to such testing?
- (6) On how many samples (expressed as a total and as a percentage) have the acceptable levels been exceeded?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Attitude to D.D.T. and other insecticides is constantly under review.
- (2) (a) Household indoor space sprays containing D.D.T. are not accepted for registration.
- (b) D.D.T. may not be applied to any fruit or vegetable within the period of 4 weeks prior to harvesting.

- (c) D.D.T. is not to be used on fodder crops grazed by or fed to dairy cattle or stock being finished for slaughter.
- In other cases, D.D.T. is not to be applied to pasture which is fed to stock within 30 days of grazing.

- (d) D.D.T. is not to be applied to dairy animals. Veterinary medicines containing D.D.T. are not accepted for registration.

- (e) Grain treated with D.D.T. is not to be used as a feeding stuff.

- (f) Pesticides containing D.D.T. may not be sold unless registered in accordance with the Pesticides Regulations.

- (3) Approximately 160.

	%
(4) Meat	33
Dairy products	17
Eggs	5
Grains	33
Fruit and vegetables	12

- (5) Yes.
- (6) The average number of samples above tolerance in one month would be less than one.

12. PRESS COUNCIL *Establishment*

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

What initiatives are open to the Government to move for the implementation of a Press council such as exists in other countries?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I am only aware of the Press council operating on an industry basis in England.

It would be difficult to devise legislation to establish such a body.

13. HOUSING

Langford: Shopping Complex

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) When is it anticipated the shopping complex will be built to cater for the residents living in the State Housing Commission area of Langford?
- (2) What is the exact location set aside for this shopping complex?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) Zoning approval for the shopping centre site was delayed until protracted negotiations concerning a hotel site had been finalised. Assuming there are no objections to

the advertised zoning of the shopping centre site, (objections close 20th October, 1972), it is anticipated that public tenders will be invited before Christmas 1972 for construction of the shopping facilities.

- (2) The shopping centre site has an area of approximately 4 acres (1.62 h.a.), and is located on Langford Avenue and near Brookman Avenue.

14. ALBANY HIGHWAY

Cannington: Rerouting

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any consideration been given to the re-routing of Albany Highway along Wimbledon Street, Cannington, in this year's budget?
- (2) If not, can he advise when consideration will be given for this work to be done?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The existing Albany Highway will be adequate for traffic for many years, and therefore no high priority can be given to the Wimbledon Street deviation.

15. CATTLE NUMBERS

Kimberley

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What were the estimated cattle numbers in Kimberley as at 30th June, 1972?
- (2) What were the estimated numbers as at 30th June, 1970 and 1971?
- (3) What numbers are anticipated as at 30th June, 1973 and 1974?
- (4) (a) What approximate numbers of live cattle have been taken out of Kimberley in the years ended—
 (i) 30th June, 1970;
 (ii) 30th June, 1971;
 (iii) 30th June, 1972?
- (b) To where have these cattle been transported and by what means?
- (5) (a) What numbers of cattle have been processed in each of the meat works in Kimberley for the 1970 and 1971 killing seasons?
- (b) what numbers are anticipated for the current killing season?
- (6) Is there any danger of the live cattle that are leaving Kimberley depleting the herds below economical and other acceptable levels?

- (7) (a) Are there any restrictions on the movement of cattle such as age, breeders, numbers, proportion of herd, etc.;
- (b) is any approval needed, and, if so, what is the form of approval?
- (8) What is the Government's policy in respect of the movement of live cattle out of Kimberley—
 (a) generally;
- (b) in relation to economic numbers for established or projected meat works?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Approximately 620,000 (actual figures not available).
- (2) June 1970—647,317.
 June 1971—624,511.
- (3) 30th June, 1973—620,000.
 30th June, 1974—600,000.
- (4) (a) 1st January, 1970 to 31st December, 1970—15,694.
 1st January, 1971 to 31st December, 1971—32,157.
 1st January 1972 to 30th June, 1972—22,000.
- (b) Mostly to Queensland and Northern Territory. Some to South Australia and South-west of Western Australia. Mainly road transport. Some by boat to Robb Jetty.

	1970	1971
(5) (a) Wyndham	32,736	22,589
Broome	17,168	25,398
Derby	14,423	11,066
(b) Wyndham	35,000
Broome	26,000
Derby	10,000
(6) No.		
(7) (a) and (b) No, providing they comply with quarantine requirements.		
(8) (a) and (b) There is no intention to impose any more restrictions on cattle movement from the Kimberleys provided quarantine requirements are met.		

16. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Accommodation: Shortage

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

Further to question 21 of 16th August wherein he replied that there were 268 vacancies spread over 10 of the 14 high school hostels and to question 25 of 17th August to which he replied that the vacancies for 1973 have not

been established, can he now indicate which hostels are more likely to have vacancies for 1973 as some parents are already being refused accommodation for next year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The hostels which are more likely to have vacancies in 1973 are:—

Albany Methodist Girls.

Bunbury.

Carnarvon.

Esperance.

Port Hedland.

It is not possible to make a statement regarding the other hostels.

17.

EDUCATION

High School at Kambalda

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the latest position about a high school for Kambalda?
- (2) How many children currently have to be transported to Kalgoorlie for high school education?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) It is anticipated that a high school will be established at Kambalda in 1974.
- (2) Approximately 200.

18.

EDUCATION

Retarded Children

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of a survey carried out in the Kwinana-Rockingham area which revealed that 198 children required educational facilities because of physical, mental and emotional retardation?
- (2) Is he also aware that a similar study has been carried out in the Pinjarra-Mandurah districts with somewhat similar results to that of Rockingham-Kwinana?
- (3) In the light of the obvious need to treat and assist such children in their own districts, what are the State Government plans to assist in this matter?
- (4) Can he give some details regarding assistance, once the need has been determined?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. In addition a departmental survey of the need for remedial teaching in reading has been carried out.
- (2) Surveys have been carried out by the department among children with mental retardation.

- (3) In the Rockingham-Kwinana area the remedial work is being undertaken in the schools as part of the teachers' normal professional duties, assisted by additional staffing where the need has been identified. A special class for slower learning children has been established at Carcoola School for children from the Mandurah and Pinjarra districts. The need for a training centre at Pinjarra is being examined.

- (4) Where a need has been determined, special classes are established for the slower learning child. Training centres for more backward children are established as subsidised schools or fully supported schools depending upon the number of children to be accommodated. Remedial assistance is provided at particular schools as and when required.

19.

SCHOOLS

Free Book and Stationery Scheme

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he list and cost for each grade 1 to 7 the items to be included in the free special issue stationery for 1973 for primary school students?
- (2) Does the Government intend to increase the \$1 allowance per student should this be demonstrated as inadequate?
- (3) Is the Government intending to insist headmasters do not include these special items on book lists for 1973?
- (4) Has the objection to the department from headmasters over the inadequacy of the \$1 been extensive?
- (5) Will he let me have a copy of each free issue book prepared by the staff of the department since the inception of the free scheme?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Lists will vary from school to school in 1973 but such lists will be phased out as from 1974, when materials will be provided in the annual requisition. The \$1 is a special interim allowance to assist parents during the transition period.
- (3) No. Headmasters are expected to reduce the demands on parents to the extent of the special Government assistance provided.
- (4) Of 732 Government and independent primary schools, less than 3% have submitted written comments.
- (5) Copies of all materials are available at the Curriculum Branch, Parliament Place, Perth.

20.

HOUSING*Naval Base Project*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

Although he states that the Department of the Navy has not made a formal application for the houses for the H.M.A.S. Stirling personnel—

- (a) have negotiations been proceeding;
- (b) if so, what are the outstanding matters requiring agreement before the houses can be built and provide extra employment for the building work force in the region?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

Housing for serving personnel of the armed services is provided under an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. The normal channel of communication in these matters is between Commonwealth Department of Housing and the State Housing Commission. Any approaches directly from service authorities can only be regarded as informal and exploratory.

The Commonwealth Department of Housing has sought information as to the nearest location the commission would be able to provide 70 houses for occupation towards the end of 1975, having in mind the housing is financed from loans repayable by the State, and the location is a matter for State decision. It also sought the construction timetable for these, and the estimated costs. That department has been advised the location would be Parmelia, construction should start during September, 1974 to March, 1975, and has been given cost estimates.

The Department of Housing has replied indicating Navy Department had expressed preference for Rockingham, and have been advised the commission re-affirms Parmelia.

No further approach has been received from Department of Housing.

I might add that I hope the above information completes the honourable member's file.

21. **KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL***Gymnasium*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

When will a gymnasium be provided at the Kalamunda high school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

An absolute priority list has not been established as the position is reviewed each year and schools are selected according to the finance available. It is not possible to state in which financial year a hall-gymnasium will be erected at Kalamunda as this will depend on the priorities of other schools and the financial position after other urgently required accommodation needs have been met.

22. **KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL***Additions*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When will work start on the major additions at Kalamunda high school?
- (2) Will he please supply me with a copy of the plans and specifications for the work?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Tenders closing on 12th September, 1972, were called on 19th August, 1972.
- (2) A copy of the plans and specifications can be viewed at the Public Works Department.

23. **KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE***Foothills Route*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Has the State Electricity Commission completed its survey of the foothills route (line west of the Darling Range escarpment) for the 330kV Kwinana-Balga power line?
- (2) (a) If so, will he provide me with a drawing which indicates the exact route;
- (b) if "No" to (1), will he state when the survey will be complete?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) See (1).
- (b) On present indications, two months.

24. **EDUCATION***School at Forrestfield*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that a large scale housing scheme is planned on an area of land adjacent to the existing Forrestfield townsite and that it is possible that some new homes could be occupied during the 1973 school year?

- (2) Has his department a site for a new primary school (or schools) in the area, and, if so, where are they?
- (3) What is the maximum school population planned for the existing Forrestfield school?
- (4) When is it anticipated that the maximum population at this school will be reached?
- (5) When will a new school be provided to cater for the planned development?
- (6) Will a new school be built before the present school reaches its maximum number?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. The position is being watched closely but it is more likely to be 1974-75 before major developments take place.
- (2) There is a proposed primary school site in the area north of Hale Road. This site could be subject to some variation.
- (3) 720.
- (4) This will be dependent on further housing development in the area.
- (5) It is not possible to give an accurate indication at this stage as the provision of a new primary school will be dependent upon local growth.
- (6) The erection of a new school in the Forrestfield area is not anticipated prior to the completion of an eighteen room school at the existing Forrestfield School, but the decision will be dependent upon the type of growth experienced.

25. EDUCATION

Classes: Excess of 40 Pupils

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many State primary school classes exceeded 40 in number at the last time statistical information was supplied to the Education Department by headmasters?
- (2) When was this information supplied?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 664.
- (2) February, 1972.

26. *This question was postponed.*

27. METROPOLITAN MARKET TRUST

Members

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many members are on the metropolitan market trust?

- (2) Who are they and whom do they represent?
- (3) What is the period of appointment of each member?
- (4) When does the present term of membership for each member expire?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) 5.
- (2) Mr. J. H. Arbuckle (Chairman)—Government representative.
Mr. J. B. Hawkins—Government representative.
Mr. W. R. Stevens—Producers' representative.
Mr. A. E. Brindal—Consumers' representative.
Mr. J. A. del Piano—Perth City Council representative.
- (3) 3 years. In the case of resignations or retirements, the replacement is appointed for the balance of the former member's term.
- (4) 26th August, 1972.

28.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Kelmscott Route

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Is it intended to route the 330kV power line up the Turner Road valley, Kelmscott?
- (2) Has the Environmental Protection Authority researched and reported to the Government on the preferred route for the power line to traverse the Darling scarp from the coastal plain through to the hills?
- (3) If "No" to (2), will he seek this guidance immediately?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No. Before the authority was constituted, the Director of Environmental Protection was consulted.
- (3) See (2). Cabinet had received the opinion of the Director of Environmental Protection before reaching its decision on the route.

29.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Relief: Commonwealth and State Funds

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) As his replies to question 12 of 1st August, 6 of 3rd August and 7 of 9th August appear to be contradicted by his reply to part (1) of question 12 on 15th August, will he now let me know how much in fact the State found for unemployment from its own sources in 1971-72?

(2) Has there been an adjustment of country unemployment relief funds by the State in utilising Commonwealth moneys to pay employees who would have normally been on the State payroll?

(3) If "Yes" to (2), what has been the saving to Western Australia by this action?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) \$1,840,000. There is no contradiction in previous replies.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by (2).

30. WATER SUPPLIES

Kellerberrin: Cost of Tank

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) What was the estimated cost of the new concrete lined earth tank west of Kellerberrin?

(2) What is the actual or current estimated final cost?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) \$230,000.

(2) \$210,000.

31. RAILWAY CROSSING

Wyalkatchem: Flashing Lights

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Since during August, 1970, approval was given by the former Minister for Works for the installation of flashing lights at the Ferries Street crossing at Wyalkatchem, will he give reasons why the lights have not been installed?

(2) When will the work be proceeded with?

(3) Is it intended that crossing lights be installed at the Gnuca siding on the Wyalkatchem-Koorda road?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) Flashing lights have not been installed at this railway crossing because of the higher priorities of many other installations throughout the State.

(2) No firm date can be given at this stage. However, the necessary field survey will be carried out in the near future preparatory to the design being commenced by the Railway Department. When the design has been finalised, the crossing will be included in the installation programme.

(3) Yes.

32.

HOSPITALS

Central Laundry: Source of Finance

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Health:

Would he state those hospitals—amongst the ones named in his reply to question 39 on 16th August as contributing through borrowing to the central laundry scheme—which have no need for further beds or expansion of any other nature?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

All five hospitals named in my reply to question 39 on 10th August, 1972, have need for further beds or expansion of other facilities, but a basic pre-requisite for expansion is an efficient laundry and linen service.

33. QUARANTINE CHECKPOINT

Norseman

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

(1) Is the Department of Agriculture's checkpoint at Norseman manned 24 hours a day?

(2) If not, for how many hours in each day is this checkpoint operated?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) No.

(2) The checkpoint operates for eight hours daily, Monday to Friday, and for ten hours on alternate weekends. The shifts are designed to cover the main traffic flows and are varied to avoid a regular pattern of operation within daylight hours.

When provision has been made for floodlighting, the hours of operation will be re-examined.

34.

SHEEP AND CATTLE

Thefts

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Further to part (3) of question 55 on Wednesday, 9th August, which states that in 1972 six prosecutions were made for sheep stealing and three prosecutions for cattle stealing, how many sheep and cattle were involved in each of these prosecutions?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

Detailed records of this nature are not maintained by the Police Department but three cattle and approximately 25 sheep were involved in all the prosecutions referred to.

35. **WEMBLEY SCHOOL***Resumptions for Extensions*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Referring to his reply to question 23 on 11th May, 1972 could he say whether the property known as No. 62 Alexander Street, Wembley, on the southeast corner of Grantham Street is included in the ones which are being or to be acquired for the Wembley primary school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Yes.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE**BUDGET***Date of Introduction*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Treasurer:

I am sorry I did not have a chance to let the Treasurer know of this question in advance but I am sure he can answer it off the cuff.

Has he made up his mind when he proposes to introduce the Budget? Will it be immediately after next week's recess?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I regret that I cannot give a precise date but the Budget is in the course of preparation. Treasury officers are working on it and I am anxious to introduce it as early as possible.

**COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS
AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Minister for Education), and read a first time.

**FUEL, ENERGY AND POWER
RESOURCES BILL***Third Reading*

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Fuel) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

During the second reading and Committee stages I gave an undertaking to the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party that I would make some inquiries in an endeavour to clarify some of the points raised.

The short title of the Bill caused some concern to the Leader of the Opposition because, although the Bill is entitled "Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill," at various times it has been referred to as the "fuel and power Bill." The short title is to be, "Fuel, Energy and Power

Resources Act, 1972." The full title is to be, "An Act to make provision for the conservation and utilisation of the present and future sources and supplies of fuel, energy, and power in and to Western Australia, the establishment and functions of the Fuel and Power Commission of Western Australia and the Fuel and Power Advisory Council, and for purposes connected therewith."

When framing the Bill, the following factors were kept in mind:—

"Fuel" has been looked upon as a combustible material finally leading to the production of power.

"Energy" has been looked upon as a potential source of power in the form of tidal energy and hydraulic energy for the ultimate production of hydro-electric power.

"Power" has been looked upon as harnessed energy in a form immediately available to perform work.

On the Western Australian scene, among the fuels would be coal, timber, oil, and natural gas. Energy would be in the form of the tides and rivers of the north-west, together with atomic substances. Power would be predominantly electricity, steam, etc. It is considered that the short title should therefore be retained to cover all the possibilities mentioned above.

The Leader of the Opposition queried the use of the word "undertake" in clause 7(d), which reads—

(d) to promote, and with the approval of the Minister to undertake, the co-ordinated development and use of the sources and the supplies of fuel, energy, and power in and to the State.

The information I have received from the draftsman is that the word "undertake" has been included to cover the possible eventuality that the State and the Commonwealth Governments might combine financial resources to undertake the construction of a natural gas pipeline, the development of a tidal power scheme, and an integrated power scheme for, say, the Pilbara and the eastern goldfields area. It is not envisaged that the fuel and power commission of Western Australia would set itself up as a trading concern but rather that it would be the body responsible to the Government to cause positive action to be taken to cope with a situation which may develop in the fuel and power field at some time in the future.

With regard to the query raised concerning delegations under clause 17(2) (b), the Parliamentary Draftsman advises that it is necessary to make clear that where a person to whom some authority has been delegated is called upon to express an opinion, the opinion must be his and not one obtained secondhand. I am informed that this wording is quite common in a number of Acts which have been

passed recently in this State. I made inquiries and I found that a similar situation exists in section 31(2)(b) of the Environmental Protection Act, 1971; in section 16(6) of the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act of 1967; and in section 4(8) of the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act, 1971.

Under clause 26(1)(c), the need for the Minister to nominate a council member in writing was queried by the Leader of the Country Party. I have been advised that there would not appear to be any great problem in the Minister making a nomination in writing, and this would appear to be desirable for the orderly conduct of proceedings. It is pointed out that this is not a vital matter and, if the Leader of the Country Party desires, the words, "in writing" could be deleted because we feel it will not affect the legislation in any way.

The draftsman feels that the words, "in writing" will not affect the operations of the council because the presiding officer would have to come from the council, and the matter would have to be advised in writing by the Minister. We do not believe this would cause undue delay. However, if the Leader of the Country Party wishes to insist that the words be deleted we can arrange for this to be done in another place.

Mr. Nalder: That was suggested only to allow the operation of the legislation to work smoothly and without difficulties.

Mr. MAY: I appreciate the honourable member's point of view. The Parliamentary Draftsman does not consider the words will create any difficulty if left in the Bill, but if the honourable member feels it is desirable to delete them we will arrange for it to be done in another place.

MR. JONES (Collie) [5.03 p.m.]: In the second reading debate I referred briefly to the policies followed by the State Electricity Commission, and I urged the new commission to look more closely at the use of coal for power generation. I also pointed out that when the last unit at Kwinana is installed some 900 megawatts of power will be available from that oil-burning source, together with a lesser amount from the East Perth and South Fremantle stations. During my speech I said that only 340 megawatts are available from the coal-fired system.

I expressed concern that in the case of war or other hostilities our power supplies could be jeopardised because it cannot be denied that when the last unit at Kwinana comes into operation most of our needs will be supplied from one district. With this in mind I hope the proposed commission will look closely at the possibility of a greater concentration on the use of coal for power generation.

During my submission I also pointed out that in my view the S.E.C. had adopted the policy it has been following as a result of the known coal reserves. I think I clearly indicated that the known coal reserves are now much greater than was anticipated by the commission at that time.

In the current *Hansard* at page 2516 the Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying—

In my experience it has become apparent that the great brains of the world who study this question are more concerned about the problems over the next 15 years than with problems beyond that time.

In his submission the Leader of the Opposition put forward his views concerning new power resources and the means by which power will be generated in the future. I took the opportunity to refer to his remarks during my second reading speech.

It is interesting to note that since the debate on the second reading of this Bill concluded last week, a symposium was held in Sydney at the instigation of the Atomic Energy Commission. It was attended by staff of that commission, and was held on the 17th August. After it concluded the following public statement was issued:—

Australia's exports of uranium ore are expected to be worth up to \$200 million by the early 1980's. This was the confident prediction of staff from the Atomic Energy Commission at a Symposium in Sydney today.

Some half-dozen experts on atomic energy agreed at the meeting that Australia was unlikely to get nuclear power for 10-15 years.

Professor G. D. McColl, of the University of New South Wales said that, on current costs, power generated by coal had a substantial cost advantage over nuclear power. However, the prospects for the export of uranium were extremely good, according to Dr. R. K. Warner, another specialist from the Atomic Energy Commission.

They presented a paper to show that Australia's uranium reserves were sufficiently large to permit extensive export for many years without prejudice to its own requirements.

Whilst I do not wish to argue to any great extent, it is clear that the statement I have read out is quite different from the predictions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition during the second reading debate. I think that statement supports the argument I have been putting forward ever since I came to this Parliament, and even before I came here; that is, coal is just as economical as other forms of fuel for heat. So I would urge

the proposed commission to concentrate on the furtherance of our coal-fired system.

Whilst I am on my feet I would like to point out that if we examine the policies being followed in other parts of the world—and, indeed, in other parts of Australia—we will find that today power commissions in other States and in other countries where economic coal is available are extending their coal-fired systems.

If anyone wishes to argue about the price, I would refer him to Queensland where there is an abundance of coal. In that State one power house is paying as much as \$9 a ton for coal. I realise that the question of calorifics must be considered. Whilst Collie coal has a much lower calorific value than coal from New South Wales or Queensland, it has other benefits which Eastern States coal do not have.

Mr. Nalder: What is the present price of oil?

Mr. JONES: I am not speaking about oil at the moment. I am concentrating my efforts on coal. I thought we heard enough of oil when the honourable member was Minister for Electricity. If he wants to go into that question again I am willing to enter into argument with him because I now have at my disposal information which I did not have when I was on the other side of the House. Time will not permit me to go into that now, but I would like to take it up on another occasion.

Mr. Nalder: It must be less than the price for coal.

Mr. Williams: You have plenty of time.

Mr. JONES: I am quite prepared to discuss this matter with any member on the other side of the House at a time suitable to him; but at the moment all of our concentration should be on the expansion of our coal-fired generation system. I will end my remarks by making the point that I admit Collie coal has a lower calorific value than Eastern States coal, but the ash content of Collie coal ranges between 3 and 7 per cent, whereas in the Eastern States the average is as high as 20 to 25 per cent.

Therefore it will be seen that in the Eastern States where coal is used for power generation about one-quarter of it is a waste product and the disposal of that waste causes some concern to power commissions in those States.

I thought I would make that position clear. It indicates that we have no concern for the next 10 to 15 years, and I sincerely hope the proposed commission will give greater consideration to extending the coal-fired system now that the reserves of Collie coal have been proved to be greater than the earlier estimate. I support the third reading.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) (5.10 p.m.): In view of the comments made by the member for Collie I feel it is important that I make a few brief remarks to put the record straight in regard to a couple of matters. The honourable member quoted part of the speech I made during the second reading debate on this Bill, and he referred specifically to page 2516 of the current *Hansard* where I said—

In my experience it has become apparent that the great brains of the world who study this question are more concerned about the problems over the next 15 years than with problems beyond that time.

However, he did not quote my subsequent amplification and the several points I listed. It is terribly important that we in this House understand exactly what we were talking about during the second reading debate. If we get bogged down on coal, oil, gas, or any one thing of that nature as a specific subject and a hobby-horse of some member or other, we will completely lose sight of the objectives of the Bill.

In the next column of the same page in *Hansard* I amplified my remarks and asked the question: "Why the next 15 years?" I then went on to explain that there is a very good reason for this, and said—

Firstly, environmental considerations are critical with the existing readily available sources of fuel. The world is using a prodigious amount of petroleum fuel which is very heavy in sulphur—and SO₂ is something which triggers off a very sharp reaction in the community today.

That is the reason for the next 15 years being very critical in the minds of the scientists; because not only do we have the problem of SO₂ with some fuels which are used in large quantities today, but also other problems of rather delicate political situations in the countries of greatest petroleum availability, such as the Middle East.

No-one is quarreling with the member for Collie regarding the use of coal; the mere we can get out of the ground and use within the economic resources we have the better it will be. It is rather amusing that the honourable member is now prating about the amount expected to be available in Collie—and I hope it is there—because he overlooks the fact that his union was very critical of the Brand Government when it brought a certain gentleman over here who said that there was something like 80,000,000 tons of coal at Collie. His union got onto its high horse and screamed blue murder about that and said there was not that much

coal there; and then it promptly engaged the same man and got him to change his mind.

No-one is questioning the desirability of using Collie coal or proving the reserves. I hope that we not only find more coal at Collie but also find another coalfield. We need all the sources of fuel and energy we can find, and they will all be harnessed in due time. But if we look at this purely on the basis of one local fuel we will defeat the objectives of the Bill.

I want to tell the member for Collie that as a result of the more advanced forms of energy and fuels which are being developed—and particularly the more advanced forms of nuclear energy—the whole scene will change in the next 15 years; and within a further 15 years there will be a further change with the large volume use of solar energy in the form of hydrogen and other ways.

I do not want the honourable member to create the impression that we on this side of the House do not want to see more coal found and used. I hope we find more coal, and I hope we find other fuels. I can understand why Queensland will become an ever-increasing user of coal. That State has prodigious resources of coal, both fuel coal and coking coal, of high calorific value. Naturally, as part of the overall national scene I hope that fuel will be used.

I suppose the member for Collie is aware that techniques have been developed, and have been perfected, so that coal will not have to be mined but will be used *in situ*. No longer will men have to go down into the bowels of the earth to get it out. These techniques are, of course, putting coal to its greatest possible economic use. There are other factors which the honourable member has overlooked. There could be better economic gain in the use of some of the Collie coal for chemicals as well as power generation because of its special qualities.

I merely wanted to put the record straight. First of all when we speak about 15 years being the critical factor, this is mainly for environmental as well as political reasons. We on this side of the House want to see more Collie coal found, proved, and used. We also want to see coal resources found in other places.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Mental Health Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Auctioneers Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General), and transmitted to the Council.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [5.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [5.19 p.m.]: At the third reading stage of this Bill I take the opportunity to make some comments on the checkpoint at Norseman. Criticism has been made that this checkpoint has not been used as effectively as it could have been. Therefore, I think this matter should be examined to ensure that no interstate operators are entering the State of Western Australia without being thoroughly checked. In answer to a question asked by the member for Roe today, the Minister indicated the times during which the checkpoint operated, and added that when floodlighting provisions are made, the times will be re-examined. I think this is a move in the right direction.

It is not difficult to check stock that is transported by rail, because all stock coming from the Eastern States is despatched to Parkerton and thoroughly checked there before being transported to other parts of the State. However, in regard to road transport of stock the Norseman checkpoint has been subjected to some criticism, because sometimes stock, when being transported on interstate vehicles, have got through without being checked. I therefore ask the Minister to ensure that the inspectors to be appointed will police the provisions contained in the Bill as effectively as we would desire them to be policed.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [5.20 p.m.]: I can assure the member for Mt. Marshall that the Norseman checkpoint has given us a great deal of concern and therefore has been kept under constant surveillance. The checking operation at the moment is designed to use the services of the inspectors at that period when the traffic flow is the greatest, and this period has been calculated as accurately as possible.

We, too, would like to see a 24-hour surveillance at the checkpoint, but the facilities and the economic factors involved have to be taken into consideration. However, I give the honourable member the

assurance that we are concerned about this checkpoint and that it is kept constantly under review.

Mr. Nalder: The man who wants to break the law will go through at night, and not during the day.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Quite so.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

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

POLICE FORCE

A.L.P. Moves for Inquiry: Motion

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.21 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House:—

- (a) the persistent moves by the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party to have the Western Australian police force investigated are to be deplored and are attempts to undermine the morale as well as the efficiency and the effectiveness of the force;
- (b) it is important that there be a well trained and well equipped police force which commands the respect of the community so that the democratic way of life and the general well being and safety of the community can be preserved.

It is not without a great deal of regret that the Opposition has made a determination to introduce this motion to the House. Over a long period of time, and more particularly since the present Government came into office, we have heard a great deal of criticism against the various activities of the Police Force. With the passage of time we imagined that these snide attacks on the force, and the attempts to white-ant it would, more or less, have disappeared.

As recently as last week my leader had proposed to put a question on the notice paper relative to the latest request by the State Executive of the A.L.P. for an inquiry into the Police Force. As I have said, we felt that these waves of protest and criticism would disappear. However, it appears that this is not to be and therefore we have taken this opportunity to move a motion, rather than ask the question to which I have referred, to obtain from the Government and its supporters their attitude towards the action being taken by the

State Executive of the A.L.P. in respect of this undermining and white-anting of the Police Force.

The motion was motivated by the most recent request by the State Executive of the A.L.P. to have an inquiry held into the pay, working conditions, and the like, of the Police Force. We believe this to be a back-door method of achieving an inquiry which request, to date, to give it some credit, the Government has refused.

Anyone who knows anything about the operations of the Police Forces in the various States, knows full well that the conditions of service, pay determinations, and so on, are arrived at as a result of mutual negotiations between the Government and the representatives of the force. To the best of my knowledge, in this State there has not been a major disputation in respect of pay and service conditions of the Police Force between the Government of the day and the force for a considerable period of time. The representatives of the Police Forces in each State meet regularly and between them determine what should be the proper conditions in respect of pay, promotion, and the like and, in every instance during the time we were the Government—and I think this has applied in the past also—such determinations have been made by mutual agreement between the Government of the day and the union representing the Police Force.

Therefore the action by the State Executive of the A.L.P. in requesting an inquiry to be held into the conditions and pay of members of the Police Force is, I repeat, a back-door method of achieving an inquiry which, so far, has not come to fruition.

Mr. Lapham: Is not that an assumption?

Mr. O'NEIL: I said that we believed it to be. I said we have decided to put forward this motion rather than ask a question on what the Government proposes to do about this line of inquiry so that, once and for all, we have stated in this House by the Government and its supporters their correct attitude towards the Police Force.

Mr. Bickerton: How long did it take you to think up the motion?

Mr. O'NEIL: Very little time.

Mr. Bertram: That is fairly obvious from the wording of it.

Mr. O'NEIL: We will listen with a great deal of interest to what the Minister has to say when he speaks to the motion. One does read reports—and I suppose this is to be expected—that certain minority pressure groups are constantly accusing the Police Force, not only in Western Australia and in the rest of the Commonwealth but in other parts of the world also, of actions such as brutality and over-reaction to demonstrations, or what is considered to be nonreaction to demonstrations.

Mr. Bickerton: From where did you get this information?

Mr. O'NEIL: I must have obtained my information from the media, because I have mentioned that these reports concerning the activities of the police are published not only in Western Australia and in the rest of the Commonwealth, but also in countries all over the world. It may well be that some criticism can be directed at the media for sponsoring the attitudes of these minority pressure groups, but on the other hand one must have regard for the fact that very often we read reports that praise highly the work of the Police Force when, in the normal course of its duties, it successfully apprehends vicious criminals. In such instances the force does receive more or less unstinted praise.

On the other hand, for some reason or other, where a major piece of detection takes place, or a person is apprehended following a rather strenuous search, one finds reason, according to some of the reports published in the media, for criticising the actions of the police. One simply has to look at the well known Cook case—not the Garry Cook case—in regard to which the police were praised to the nth degree for their efficient action, but then, on considering the other side of the coin, the police were subjected to a great deal of criticism for apprehending a person named Brockman, who, for some reason or another, came to be regarded more as a martyr than an offender. So there is this tendency to wax and wane between unstinted praise for, and unstinted criticism of, the Police Force.

Mr. Hartrey: The police got a great deal more praise for catching Deeming, the murderer, than they did for catching Ned Kelly. However, that is not surprising.

Mr. O'NEIL: It may well be that the media waxes and wanes on any particular issue. I am not being critical about that aspect of the matter. It is often said, too, that in regard to other matters, such as drug abuse, the media, perhaps, in some respects, can be blamed because of the amount of publicity it gives to the number of prosecutions, because this would seem to indicate that drug taking is far more widespread than it really is and that this creates in the minds of some people the thought that perhaps drug taking is not such a bad thing.

I suppose these are philosophical considerations, and I am not placing any blame at the door of the media for publicising to a certain degree what are considered to be the brutal actions of the police that are taken for the protection of the public. In order to bring the whole matter into proper context, and for the purpose of the record, it is necessary to go back to the genesis of the requests that have been made for an inquiry, not only

by the political wing of the Labor movement, but also, if not directly by the industrial wing of the Labor movement, certainly by the industrial members of the State Executive of the A.L.P.

Firstly, early in 1971 a rather disastrous event occurred in the history of this State, resulting in the appointment of a new Minister for Police. I am not saying that his appointment was disastrous, but the event which occasioned the appointment was, in my view, disastrous. On the 7th March, 1971, *The Sunday Times* wrote a leading article which I am sure in one respect was not appreciated by the Minister for Police, but I am sure it is one with which the member for Boulder-Dundas might have some sympathy. The article read to this effect—

“It is encouraging to see that the Police Minister, Mr. Dolan, the oldest member of the new Labor Cabinet—I do not know why the word “oldest” had to be included. To continue—

—has not wasted any time in examining the structure of his force.”

The paper then referred to the items he would consider including increased staff, quicker promotion on merit, better buildings, better equipment, and the like. This was all stated as if it were something brand spanking new which emerged from the oldest member of the State Labor Cabinet. These matters are under constant consideration by every Government in respect of its employees, whether they be policemen, school teachers, or anyone else. All these items are absolutely necessary. I think members of the previous Government can recall the pressure which was brought to bear on them by the then Minister for Police when considering expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund as to how much more he could get to improve the efficiency of his force. No-one can deny this. It is not something new, but has occurred year after year.

Mr. Lapham: It is increasing though, is it not?

Mr. O'NEIL: Oh yes. Percentage increases are compounding. They are not simple percentage increases that occur. No matter what one does, if one doubles something one reaches infinity.

As recently as the 11th of this month the *Daily News* carried a statement, the headline of which was, “GOVT. PLANS ONE BIG H.Q.” This was as if this was something brand spanking new.

Mr. Bickerton: It is re-brand spanking new.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right, but with a capital “B” for “Brand”! The present Government is taking the credit for this complex when it was initiated by the previous Government.

Mr. Hartrey: What has this to do with the motion?

Mr. O'NEIL: I was referring to the oldest Minister and the statement concerning the new building and equipment. It seems to me that this Government has reshaped the original proposal of the Brand Government which commenced with the Central Perth Police Station being opened near the Causeway. This is nothing new. I am simply making the point that there is a continuing endeavour by all Governments to improve the efficiency, staffing, and morale of our Police Force.

Unfortunately there are pressure groups—and the one I am talking about is a major pressure group—doing their best to undermine the efficiency of our force.

One of the first indications relative to inquiries into the force appeared on the 21st July, 1971, not very long after the change of Government. The Premier advised this Parliament that he was considering a request by the State Executive of the A.L.P. for an inquiry into police action during the visit of the Springbok rugby team.

On the 6th August, 1971 in the Police Union's journal there was an editorial by the secretary of that union (Mr. Fraser) who denied the accusations of police brutality and bias expressed in a university student publication. So far we have the Government giving an indication it was looking into a request by the State Executive of the A.L.P. concerning accusations of police brutality, and the secretary of the union denying accusations made against it in a university student publication.

I will pause for a moment to make a point I omitted to make when I commenced. Firstly let me say that I do not believe an organisation such as the Police Force should have affiliation politically with any party at all. I can recall in early 1959 or perhaps late 1958 during an election campaign that the Labor Party through a series of full-page and half-page advertisements in *The Sunday Times* endeavoured to keep the then Labor Government alive. Each of the newspaper advertisements was authorised by a number of unions. It is not without significance that the secretaries of the unions in most cases were named, but the names of certain secretaries were omitted. One of those omitted was Mr. Troy, and others of the same ilk.

However, I was rather appalled that one of the advertisements was sponsored by the Police Union, amongst others, because at that time to the best of my belief that union was affiliated with the industrial wing of the Labor movement. It may even have been affiliated with the Australian Labor Party itself; I am not sure of that. I further believe it is no longer affiliated. Maybe the President of the A.L.P. can tell me whether that is so. I think it is and at least something was achieved; that

is, that the Police Force, the force responsible for the maintenance of law and order, which must take its orders from Governments of any colour, is certainly now no longer affiliated with a political party, and that is the way it ought to be.

Probably again, I will be accused of being sinister, but I wonder whether these continued attacks on the Police Force by the State Executive of the A.L.P. did not have their genesis in the action taken many years ago in connection with its disaffiliation from that particular party. That is by the way, but maybe we will receive an explanation from the Government or one of its supporters.

Mr. Bickerton: There is no connection whatsoever.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am very glad we had that. I appreciate that had the Minister made the remark when he was on his feet rather than when sitting down his name would have been in capital letters instead of only small letters which are used for interjections.

Mr. Bickerton: There is no connection whatever.

Mr. O'NEIL: Referring back to the sequence of events which occasioned the introduction of this motion, on the 12th August the Minister for Police (Mr. Dolan) denied allegations of brutality by the police during an outbreak of violence at Mt. Tom Price. This was another accusation of violence, but on this occasion it was not related to a political issue, and the accusation came from a person whose name is becoming quite well known in this Chamber—Mr. Clohessy—who is the Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union.

Mr. Bickerton: Not only in this Chamber.

Mr. Jamieson: You know him. He was one of your offsidiers for long enough.

Mr. O'NEIL: He was "off-side" as far as I was concerned, and he still remains "off-side."

Mr. Jamieson: You had some very thoughtful discussions with him.

Mr. O'NEIL: Yes. I can have thoughtful discussions with the Minister for Works, but that does not mean we are bed mates.

Mr. Jamieson: Careful now. There has been no legislation yet, you know!

Mr. Bickerton: You are updating the matter!

Mr. O'NEIL: A letter to those concerned from the Minister for Police described the allegation as inaccurate. However, following on with the story, after an A.L.P. Executive meeting on the 16th August, 1971, an article appeared in the paper headed, "A.L.P. asks for probe on police." I do not know whether the A.L.P. used the word "probe," but the Press stated that the A.L.P. Executive asked for a probe.

Mr. Hartrey: That is a recognised Press expression.

Mr. O'NEIL: It is like the word "crisis" which got me into trouble some years ago.

Some of the accusations regarding the Springbok tour were that the police had lied to the Minister and the Premier; that the police gave biased and untrue accounts; that a letter from the Premier to the A.L.P. criticised—

Mr. Bickerton: Where are you getting this from?

Mr. O'NEIL: I am quoting.

Mr. Bickerton: What from?

Mr. O'NEIL: From some extensive notes I made myself which I am now having some difficulty in reading as I am a shocking writer.

Mr. Jamieson: You should have been a doctor, not a teacher.

Mr. Lapham: Are your notes in shorthand because if so the *Hansard* reporter might be able to read them?

Mr. O'NEIL: The *Hansard* reporters may be able to read my writing better than I can!

The issue of the Springbok tour was once again revived and Mr. Chamberlain, the State Secretary of the A.L.P., is reported to have said that the report gave the impression of whitewashing. This is the report the State Executive accused of being biased and misleading. Mr. McMullan, the secretary of the Gaol Officers' Union—and here we have the influence of the industrial wing of the Labor movement making its voice heard on the Council of the State Executive—quoted two reasons for the inquiry, one being the behaviour of the police during the tour, and the other being that the police had lied to the Minister.

Mr. Bickerton: Can you repeat the publication from which you are quoting?

Mr. O'NEIL: I am reading from a series of newspaper reports.

Mr. Bickerton: Don't you think we are entitled to know these so we can check them?

Mr. O'NEIL: I suppose so, but if the Minister likes to have a look at the minutes of the A.L.P. Executive meeting on the 16th August, 1971—

Mr. Jamieson: How did you get them?

Mr. O'NEIL: —he will find reference to it; it is reported in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, the 17th August, 1971, and the article was written by Mr. B. Christian.

Mr. Bickerton: What was the date?

Mr. O'NEIL: The 17th August, 1971.

Mr. Bickerton: It has taken you 12 months to submit this motion.

Mr. O'NEIL: I think the Minister was out of the Chamber when I said that it was with a great deal of regret we found

it necessary at long last to take action by way of a motion. We had hoped the constant pinpricking attacks on the Police Force by the A.L.P. would have been discontinued, but such is not the case and the decision to move this motion was motivated by what we believe is the snide effort to get an inquiry into the Police Force, but which the Government has so far refused, by referring to pay conditions and the like, which is the back-door way of getting something which the Government has, to its credit, refused to grant.

Mr. Bickerton: It is not the first inquiry requested into the Police Force.

Mr. O'NEIL: We believe that if one request was refused that should have been enough, but request after request after request is being made. We hoped the matter would be left alone by the State Executive of the A.L.P. following several refusals by the Government, but such is not the case and so we have introduced this motion, as I said before, to enable the Government and members supporting it to express in this House their points of view concerning the actions of the State Executive of the A.L.P.

Mr. Bickerton: Do you want an inquiry?

Mr. O'NEIL: Certainly not. We do not believe there should be one. However, we want the Government to tell the Parliament that it does not want one either.

Mr. Bickerton: Every case is treated on its merits.

Mr. O'NEIL: We will see how the Minister votes when the question is put. Still in the same newspaper article to which I have referred, the motion passed at the State Executive meeting reads this way—

Mr. Bickerton: Can you vouch for its accuracy?

Mr. O'NEIL: I have said that I can vouch for the accuracy of the man who printed it, but if the Minister wants to check the accuracy of the motion I suggest he should look at the minutes of the State Executive meetings. Since the motion appears in inverted commas in the newspaper report, I presume it is a direct quote and, had it been inaccurate, I am sure the A.L.P. Executive would have denied it.

Mr. Bickerton: You should emphasise this is a reproduced newspaper article.

Mr. O'NEIL: When the Minister speaks perhaps he will tell me whether this motion, which is reported to have been passed by the State Executive of the A.L.P., is correct. It says—

The State Executive expresses concern that the Minister for Police and the Premier have obviously been misinformed by the Police Department,

and urge that the inquiry be carried out, and that a deputation including Mr. McMullan wait on the Premier and the Minister for Police.

That is reported to be the motion that was carried by the State Executive. It is in quotation marks and should be reasonably accurate. About the same time Chief Superintendent Leitch was quoted as having said—

Mr. Bickerton: That is better.

Mr. O'NEIL: To continue—

I can only say that the Governor, the Premier and other officials have made public statements saying that our police force had done a good job.

He was referring particularly to the incidents which related to the Springbok tour. Once again, this was followed by an expression of confidence by the Police Union in members of the Police Force and a statement made by Mr. Dolan to the effect that he had complete faith and confidence in the Police Department. He did not believe that the department had tried to mislead him.

That is all very good and members on this side of the House, through the many statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, have supported the Minister for Police for standing up for members of the Police Force, their actions, and the manner in which they perform the onerous duties which are imposed upon them.

I will preface my next remarks with the word "finally" but, as members will see later, it means little. Finally, in September, the Government refused the request for an inquiry.

That is the history of the first issue and the Opposition would have expected that to be the end of it. The particular quotation which seemed to have terminated this needling appeared in *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 9th September, 1971, under the heading, "Tonkin Rejects Police Inquiry." I shall quote a few passages from this, as follows:—

Mr. Tonkin said that Mr. Court had wrongly assumed that the State executive of the A.L.P. had demanded that the Government should hold an inquiry.

That is a rather interesting kind of assumption.

Sir Charles Court: I'll say!

Mr. O'NEIL: The article also states—

It had merely urged the need for an inquiry into a particular incident in which some police officers were involved.

A little later on, the article says—

Mr. Chamberlain said last night that the question of the inquiry had become a campaign to try to discredit the

Labor Government by inferring that it was being dictated to by the State executive of the A.L.P.

Even Mr. Chamberlain was having some sleepless nights!

Sir Charles Court: We did not infer; we said it straightout.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right. We said straightout that the Labor Government was being dictated to by the State Executive of the A.L.P. That was not the final matter although we imagined it would be. The Miscellaneous Workers' Union made a request to the A.L.P. State Executive in connection with changing the police procedure for fingerprinting people. Here we see an intrusion of the industrial wing of the Labor movement into matters of A.L.P. policy. The request came from the Miscellaneous Workers' Union following the anti-apartheid demonstrations during the Springbok rugby tour.

Mr. Hartrey: It was not to do with the Springboks.

Mr. O'NEIL: The article appears in the *Daily News* of the 28th September, 1971, and is by the same gentleman, Mr. Bret Christian, who must be the reporter who attends the meetings of the A.L.P. Executive. The article is headed, "A.L.P. fingerprint plea rejected." It reads, in part—

Police procedure for fingerprinting people who have been arrested will not be changed despite a request for the change from the A.L.P. State Executive.

Mr. Hartrey: It has been abolished, not changed.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am pleased to know that. The honourable member said this had nothing to do with the Springbok tour, but the same article reads—

The executive submitted proposals to the Minister for Police, Mr. Dolan.

They came from the Miscellaneous Workers' Union following the anti-apartheid demonstrations during the Springbok rugby tour.

If the State Executive of the A.L.P. thought that statement was wrong, it could have denied it. The member for Boulder-Dundas says it is wrong, and I am prepared to agree with him, but I can only go on what the report says.

Mr. Hartrey: I am not talking about the report but the fingerprinting.

Mr. O'NEIL: The apology from the member for Boulder-Dundas is accepted. I was talking about a matter arising from the Springbok tour. We had thought that this tour was forgotten, but apparently this was not the case. The Minister for Police rejected these proposals and was reported to have said that the Western Australian police had a fine record of tolerance towards peaceful demonstrators.

Once again the Minister for Police was put into the position of upholding the honour and dignity of the force of which he is commissioned to be in charge. Incidentally, it is quite right that the Minister should speak out for the force in this way.

I am digressing a little from the subject matter, but in talking about the influence of the media, little pressure groups, and so on, the Very Reverend Dean Hazlewood decided at some point of time that, since everyone else was having a shot at the Police Force, he might as well be in it too. He is quoted as having said, when describing the actions of the police in connection with drug raids—

Through the windows enter a group of official baboons, banging and slamming and treating these people—

He is referring to pot smokers. To continue—

—as degenerate criminals.

Quite rightly this raised a storm of protest in the community. As a result of this at least one action was taken of which we on this side of the House are extremely proud; the State Women's Council of the Liberal Party withdrew an invitation to the Reverend gentleman to be spokesman at one of the council's seminars on community affairs.

Mr. Hartrey: Are you proud of that?

Mr. O'NEIL: They, like many decent people, had the courage to indicate their abhorrence of the remark passed by the Reverend gentleman.

The matter, once again, developed into a running fight and running sore between the State Executive of the A.L.P. and the Police Force, with the Government the meat in the sandwich. Complaints re police conduct at an anti-war demonstration at the U.S. Consulate were made to the Premier in May, 1972. This was the occasion when the U.S. Secretary of State (Mr. Rodgers) was passing through Perth to attend a major conference in Canberra. At that stage the State Executive of the A.L.P., unable to win any Government action in the matter, decided it would set up a special committee to investigate the handling of the demonstration. I do not know whether that committee has reported or what it had to say. Perhaps it would be better if I do not say too much, since certain aspects of that demonstration could be regarded as *sub judice* if I read tonight's paper aright. On that occasion, and for the benefit of the Minister, there appears on page 2 of the *Daily News* of Wednesday, the 7th June, an article headed, "Police at demo: ALP complaint."

Mr. Bickerton: When you were Minister for Housing did you believe everything you read in the *Daily News*?

Mr. O'NEIL: If the Minister likes to refute the article, he may do so.

Mr. Bickerton: I was just wondering what authority you put on it.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister may have missed the point. I said that while I do not blame the media for any action taken for or against the police, it seems that by publicising a great deal of this, the media may create in people's minds an attitude that all policemen are the same—either all bad or all good—depending on what their thoughts are at the time.

I make the point that this is a running sore. My references are pertinent to keep things in order. The Minister himself requested I give him information as to the source of some of my quotes.

Mr. Bickerton: Fair enough.

Mr. O'NEIL: I have already given the date of this article which states—

The State A.L.P. executive plans to meet the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, to complain about police conduct during an anti-war demonstration outside the U.S. consulate in Perth last month.

There are other comments about this and, later on, the article states—

Earlier one branch requested that Mr. Tonkin be asked to view all television and private film of the May 11 anti-war demonstration that would "promote ministerial action to restrain unnecessary brutality by police."

Perhaps during the course of this debate we may hear a little more about some of the matters related to the films taken during that particular demonstration to which the article refers.

Finally the Minister for Police was put on the mat.

Mr. Bickerton: Very democratic.

Mr. O'NEIL: Yes, very democratic! In *The West Australian* of the 20th June, 1972, appeared an article under the heading, "Lab. criticism of minister." It says, in part—

The Minister for Police, Mr. Dolan, will be asked to address the A.L.P. State Executive on comments he has made about police handling of recent anti-war demonstrations.

Mr. Dolan's praise of the police action has drawn a spate of criticism from A.L.P. members and branches.

Further, the article states—

Mr. Dolan's comments and police actions at the demonstrations have both been the subject of much criticism at the executive. There have been allegations of police brutality.

The Balga branch recommended that Mr. Dolan be condemned for making what it called sweeping statements.

The Claremont-Nedlands branch said it was amazed at what Mr. Dolan was reported to have said. It condemned his attitudes.

The Balga branch asked the executive to instruct Mr. Dolan—

I like the word "instruct." To continue—to advise the police that the confiscation of banners, flags, placards and pamphlets was contrary to fundamental democratic rights.

Mr. Bickerton: What happened?

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister will be advised as I proceed.

Mr. May: Will he be "instructed"?

Mr. O'NEIL: Apparently only the A.L.P. Executive has the power to instruct Ministers. I intend only to advise.

Mr. Bickerton: If that was the case you would not be moving the motion.

Sir Charles Court: We are giving you the confidence to take a firm stand against the executive. To have the backing of the Opposition is important when you have a majority of one in this House, and do not have a majority in the Parliament.

Mr. O'NEIL: At this stage one could have expected the Premier to come to the support of his Minister and to stand behind him.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How do you know the Premier did not stand alongside him that night at the executive meeting?

Mr. O'NEIL: What about saying it publicly.

Mr. Bickerton: It was not in the *Daily News*?

Mr. O'NEIL: Perhaps the Premier made a public utterance as to his faith in the Minister, but as far as I am concerned, if he stood behind him it was about a mile behind him.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is what you say. I would like to bring you up to date. I made it my business, at some inconvenience, to be present at the State Executive meeting that night. I was pleased to hear the Minister for Police being applauded after he had made his explanation.

Mr. O'NEIL: I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the Premier in taking that stand. As far as we were concerned, the Minister for Police was like a shag on a rock. The only public utterance I could see was one made by the Leader of the Opposition in *The West Australian* of the 21st June.

Mr. Bickerton: In other words, you are going to withdraw the motion.

Sir Charles Court: No, you need our support.

Mr. O'NEIL: I will not read it fully. It is sufficient to say that the particular article is headed, "Court Supports Dolan's Stand"—and it is not a police court. The article commences—

The Minister for Police, Mr. Dolan, who has been under fire from his party's State executive, received support last night from the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Charles Court.

The honourable member may read what the Leader of the Opposition had to say. I have given him the reference. There is a further reference to the police at the end of the article where it states—

The continued attacks by the Labor Party against the Minister for Police, Mr. Dolan, were disappointing and astonishing, the secretary of the Police Union, Mr. I. T. Fraser, said yesterday.

Mr. Dolan had always had the full support of the union.

"Mr. Dolan has done a mighty job, not only for the police but for the State," Mr. Fraser said. "I am disappointed and astonished at the continued attacks on him."

Mr. Bickerton: He is still the Minister for Police, what are you worrying about?

Sir Charles Court: For how long? It is just as well the present Minister for Police is not a candidate at the next election.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: He has already announced that.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister for Police appears to be a person cast in a rather strange role. In this House we are all well aware of Senator Wheeldon and some of his exotic attitudes in relation to law and order. On the 1st August, 1972, an article appears in *The West Australian* reporting Senator Wheeldon's comments at an A.L.P. State Executive meeting the previous night. It says—

The W.A. police force compared favourably with the much-vaunted London metropolitan force, Senator J. Wheeldon said at an A.L.P. State executive meeting last night.

Mr. O'Connor: Doesn't he like them either?

Mr. O'NEIL: I just wonder whether we are not seeing here an endeavour to assist. However, when one has regard for the Senator's general attitude as far as law and order is concerned, one wonders whether he was speaking with tongue in cheek.

Mr. Bickerton: You are not implying he is against law and order?

Mr. O'NEIL: I will ask the Minister to make his own assumption.

Mr. Bickerton: It is an implication to which he has no opportunity to reply.

Mr. O'NEIL: He certainly does not like what he refers to as "a Greenwoodian sense of law and order."

Mr. Bickerton: Nobody does.

Sir Charles Court: Did you not see the Senator in the drug television programme with the Dean when the Dean made his scurrilous attack on the police?

Mr. Graham: You are annoyed because you were not on the screen.

Mr. O'NEIL: Senator Wheeldon went on to say this—

One of the most serious things that could happen to a society was a lack of public confidence in the police force.

We agree wholeheartedly with this and it is one of the reasons behind the introduction of this motion.

Mr. Jamieson: We will have to see he is not on a unity ticket with you.

Mr. May: There was an all-time record of resignations from the Police Force.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Senator did not close all his doors and options. He followed his remarks by saying—

The present situation in Australia was not good.

Even though we are equal to the London Bobbies. He continued—

There were serious charges pending against officers of the police force in practically every State.

Mr. Bickerton: Are all policemen friends of yours?

Mr. O'NEIL: I certainly hope so. Although we appreciate the jocular remarks which have been passed, we cannot get away from the seriousness of the situation. It is quite clear that for some considerable time the Police Force has been subjected to what I believe to be totally unwarranted attacks. Nobody in this House or in this State would agree that this is good for the Police Force, the State, or the community. It is about time that we, as a legislative body, expressed our views very strongly.

The Government has rejected most of the applications for an inquiry. The Minister for Police has had the support of his leader in rejecting accusations by the State Executive of the A.L.P., but unfortunately for him, and for the State, I do not believe the Premier's support was reported in the media. Now is the time for the Premier to get up and say just what he thinks about the continuous attacks upon the Police Force. Now is the time for him to realise that this is nothing more than a back-door move by the State Executive of the A.L.P. to force an inquiry into the Police Force. To the Premier's credit, up to date he has refused this.

Sir Charles Court: Mr. Speaker, do you require a seconder to the motion?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bickerton (Minister for Housing).

COCKBURN SOUND DEVELOPMENT

Master Plan: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 2nd June, on the following motion by Mr. Rushton:—

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the evidence given to the Commonwealth Standing Committee on public works at the recent public hearings in Perth about the Navy's plans for Garden Island, the obvious advanced stage of the Navy's research work and the magnitude of the project, and the anticipated early Commonwealth decisions following the Committee's report, there should be a top level study—with independent specialist consultants if need be—to produce a master plan for the integrated development of Cockburn Sound and all of the shire council areas immediately involved, especially as estimates of at least \$150 million of Fremantle Port Authority installations alone are in contemplation.

In considering this plan, it is important to have regard for the fact that the future of some of the towns and particularly Rockingham is at the crossroads. Therefore this master plan needs to have regard to such things as:—

- (a) the future of towns like Rockingham which involve close association with developments in Cockburn Sound;
- (b) Point Peron reserve;
- (c) the future of beaches;
- (d) the future of Kwinana beach and township;
- (e) provision for industry generally;
- (f) Fremantle Port Authority installations including container and LASH ship berths;
- (g) Naval facilities;
- (h) provision for a major commercial dry dock, ship survey, building and repair facilities jointly with or independent of Navy facilities; and
- (i) transport facilities.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [6.06 p.m.]: I want to say at the outset that I support the motion which has been moved by the member for Dale. The whole object of the motion is to request the Government to institute an inquiry or a top-level study in order that we may have

planned development in the Cockburn area. I hope that the Government will support the motion. I can see no reason why it should not support it.

Particularly in the last few months we have had all sorts of conflicting reports about the type of development which is likely to take place in the Cockburn Sound area. It will be a tragedy if the issue is not sufficiently studied to ensure, firstly, appropriate siting of the industrial complex; and secondly, that the area is maintained as a playground for the benefit of the people living in the metropolitan area.

Just recently there was a suggestion in the Press—actually it went far beyond a suggestion—that the Government intends to construct a housing area in the Naval Base section of the land fronting Cockburn Sound. I understand some thousands of houses are to be built in this area—sufficient to house 15,000 individuals. However, this settlement will be in very close proximity to the suggested site of the new steel mill, right in line with the pollution from the prevailing winds.

I also understand there was no attempt on the part of the Government to refer this to the Environmental Protection Authority. I find this hard to believe. This is to be a relatively large settlement virtually on the shores of Cockburn Sound in the lee of the smoke and pollution which will issue from the large steel works in the area. Yet the Government is prepared to consider the construction of a settlement of that kind without attempting to refer the matter to the Environmental Protection Authority. Other plans have been referred to the authority prior to the signing of agreements.

In this instance there has been no planning at all in respect of development in the vicinity of Cockburn Sound. If we are to have great steel works eventually, it would seem likely that they will be located on Cockburn Sound. If we are to have other types of development, such as the housing settlement of which I have spoken, surely we should have a top-level study to ensure that the plans are integrated in a way which will preserve the environment of Cockburn Sound to the greatest possible extent. We must also ensure that industry can find a place in the great industrial complex which has developed in the vicinity of Cockburn Sound.

In 1965 a leading officer of the Town Planning Department (Mr. H. C. Morris) was reported in a Press article as follows:—

A 20-year scheme to make Kwinana the centre of a big exporting complex of industries was outlined yesterday to the conference of the Australian Institution of Engineers at the W.A. University.

Mr. H. C. Morris, senior engineering planning officer of the W.A. Town Planning Department, said that when

the Fremantle inner harbour was fully developed, new berths would best be sited on Cockburn Sound between Rockingham and the BP refinery.

According to long-range department plans, a mile-long causeway would be built from Point Peron to Garden Island. This island could be turned into a harbour and industrial site.

The Town Planning Authority was considering reserving land south of Rockingham which could be needed for road and rail access to the island.

Point Peron would stay a recreation reserve, but the island's protected shores, deep waters, good anchorages and virgin land suited it for industry.

This was a statement made by a senior officer of the Town Planning Department to a conference of engineers. The Premier of the day (Sir David Brand) immediately refuted some of the statements. Further on the article states—

Premier Brand said yesterday that there was nothing definite about the long-range scheme for development of the Cockburn region outlined by the senior engineering town planning officer, Mr. H. C. Morris, on Monday.

Mr. Brand said that Mr. Morris has projected his own ideas for the possible future development of the Cockburn area. These had not been endorsed by the Government.

It will be seen that in 1965 the Town Planning Department was working on the preparation of a 20-year plan for the Cockburn area. I should imagine that is the last plan which has been put forward. Since then, of course, there have been radical changes. We now have a Naval Base sited at Garden Island.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Prior to the tea suspension we were discussing a plan which was put forward by a senior officer of the then Western Australian Town Planning Department about which he made mention in 1965. I was pointing out that notwithstanding what he had in mind at that time, since then a great many changes have occurred in respect of development in Cockburn Sound and the areas immediately adjacent to it. I indicated that so far as I am aware there is no overall plan for this particular area.

In the metropolitan area we have a metropolitan region plan which has been endorsed by all parties in this House and by this Parliament; it has been accepted generally by the people in Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: When you say both parties, you are excluding the Country Party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I said "by all parties". I would not exclude the Country Party; it is a most important party. The point is that we placed a great deal of stress on

our metropolitan region plan; indeed, we regard it extremely seriously and as being absolutely vital to the orderly development of the metropolitan area.

We find, however, that right alongside this great metropolitan region we have Cockburn Sound for which there is no comparable plan. We also attach a tremendous amount of importance to Cockburn Sound and the areas adjacent to it; the great industrial area of Western Australia.

The sound itself is virtually a playground and it will still remain a playground to cater for many of the forms of recreation enjoyed by the people who live in the metropolitan area. There is no reason at all why Cockburn Sound cannot be retained as a playground while at the same time having industry established there.

This will not be achieved, however, unless we have an overall plan for the area in question. The member for Dale has moved a motion which simply calls for a top-level study and the formulation of some sort of master plan for the development of this region. I cannot see how any member of the House can oppose such a motion.

I am sure each one of us will accept the fact that a plan for Cockburn Sound is vital if it is to be reserved as a recreation area. Starting from that premise I would assume that every member in the House would realise that the best way to retain it as such a playground, while at the same time finding a place for industry in the area adjacent to it, would be to have an overall plan for the purpose.

We must have a plan which is the equivalent of the metropolitan region plan. It could, perhaps, be called the Cockburn Sound and adjacent areas region plan.

Mr. Graham: You well know the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has approved this area being rezoned from industrial to urban.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Of which area is the Minister speaking?

Mr. Graham: The Cockburn-Coojee area.

Mr. GRAYDEN: What has been suggested by the member for Dale is the necessity for a top-level study with a view to producing an overall plan for Cockburn Sound and the adjoining shires.

Mr. Graham: This is a continuing process.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is not. The Minister for Development and Decentralisation has just said that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority had approved the areas adjacent to the sound being rezoned urban.

Mr. Graham: That is so.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I cannot see how that meets the requirement. We have already pointed out that recently the Government decided to site a settlement to house 15,000 people within a few miles of the steel works on the shores of Cockburn Sound and in the direct path of the prevailing winds.

Mr. Graham: It is a much better plan in spite of the steel mill than, say, the new Kwinana townsite.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The townsite at Naval Base is in the direct path of the prevailing winds which carry pollution and smoke from the steel works across to the new housing settlement. The siting of that settlement was not referred to the Environmental Protection Authority.

Mr. Graham: The siting of what? No attempt was made to resite what?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Before it was decided to site the town at Naval Base the Government made no attempt to refer the matter to the Environmental Protection Authority.

Mr. Graham: The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority had already approved its becoming a residential area.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Government claims to be very interested in conservation and in the protection of the environment; and, such being the case, when it was decided that a housing settlement be established in close proximity to an industrial area, surely the matter should first have been referred to the Environmental Protection Authority to establish whether or not the site was appropriate or the proposition reasonable.

Mr. Graham: Do you think it would be protecting the environment if there were a whole lot of smoking chimneys?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is not a question of protecting the environment. Industry must be established on the shores of Cockburn Sound, but the point is it is not logical to place a township in close proximity to the steel works, particularly in view of the pollution that is likely to occur. No attempt was made to develop a top-level plan in that instance. The Government did not refer the matter to the Environmental Protection Authority.

Mr. Graham: A few minutes ago you were extolling the virtues of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and talking about the good job it is doing. You seem to forget that it is that same authority that has given approval in respect of this area.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is for the Government to choose a satisfactory site for the new housing area. Not only did the Government fail to do this but it also failed to plan for the purpose. Accordingly I feel that this highlights the need for some top-level study to be conducted which will

result in the planning of Cockburn Sound and the adjacent areas with a view to providing orderly development in that region.

Mr. Graham: If you feel like that you should move a vote of no confidence in the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is no necessity for that. The Minister mentioned that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority had approved the area being zoned urban. Accordingly it is now left to the Government to take the necessary action. Had this matter been referred to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority would it have agreed to the siting of the town in that particular locality?

Mr. Graham: They have had another look at it and they are more emphatic in their view.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I cannot accept that. I cannot see how the M.R.P.A. would place a township in the path of the prevailing winds which carry smoke and pollution from the industries established in the area.

Like most members I have had the experience of going to Rockingham via Bibra Lake and I can assure the House the smelly fumes emitted in that area are most objectionable. They seem to be taken up on the winds, after which they settle in the areas to which I have referred. This has been going on for some time, because the area in question is in the direct path of the prevailing winds.

When heavy industries are established there are certain spots in which houses cannot be built, but in this case the Government has placed them in the direct path of the pollution that is being emitted.

As I have already said, this highlights the necessity for some overall plan. As we all know there was a time when the Swan River was being polluted; a number of factories were discharging their waste into the Swan River. An organisation was, however, set up to police this aspect and while the matter was not corrected overnight, pressure was brought to bear on the factories in question which border the Swan and over the years the necessary provisions have been made for the disposal of such waste. It is not now discharged into the Swan River. As a consequence we have a river which is relatively free from pollution.

This also applies to Cockburn Sound. While at the moment it is relatively free from pollution I feel sure it will not remain so unless some study is conducted into the matter and some plan devised which will ensure the orderly development of Cockburn Sound and the region adjacent to it.

Mr. Graham: You are going to make it clean by putting more industry there?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This has already been set aside as a great industrial complex. Industry is already established in the area

and it can remain there, and though the industries may increase they would not necessarily pollute Cockburn Sound and the environment provided an overall plan were devised to prevent this.

Mr. Graham: Which is the direction of the prevailing winds in respect of Coogee?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I should imagine they would come principally from the south, the south-west, and the west.

Mr. Graham: In respect of this area where do you think the steel works will be? Will they be to the west or to the south-west?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister himself does not know. One moment he is talking about putting the steel mill north of Perth and later he talks about establishing it east of Perth.

Mr. Graham: If it is to be established north of Perth it will not have any impact on this area.

Mr. GRAYDEN: At this stage nobody seems to know where the steel works are likely to be established.

Mr. Graham: If they are at Kwinana they will be established on the B.H.P. lane.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Recently I had the experience of visiting Whyalla where huge steel works are established on the shores of the ocean.

Mr. Graham: They are rather prehistoric works.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I was rather amazed to find that the local authority which controls the Whyalla area is able to maintain relatively fine beaches with all sorts of amenities no more than a mile or so from the steel works. It goes to show that we can have heavy industry in an area and still maintain it as a suitable recreational area. That is the view one gets when one visits Whyalla. This is a huge steel mill. I do not imagine that any steel works we establish on the shores of Cockburn Sound will be any larger. Within a mile or so of Whyalla we find good beaches. So, it is possible to retain the beaches in good order in the vicinity of Cockburn Sound, if we plan for the orderly development of industry.

One could go to Western Port Bay where a large BP refinery has been established within a few hundred yards of the shore. One cannot see it as one drives along the shore, but I understand it is set back 300 to 400 yards. This is a huge refinery, but it has not marred the surrounding area. Such orderly development requires reasonable long-term planning.

On the 19th August a report appeared in *The West Australian* under the heading of "B.H.P. is firm on Kwinana site." The report states—

B.H.P. has dashed the State Government's hopes that it will establish a \$1,600 million jumbo steel plant outside the metropolitan area.

The company has indicated that if the steel works cannot be established at Kwinana, Australia could lose the industry altogether.

The Minister for Development and Decentralisation, Mr. Graham, who had talks with B.H.P. officials in Melbourne this week, said yesterday that he was still confident the industry would come to W.A.

"But let's face it—it looks as though it will be at Kwinana or out of Australia," he said.

He said that B.H.P. was continuing cost studies of establishing the industry at sites north and south of Perth. But it had said that a location other than Kwinana would add about \$400 million to the capital cost and would increase operating costs.

Possibly we will have in the Kwinana area a steel mill which will cost \$1,600,000,000. In reply to a question asked by the member for Dale, the Minister for Development and Decentralisation said that arising out of the steel works and the ancillary services to keep the steel works in operation, an additional 100,000 people will be attracted to the area. If we are to have an additional 100,000 people there as a consequence of the establishment of a steel works and supporting industries and services, surely there is need for a study of the situation to be made so that we can arrive at some overall plan for the orderly development of the area.

One can go along Rockingham beach during the summer months and invariably find plastic bags washed up on the shore. These remain on the beach for months. The explosives which are used in the area are wrapped in these plastic bags, and after they have been detonated the bags are washed up.

I feel sure that a tremendous amount of damage must be caused to Cockburn Sound with all the blasting taking place there, but obviously a certain amount of it is necessary. However, all such operations would come under the scrutiny of the body which is proposed by the member for Dale. We could take into consideration the scollops which have been dredged from the bottom of the sound. The vessels drag wire baskets along the bottom, and these dig into the sand and mud. Eventually the whole of the bottom of the sound is dragged over, and as a result the ecology is upset.

All these matters would be considered by the body proposed by the member for Dale, should the Government agree to a study being undertaken of Cockburn Sound and adjacent areas with a view to arriving at an overall plan. I think the member for Dale should be applauded for introducing this motion. The wording of it bears repetition. It states—

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the evidence given to the

Commonwealth Standing Committee on public works at the recent public hearings in Perth about the Navy's plans for Garden Island, the obvious advanced stage of the Navy's research work and the magnitude of the project, and the anticipated early Commonwealth decisions following the Committee's report, there should be a top level study—with independent specialist consultants if need be—to produce a master plan for the integrated development of Cockburn Sound and all of the shire council areas immediately involved, especially as estimates of at least \$150 million of Fremantle Port Authority installations alone are in contemplation.

That is the crux of the motion, and it is one of consequence. It is a motion which should have the support of every person in this vast State of ours. We have talked in terms of the presentation of petitions and of obtaining the opinions of people through various polls, but if we were to take this motion outside Parliament for decision by the people I am sure every person would support it.

The motion calls for a study to be made of Cockburn Sound and the adjacent areas so that an overall plan of development can be arrived at. We already have a plan for the development of the metropolitan region, and this has the support of members of Parliament and, I think, of every person in the State. If it is necessary to have such a plan for the metropolitan area, then it is equally necessary to have one for Cockburn Sound.

We have had some glaring examples of the lack of planning on the part of the Government. There is the case of the housing settlement being established in the line of the prevailing winds in an industrial area. Today a Bill relating to the building of a Perth regional railway may be debated in another place; and this afternoon when members of this House went along to hear a discussion on the corridor plan arranged by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, they heard Dr. Carr explain the objections of the authority to the Ritter plan. All members were invited, and a large number did attend.

One of the questions asked was this: What did the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority think about the regional railway plan which is the subject of a Bill being dealt with in another place? To the astonishment of those present, Dr. Carr said the matter had not been discussed by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

I was dismayed and astonished. I still cannot believe that a Government can introduce a Bill to provide for the construction of a regional railway without referring the matter to the town planning authority. I presume the Government has

not referred it to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, because that body has not discussed the plan. As a matter of fact, Dr. Carr did not seem to know anything about the proposals contained in the Bill.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Lloyd, the Town Planning Commissioner was of course a member of the committee responsible for it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I understand from what Dr. Carr has said—

Mr. Graham: I cannot help what you understand. I am telling you a fact of life.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I did not know that—

Mr. Graham: Of course, you did not know. I think you ought to find out before you start speaking.

Mr. GRAYDEN: From what Dr. Carr said I understand that a Cabinet subcommittee made a decision and took the matter to Cabinet, and Cabinet gave its approval. The important thing is we have the M.R.P.A., and a Bill has been introduced in another place to provide for the building of a railway which vitally affects the metropolitan regional plan, but the railway proposal has not been discussed by the planning authority. I will be anxious to hear the explanation from the Minister for Development and Decentralisation. I just mention that to indicate there is a good example of no planning having been done at all, if what Dr. Carr said was correct.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You know very well that is not correct, because I heard Dr. Carr telling you and others present that the steering committee which advised the Cabinet subcommittee had on it the representatives of the M.R.P.A.

Mr. Rushton: The M.R.P.A. has not received the plan.

Mr. Graham: What position do you think Mr. Lloyd holds?

Mr. Rushton: He is not on the authority.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Dr. Carr might well have said what the Premier has just intimated. I was sitting at the back of the hall. The important thing is that we have a regional planning authority for Perth. The Government has asked both Houses of Parliament to pass legislation which will vitally affect the metropolitan area, but the proposal has not been considered by the M.R.P.A. This was merely a Cabinet decision.

I mention that to indicate it is not good enough for the Government simply to say "Do not worry about Cockburn Sound or the adjacent areas. The planning of these areas is in good hands." If the Government can do what it has done in respect of the regional railway proposal, then obviously the planning is not in good hands. If the Government has done what

it did in establishing the housing settlement at Naval Base in line with the prevailing winds from the industries established at Kwinana, then obviously the planning of Cockburn Sound and the adjacent areas is not in good hands.

Mr. Graham: Obviously you are not prepared to accept the decision of the M.R.P.A. in connection with Cockburn Sound. Why is there now all the virtue being expounded by you on something else, that the land should be rezoned to urban?

Mr. O'Neil: Dr. Carr did not sound very enthusiastic.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In rezoning the land I did not imagine that the Government would establish a township there.

Mr. Graham: In the words of Dr. Carr, it would be absurd that people like you could sterilise several thousand acres of land in a position right next to the water's edge.

Mr. GRAYDEN: To follow this through to a reasonable conclusion we will have a town set up right against the industrial development.

Mr. Graham: You are wrong again.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Government seems to think that when some open space is available houses should be erected on it. It does not want to establish anything else on the area in question. The Government seems to be saying this: Why spend money on buying land in a more desirable location? It seems to think the people who will be occupying those houses could not care less; but, of course, that is not the case. These might only be State Housing Commission homes, but it is only right that they be built on a reasonable location. If the Government proceeds with the building of houses on that site I am sure that ultimately it will receive all sorts of complaints.

We have near Perth a large cement works. For years complaints have been made about those works. In South Perth, which is about three miles from the cement works, if the winds are blowing in the right direction the cars become covered with cement dust. This happens three miles or so from the cement works. In these circumstances I cannot understand how the Government can entertain the thought of establishing a housing settlement next door to an industrial area and in the line of the prevailing winds.

However, the point is this: There is a definite need for a top-level study to be made of Cockburn Sound and the adjacent areas. I think every member of the House, irrespective of what he thinks when he makes a decision on this motion, must believe that. We have members in the Opposition who represent electorates bordering the Cockburn Sound area. We also

have a Minister in the present Government who represents the electorate of Cockburn.

Mr. Bickerton: He represents it very well, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am sure the Minister who represents the area would be in favour of a top-level study with the object of producing a master plan for integrated development of Cockburn Sound.

The member for Fremantle has spoken frequently on the subject of conservation and the need for protecting the environment, and I think he is most sincere. He has done much which has been of great advantage to the State in this respect and I imagine he would be delighted with the idea of a top-level discussion to formulate a master plan. Certainly, all the residents of Western Australia would consider it a splendid idea.

I do not know whether the Government intends to support the motion, but I cannot see how it can possibly oppose it. The request is reasonable and such a study is long overdue. If it were carried out we would have an overall master plan which would ensure the orderly development of Cockburn Sound and adjacent areas, and that would be of great advantage to the people of this State.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [8.02 p.m.]: I rise to support this motion moved by the member for Dale. I believe it is well considered, and it is desirable for two reasons. Firstly, public interest in this country takes in issues other than just producing a few jobs, and that interest is greater than ever before. The member for Dale has seen fit to bring this motion to the Parliament so that we may have a look at the total question of our most important industrial area; namely, Kwinana.

Quite apart from that I think the motion is important in its own right. This is our most important industrial area and it is one which we have to make sure is properly planned so that we get the best from the land which is available and from the location itself.

It is important, therefore, to go quickly over the origin of the area. It was the brainchild of Mr. R. J. Dumas—later Sir Russell Dumas—and most of the planning in respect of the development of this area took place during the first ministry of Mr. David Brand—now Sir David Brand.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Did you not recommend that this change take place, with regard to the land we are talking about?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not talking about that land at all.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is what the motion is about.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, it is not.

Mr. Graham: It is the most important element; the change from industrial to urban.

Mr. O'Neil: Rubbish.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The two Ministers—the speech of one has been read to the House in his absence—obviously have not read the motion.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We have just listened to the member for South Perth.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He was dealing with one aspect of the motion. I will come back to this because I will ask the Premier to table papers in respect of an answer he supplied.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That will not be any trouble because I have the file with me.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will ask a question about that matter but it has nothing to do with this motion.

Mr. Graham: It has a lot to do with the concept of the motion.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It amazes me the interjections we are getting from the other side of the House when this motion deals with the total concept of the Kwinana area; not only the water or the industrial area.

Mr. Graham: What sort of mess did you make that you want us to clean up? What is it all about?

Mr. O'Neil: Read the motion.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to point out to the Premier, and the Deputy Premier, that if they do not pay more respect and courtesy to the Opposition they can expect some trouble.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What sort of trouble? Are you threatening?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have never known any Government to make such a mess of the notice paper. There have been many instances of lack of respect for the Opposition.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is all right to make such statements but can the Leader of the Opposition give a few specific instances?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Premier would like me to do so I will with the greatest pleasure. During the last session one of our members was ready on three occasions to deal with an important matter but each time the notice paper was changed. We had another occasion just recently. The Minister made a public statement that the Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill would not be dealt with for some time. I left the House on business with the Premier and Leader of the Country Party and when I returned I found that the second reading had been proceeded with.

Mr. O'Neil: We had only 10 minutes' notice.

Mr. Graham: And we have often postponed business to suit the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Neil: The Government should apologise for the action it took on that occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that if we get back to the terms of the motion we will make some progress.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to get back to the motion but I think you will agree that I am entitled to answer interjections which are not related to the motion. Getting back to the motion, it was moved by the member for Dale who has a very special interest in the area as a local member. He has a general interest as a member of Parliament and a representative of the public. He moved the motion to deal with the total concept of the Kwinana area.

I believe the motives of the member for Dale were very sound, and his objectives very good. The reason for my remarks is that when one undertakes the development of a great industrial area such as Kwinana, the situation changes from time to time. Circumstances change dramatically. I refer to the type of industry, the type of modern requirements, and the social requirements of the community surrounding the area.

For that reason the member for Dale moved this motion in the widest possible terms to cover the total complex. He has included the residential and other aspects of this particular area because we are not dealing only with a steel industry or a chemical industry, but with people—the dormitory areas of those people who, I believe, were very well catered for in the original plan.

When this programme was first initiated, during the life of the McLarty-Watts Government, the need was for a great industrial area far beyond any concept we had had until then. The idea was to concentrate in the one area all the heavy industries which were likely to come here. That was the main objective.

I do not criticise at all because one can be wise after the event, but the only mistake was that the Government of the day did not use the powers that were given to it by Parliament boldly enough. Even the actions which the Government did take were criticised. However, we had a large new area and the land concerned was very low in value at the time. No-one was very interested in it before then and the concept of the special powers granted by Parliament were that the area of land could be developed on a total and planned basis.

A local authority was established under a commissioner and power was given to the Government of the day to acquire large areas of land at low cost. Unfortun-

ately, the Government did not use the powers to take over the whole of the very large area potentially available so that it would have been in the hands of the Government for future development, and with which the Government could attract industries of various kinds. Industry could have developed not only on the foreshore, but in depth within the total area. Finance and public reaction were inhibiting factors.

I want to refer briefly to the foremost example of modern times in the world of today of planned industrial development. I refer to development which has taken place at Fos in the south of France. I suggest to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation—with all kindness—that if he gets a chance he should look at the development to which I will refer, if he is in those parts.

Fos is situated in the south of France near the existing and old-established port of Marseilles. The south of France was inadequately served with port facilities because of the extra emphasis placed on the importation of raw materials from overseas. The importations were catching up with the French and, for that matter, with the greater part of Europe. A major port was required in the southern part of the country because Marseilles had reached saturation point and it could not handle the type of ships now being used.

The French decided they would develop a new industrial port complex at Fos and they went about it in a very bold way. The Government took over about 20,000 acres of land, a great deal of it marshy and much of it used for recreational purposes. The Government of that country decided that industry and recreation were not compatible so it took the bold and imaginative step of taking over the whole of the area. A great advantage was that the area could be planned right from the grass roots.

It does seem rather odd that in a country as old and as well developed as France the Government would be able to do this sort of thing. However, it was able to do so and it set about building this major centre for the reception of minerals from overseas, and for the reception of a large number of petroleum products including production of petrochemicals.

The heavy industrial complex is to be concentrated in the one area so that there is no conflict with people and with recreation. It is a straightout industrial area. The French Government decided that was the only way to do it, and I think it was a wise decision. To my mind if people and recreational facilities are situated too close to industrial areas there is conflict which will never be completely resolved.

That was the original concept of Kwinana: To have a great concentration of industry where there would not be a

conflict of interest. Assurances were given that there would be no intrusion on the recreational beaches to the south and to the north of the industrial area. I think that was the first case in the history of Western Australia where a green belt was established by definite planning and Government decision. The green belt was planned between the industrial area and the dormitory area for the work force. The establishment of Medina set an example.

It was about this time that Professor Stephenson was brought to this State by the McLarty-Watts Government to set up a major regional plan for the metropolitan area which put us miles ahead of any other State in Australia. That was the background of the establishment of Kwinana and I believe the time has come when somebody should have a look at the total concept, and not consider it as just something within the metropolitan regional plan.

It might be asked, with good cause, why this should be done now. There are several very powerful reasons. First of all, a Naval Base is to be established on Garden Island. This is something which all parties have supported over the years, and it was rather like the standard gauge railway from Perth to Kalgoorlie. Many people thought it would never be constructed but eventually it was built.

In the case of the Naval Base, it is now happening. We have observed the causeway being constructed to connect the mainland to the island, and we know we will have a great naval installation which will grow and grow. It will grow naturally as more and more ships are stationed in the Indian Ocean. Additional facilities will be installed to handle the sophisticated electronic equipment which is now being used by naval vessels.

It will be more than a Naval Base; it will be a great industrial complex because the work which is not done on the ships will be done in the industrial areas of Western Australia. Without such back-up industries there could not be a Naval Base, and there would not be logical expansion of the base to serve this vast region.

A very big query arises from the establishment of the Naval Base, and it is one to which I have not been able to get an answer. I acknowledge that the member who has moved the motion has not been able to get an answer either. Our query is: Are we to have a great dry dock? It was the ambition of the Brand Government and, I assume, the ambition of previous Governments, eventually to have a dry dock in Western Australia. Not just one to handle ships of 7,000 to 10,000 tons, but one capable of handling any ship which can get into Cockburn Sound.

We have the last port of call for ships crossing the Indian Ocean in one direction, and the first port of call for ships coming

from the other direction across the Indian Ocean. I can recall that on several occasions in the past ships have broken down in the Indian Ocean and tugs from Fremantle have gone to their aid. However, the ships were not brought to Fremantle for repair but were taken to Singapore, Hong Kong, or Japan. It is the ambition of most of us to have a great dry dock established in Western Australia where ships can be slipped for minor as well as major repairs. It was our ambition eventually to build ships.

I have not yet been able to find out what will happen to this concept. From the evidence that was given and from the Press comments that have been made, it appears the Government is hoping the Commonwealth will have a dry dock on Garden Island. My guess is that the Commonwealth Government would be reluctant to have a dry dock of its own, and for good reason.

It was the objective of the Brand Government to have a dry dock which would be basically a commercial dry dock for the docking of ships for survey and for repairs—not going into the building of big ships initially but graduating to that in later years. Initially we wanted a dock that was big enough and with facilities backing it up that would enable the biggest of the tankers—whether they be the bulk carriers from the north or the tankers coming into the Kwinana refinery—to be docked there. The objective was to gain the interest of a firm which had the expertise and, above all, the international reputation that would encourage the owners of these big and costly ships to allow them to go into the dock.

It is not every dock that can attract this kind of ship, because of the danger to the ship and the possibility of delay. Once the ship gets into dock it is immobile, and if there are not available competent people who know how to have the ship surveyed or repaired quickly, hundreds of thousands of dollars could be lost. That is why Singapore has such a thriving industry. It has been a blessing to Singapore to get rid of the Naval Base and become commercial. Singapore has facilities for building and maintaining oil-drilling rigs, and the same situation applies in Hong Kong. A great deal of shipbuilding is done in Hong Kong, where there is also a tremendous business in ship surveying, which has to be done by Statute at regular intervals, and the repairing of ships that have had mishaps or are due for refits. A similar situation applies in Japan, but particularly Singapore and Hong Kong have a tremendous trade in ship surveying and refitting.

We want to get this business, and we can only get it if we have a dock which is manned by people who have the expertise and, above all, the confidence of overseas shipowners.

In the old days there was a problem with ships undergoing surveys, annual refits, or repairs in foreign ports. There was the problem of the ship's crew. Endeavours were made to arrange for the docking to coincide with the leave of the crew. If the ship was in dock in Rotterdam and the crew came from England, Scotland, or any part of Europe, it took only a train or ferry ride to send them on leave when the ship was in dock. Western Australia is a long way away. However, the indications are that with fast and big planes this will no longer present a problem. If members of the crew want to go home during refit periods, they can go home at reasonable cost to the owner. These things are in favour and if we can organise ourselves we can get into the docking business.

If the Navy did not put up a dry dock on Garden Island, the Brand Government hoped there would be a site on the mainland where this type of operation could take place. I am sorry the Premier and his deputy are not taking any notice of what we are saying. The thing that worries me is, if we get an opportunity to attract this type of industry where will we put it? I could not imagine the Commonwealth and the Navy wanting to have a dock on the island because so much capital would be tied up with comparatively little use being made of the dock by the Navy. It would be much better if the Commonwealth was a party to a dock, built outside its area, which was essentially a commercial dock so that its main income would be derived from a multiplicity of ships but with the Navy having priority rights to use the dock. This is the type of negotiation we would have been aiming for, rather than for a naval dock on the island.

A dock to take Navy ships must be built to specifications different from those of an ordinary commercial shipping dock, particularly a dock for tankers; but, when building a dock, it is not very difficult to increase the specifications to enable it to take the extra concentrated dead weight involved in naval vessels compared with the bigger spread of weight involved in bulk carriers and tankers.

I believe these requirements could be met as a result of an inquiry such as the honourable member suggests, because this start on the Naval Base has completely changed the whole outlook of the port. In the original plan put out by the Fremantle Port Authority, which was approved by the Brand Government, provision was made for a dock to go in for dry docking, surveying, and repairing. Provision was also made for a large back-up workshop area, because huge installations are needed behind the actual dock, covering everything one can think of in the way of electronics, ordinary electrical work, and so on. Special expertise is needed in the

actual fittings that go into ships, whether they be of wood or metal. There is a host of things that go to make up a tremendous complex at the port, apart from the facilities available at Vickers Hoskins, Mitchell Cotts, Ledger's, and other places.

That has all gone now, and we are entitled to ask what will replace it. I do not think it is good enough to hope against hope that the Commonwealth will build a dry dock on Garden Island for its own purposes and allow commercial use of it. If we were starting out *de novo* with ownership of Garden Island, and were not competing with naval requirements, that might be the best place for a dock.

I understand one or two local firms have prospects of building some of the large oil rigs that are needed for our coast. A tremendous industry has been built up in Singapore, which has become almost the centre in the South-East Asian area for building and maintaining rigs. There are huge installations and tremendous numbers of rigs are being built and reconditioned, together with a host of service vessels—some of them very small and others up to the 1,000-ton type that is based on ports like Broome and Point Samson to service the rigs—and the floating ships on which the drilling rigs are taken out to sea. Once we get into it, it will be a never-ending business, and it will be within our engineering capacity.

The area of about 40 acres north of the B.H.P. site and before one reaches the S.E.C. site is available for the purpose of building barges, rigs, etc. We had earmarked it. Everyone seemed to want to take it over. The S.E.C. wanted it at one time, but we resisted so that it would be available for leasing to companies with contracts of this kind—either for heavy barges for the north or for drilling rigs—right on the shoreline where it would be easy to get them into the water when construction was completed.

The honourable member wants to have a project of this kind studied so that a master plan can be drawn up for the whole of the Kwinana area—not only for Garden Island and the industrial area but also for dormitory and recreational areas for the people in reasonable proximity. Everything north, east, and south of the Kwinana industrial area must be considered as being part of a total complex, and for this reason the honourable member's motion said—

—to produce a master plan for the integrated development of Cockburn Sound and all of the shire council areas immediately involved—

I think this matter has been overlooked. This is not just a question of studying the industrial area or the harbour installations themselves; it is a question of studying also the whole of these dormitory and recreational areas that extend in a wide arc covering anything up to 10 or 15 miles.

Mr. Graham: What makes you think that of the entire metropolitan region the M.R.P.A. might have overlooked this or not had in mind a proper plan?

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is not the whole of the metropolitan region.

Mr. Graham: Why do you think the M.R.P.A. has neglected this area or thinks it does not need special study?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am trying to explain something to the Minister who does not seem to want to listen or to accept that the people talking to him about these things might have a degree of sincerity. Circumstances change. Twice during the period I was in office circumstances changed with remarkable suddenness. For instance, in the early days of 1960-1962 or thereabouts, circumstances came to light in connection with one road system that had hardly dried on the plan before the M.R.P.A. and M.R.D. came up with an entirely new concept because it started to see how big Kwinana would be.

Some difficulty was experienced in making people understand that one day B.H.P. would have to go back in depth right across the main road, past where the settling ponds for Alcoa are at the moment and which were negotiated on a temporary basis.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What is your idea of a top-level study? That beats me. I had a look at the personnel of the committee that studied this in 1972, and I think it would be extremely difficult to get a higher level study than that. What have you in mind?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We were expecting that reaction from the Government. If the Government could detach men of that calibre who could concentrate on the matter for a few months and do nothing but that, I would have no quarrel. But the Premier knows that in major matters one of the greatest problems is time. We are talking about a major area and a major part of the total metropolitan region. I do not think it is reasonable to expect the M.R.P.A., with its existing staff and all the other pressures it has for the planning of the vast area we know as the metropolitan region, to do this type of detailed, specialised study. The M.R.P.A. has not the personnel to do it in the time available. I am not questioning the capacity of the officers of the M.R.P.A. or other departments, but when people of the right calibre are not available in the M.R.P.A. it is possible to engage others who can concentrate the whole of their time and energy on a special problem. One would say to that group of men, "We want you to concentrate on this. We will give you the staff, whether it takes three months or six months to do the job." I would not guess how long the job would take. I do not imagine it could be done

properly in less than six months. Something else will suffer because the men to whom I am referring are top men, if the present committee is seconded to the task.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Would you hold up this Co-operative Bulk Handling project in the meantime, which might interfere with it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No. Some of these projects are so clearcut that nothing will change them. They are basic, like the location of B.H.P. and BP. But a lot more work must be done on the planning of the roads, the service industries that must go in, and the protection of the dormitory and residential areas. Although some of the areas, such as the Rockingham, Medina, and Calista areas, have been planned for some time and appear to be clearcut, I believe changes have taken place since the standard gauge railway was put through and since the advent of new industries such as the production of nitrogen as well as superphosphate by CSBP, and the tremendous capacity that will be built into C.B.H. With the prospect of a major steel industry to handle huge tonnages, the very weight of transport going into the area will change. We are thinking of a new dimension. The back-up area behind the CSBP wharf, owned by the Fremantle Port Authority, and right around to the C.B.H. wharf I believe must be planned quickly. What will happen there? There is the question of where the alumina from the Pacminex project—if it is successfully launched—will be shipped from. It would be a disaster if that got mixed up with the wheat. That was the original concept and these questions will be resolved as a result of a study of this kind.

I would like to re-emphasise that it is not just a question of talking about the industrial area, the port area, or the Garden Island area. It is a question of the total concept of Kwinana, similar to that of the Fos area in the south of France, where it was possible to look at a piece of land and say, "This will be a great industrial area," and plan it from the ground up. We have had the same chance at Kwinana, and I believe to date we have done a very good job.

That does not mean to say that it is not due for review. The advent of the Naval Base, the expansion of industry down there, and the prospects of further expansion all make this necessary.

I wish to touch on the other potential subdivision which seemed to touch the Premier and his deputy on the raw earlier. They seem to feel that the whole motion is centred around this subject.

Mr. Graham: I am surprised that you have been referring to all this growth which is taking place. From reading your comments of the other night I thought industry would be packing up and leaving under this Government.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister amazes me because what is there now is not there as a result of his efforts.

Mr. Graham: No, but you are talking about the increasing activities.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The present Government will not be the Government forever—thank goodness. One day soon we will become the Government, and we wish to ensure that we have something ready to go ahead with.

Mr. Graham: There will be far more growth occurring when we vacate office, whatever the date is, than you left us—which was nothing.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister never stops saying that, but it does not fool anybody. I well remember the notes read out on his behalf and in his absence by the Minister for Labour, claiming credit for industries down there. Yet not one of those industries was established by a Labor Government. The Minister for Development and Decentralisation was good enough to correct the record later.

Mr. Graham: An officer made a mistake in respect of one industry; there is no need to exaggerate as you invariably do.

Mr. O'Neil: An officer did not write that speech for you.

Mr. Graham: Yes, he did; and it might surprise all of you opposite to know that the speech was written by a top officer of the Town Planning Department.

Mr. O'Neil: I thought the Minister wrote his own speeches.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope the Minister is not criticising that officer.

Mr. Graham: I am not at all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I was rather surprised at the Minister for Labour, because he happens to be a member for the district. I was surprised that he was so insistent, even after, by way of interjection, we tried to give him a lead because we realised that he had been given a piece of paper for which he was not responsible.

Mr. Graham: The mistake was entirely mine. I should have checked it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: However, there are other aspects to this matter. The Minister for Mines recently had some cross words with the Federal Minister for Defence (Mr. David Fairbairn). Mr. Fairbairn, in all good faith, said that it was rather strange that the Minister for Mines should be criticising his comments when, in fact, the State committee wanted to negotiate with the Commonwealth to share the magazine site on Garden Island. I do not know even to this day that the Minister has put the record straight in regard to that; but it was quite clear both from the evidence given—which was heard by some of our members who attended the inquiry—and the subsequent revelation of the written evidence, that the State Government

had put forward a proposition to share the magazine and also the wharf at Garden Island. I am not quarrelling with that; it makes good sense. But surely this is another point which indicates the need for someone to have a look at this not on a piecemeal basis but on a total basis.

This was always one of my problems. There would be a man working on wharves, a man working on roads, a man working on railways, and another working on something else; and one of the great problems was to bring them together so that they could think together. When they are brought together I do not question their capacity; but time was the killer and somebody who has the expertise to do this work must be allocated to make a concentrated effort and to apply the whole of his energies to the task. I believe it would be a monumental task and would enable all of the planning to be adjusted, as it will have to be adjusted from time to time, in a sensible, orderly fashion instead of finding that we have a crisis at a later date which we cannot handle.

The Minister made reference to the large-tonnage steel industry. I know the problems he faces in trying to get these people to go out of the metropolitan area. He mentioned costs of an extra \$400,000,000 just to build outside of the metropolitan area, and those costs are not unrealistic. At the time when we tried to get Alcoa to decentralise I explained to the House that as a result of initial and establishment costs it would cost an extra \$40,000,000 for the first unit over what it would to establish that unit alongside the existing installation at Kwinana.

I hope the Minister is successful in getting industry away from Kwinana. He well knows that we were negotiating for four years to get a large international consortium for this side of Australia and another consortium for the other side of Australia to move into large tonnage steel solely for export. To do this one must think big in tonnage, and one must keep the costs down through the economies of scale. The very size of these industries—assuming that we cannot induce them to go away to establish near natural gas in the north, or for some other reason—will create additional problems of transport in Kwinana. This is a prodigious problem. The ore must be brought in, and I should imagine it would be brought in by sea from the north, because I can hardly imagine Koolyanobbing supporting such an operation. But even Koolyanobbing would have to be stepped up to maximum capacity to handle this, and it would require extra standard gauge railway traffic.

The road commitment in that area would increase fivefold with the type of thing we were trying to negotiate—and I presume the Minister is trying to negotiate. The

problems do not end with the establishment of the industry, because the consequential growth is tremendous. Just imagine the extra oxygen that would have to be produced for steel making. We would have a brand new chemical complex overnight, and with operations of that size we get into other chemicals. On top of this we have the fantastic amount of service industry necessary for the steel industry. There will be works for 20 miles around just to service this great industry if we are successful in getting it. That is to say nothing of the transport problems.

We could also have a dry dock, and we could be successful in having a marine surveying and repair industry, quite apart from the construction of rigs, smaller vessels, and the like. I would rather see us go into the construction of the smaller type vessels because then we would get more vessels through. With the big fellows we would have the problems of Whyalla and Queensland, where suddenly there is a surplus of orders and then nothing at all. That is not good for the work force. However, with smaller boats, barges, and tugs there is a chance of recurring work. I feel this is the sort of thing which will come out of the study the member for Dale is advocating.

I believe the motion is timely. I am sorry that the Government saw fit to treat it rather lightly and to oppose it, because I believe it is of importance to the area in question. It reflects forward thinking on the part of the member for Dale, who wishes the matter to be studied, partly because of his local interest and partly because of his overall interest in the State.

Mr. Graham: I think it is because he blotted his copy book on the local scene.

Mr. Rushton: That is not accurate.

Mr. Mr. Graham: I was informed by the local authority that the honourable member was out of step.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It has been my privilege to be in contact fairly consistently with the local authorities down there, and I know of no-one who is in higher standing with them than the member for Dale.

Mr. Jamieson: They are telling you one thing and others another.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am sure the Minister's colleague, the Minister for Labour, would not agree with what he is saying, because the two members work closely together down there. I have found that there is a great deal of reciprocity between the two local authorities and with that, of course, between the two members.

Mr. Graham: When the plan for the development of Cockburn Sound was announced, the member for Dale was completely out of step with the view of the local authority. The local authority informed me accordingly. This motion is

covering up for the mistake he made. He was more interested in shooting at the Government than he was in doing the right thing.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would like to know more about that before I accept the Minister's version, because that is not the information conveyed to me. In fact, it strikes me that every time there is any crisis or problem in that area the first person the local authorities wish to speak to is the member for Dale—which is as it should be—because they know he is an active member.

A further point I forgot to mention concerns the question of the land about which the Premier and Deputy Premier interjected earlier. Surely this in itself justifies having another look at the total picture down there. The Premier said that I was a party to the decision that the land should be changed from industrial to urban. In due course I will ask him whether he will table the papers—and the whole of the papers.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What do you mean by "the whole of the papers"? Isn't the file enough?

Sir CHARLES COURT: There is a file on this matter in the M.R.P.A., and another in the Department of Development and Decentralisation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Surely you don't say one thing on one file and something else on another file?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, I do not.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Won't it be sufficient to give you the file in which you said it is contained?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Premier goes to the M.R.P.A. he will find that I was its great stumbling block in regard to this.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Not according to what I read.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not care what the Premier read. This is why I want all of the papers.

Mr. Graham: Whilst you were the Minister the Industrial Lands Development Authority was already commencing to clear lands in other areas as a substitution for those at Cockburn Sound.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister is putting his foot in it.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has another five minutes.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is why I say I want the total papers, because the Minister will find that the M.R.P.A. found me a rather difficult customer to deal with in regard to this matter.

Mr. Graham: That was not the M.R.P.A., but the I.L.D.A., for which you were 100 per cent, the Minister.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Industrial Lands Development Authority could not move without the M.R.P.A.; and the commissioner is a member of the authority the Minister is talking about.

Mr. Graham: They were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on acquiring alternative land, and you didn't approve of it? Not likely!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am telling the Minister that he is putting his foot in it because I was not prepared—

Mr. Graham: You have a poor memory.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Just listen to me for a minute. I was not prepared to move an inch in regard to that land unless we had the cover land elsewhere and we owned it. The Minister cannot tell us where that land will be.

Mr. Graham: Of course I can. I know where it is, and if the Leader of the Opposition has a memory he would know where it is because it was all purchased whilst he was the Minister.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have asked the Minister about this land, and he evades the issue every time. I was never prepared to allow that land to be relinquished unless we had alternative cover land elsewhere.

Mr. Graham: It was in the process of being acquired elsewhere whilst you were the Minister.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That may be so; but I am making the point that I was not prepared to let that land go, and the M.R.P.A. knows that. I was not prepared to let it go until we had absolute cover elsewhere.

Mr. Graham: Words, words, words!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will not stand this nonsense from the Minister any longer.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Why were you going to let it go?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Only because the M.R.P.A. was so insistent upon it; but I said it would not go unless land to replace it was ready and we owned it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: But what was the purpose behind letting it go? Why didn't you hang on to it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I wanted to.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Well, why didn't you?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Because the authority insisted that it should be used for another purpose. But I held out, and I am sure the Minister will know about this. If he discusses it with the M.R.P.A. he will be told that I was not prepared to allow the land to be changed over until we had the actual replacement land. I was not prepared to accept that we would get it in due course because I was more

concerned about protecting the industrial potential of the metropolitan region and the jobs of the people.

Mr. Graham: I have no recollection of seeing any areas specified in the papers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Well, the Minister should wait and see.

Mr. Graham: Yes, and the Leader of the Opposition will get a surprise.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister should talk to the senior officers of the department. He will get a surprise because they regarded me as quite a stumbling block.

Mr. Graham: Many people do, and justifiably so.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I come back to the point that here is yet another major issue in respect of which the total concept of the area has been changed. If it is desirable that the area should be a dormitory area or a recreation area, or a combination of both, surely this is something of the sort of thing upon which the total picture will be made up. It is not only a question of Calista, Medina, Naval Base, Rockingham, and Safety Bay; it also applies to the area further north in Cockburn Sound. It is all part of the total picture.

Having regard for all these changes at Kwinana, the possibility of a bigger steel concept, the changed emphasis on transportation, and the very real doubt about whether a location is acceptable to the E.P.A. and other people, surely now is the time when we should have this subjected to an expert examination. I repeat that I have no lack of confidence in the senior officers who were listed.

They have the competence, but they do not have the time to do this sort of thing. If they were divorced from their other duties and placed on this work exclusively, I would be the first to agree to such an arrangement, because they understand the background. However, if they are not to be divorced from their other duties to carry out this work, then someone should be brought in from outside to concentrate his energies on this task so that he may come up with a report in regard to any modifications that have to be made. I believe it would save millions of dollars and also render the transportation necessary to service the area much more efficient. I support the motion.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [8.46 p.m.] This motion was introduced on the 19th April of this year and an answer to it was given by the Minister for Labour and member for Cockburn on the 2nd June and yet here we are, late in August, still discussing it.

The last few words that the Minister used, when replying to my motion, were as follows:—

In these circumstances there appears to be little to support the motion for a further outlined study.

Of course, the Premier and his deputy should treat this motion fairly if I can show quite clearly that the submission made by the Minister embraces many incorrect statements. I hope, therefore, that Ministers and members on the Government side of the House, in viewing this motion in all seriousness, will give it support.

I also believe that following the presentation of facts last April the case presented has been strengthened, and this has made the preparation of a specialist's report far more urgent. Also, mention has been made of the Government's disclosure in regard to the circumstances surrounding the proposed new housing suburb at Naval Base. I will say that many of the statements contained in the answer given by the Minister for Labour to my motion depended on the Premier's committee, composed of highly qualified and responsible men—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Appointed by your Government.

Mr. RUSHTON: —and one would expect that this housing concept would be its responsibility. I am suggesting that that committee was not even consulted when this Naval Base housing suburb was first mooted and proceeded with. That concept was not even referred to the committee.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Proceeded with?

Mr. RUSHTON: Well, to the degree it has been proceeded with up to the present.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Are you not a bit ahead of yourself?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier was ready to disclose that it was the Government's intention to proceed with this housing project as soon as possible.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: My understanding of "proceeding with" means that things are moving along.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier is not disclaiming the Government's intention in that respect, and that is one reason why this matter should be reviewed.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Are there any building materials on the site?

Mr. RUSHTON: I know there are a few limestone outcrops and a dead kangaroo on the site if the Premier should care to smell it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Is there any sign of buildings being commenced down there?

Mr. RUSHTON: No.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I thought you said it was being proceeded with.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think the Premier is running away in regard to this, because the Kwinana committee has not even considered this project in its review. Surely this is an important part of the complete issue. The Kwinana committee has been established to advise the Government on the Kwinana complex and the total development that is proposed there, and yet the committee has not even had this controversial proposed housing suburb project referred to it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Who told you?

Mr. RUSHTON: Would the Premier like me to turn up the answer I received about two days ago to a question I asked in the House? Perhaps I had better look up the answer, because if the Premier still does not believe me I can tell him now that that answer came from him.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: A great deal can happen in two days.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is quite so. Does the Premier deny telling me that the committee has not even considered it?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: No.

Mr. RUSHTON: Thank goodness for that; I will not have to debate that any further.

The next item is the question of the steel works. In the Minister for Labour's reply to my motion he spoke about a downturn at Kwinana. He talked about the project figures being far less than those I had quoted, yet last weekend we heard of the Minister for Development and Decentralisation coming up with all sorts of figures far beyond those that I projected. He put those figures forward as a reason for rejecting my motion and that Kwinana is on the downturn. Another argument put forward concerns the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. It is a wonder that Kwinana is not on the downturn. We have heard today about the proposed rezoning of 20,000 acres in the northern corridor and that there will be ports and all sorts of facilities to substantiate this rezoning. This is the sort of admission that the Government is making today, and it is quite frightening when we look at what has been done, especially when we see that the corridor plan has not even been accepted or approved.

I will run quickly through the comments made by the member for Cockburn, the Minister for Labour, when he spoke on behalf of the Deputy Premier. I will show the House how far his arguments were divorced from the facts. I ask the Premier, who has a great interest in people, whether if I am able to show him that what was put forward is incorrect, he will say, in all fairness, "Let us have another look at this proposal".

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: When you introduced your motion you said one of your reasons was that the C.B.H. was under challenge. Will you tell us a little more about that?

Mr. RUSHTON: I will tell the Premier a little more about that as I proceed. I will tell him about how incompatible it is to mix alumina with the loading of wheat.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Don't forget that that was one of the reasons why you moved this motion.

Mr. RUSHTON: We will not worry about splitting straws.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is no straw.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will develop the argument for the Premier if he will only listen. Firstly, let me say this: On the 2nd June, in reply to my motion, the Minister for Labour commenced his speech by pooch-pooching the very thought that I had suggested that Sir David Brand was the person involved with the initiation of this Kwinana complex. He rounded on me and told me how ill-informed I was. Later on, during the course of his speech, when somebody interjected in regard to that issue, he went through the same attack again. It is generally thought among members of the community that the Labor movement took the initial steps in regard to the Kwinana complex. This is part of Labor's propaganda system. Therefore, it is only right that such a misconception should be corrected, because the Deputy Premier did apologise for presenting the wrong information.

Mr. Graham: That was immaterial to the motion, anyhow.

Mr. RUSHTON: It was only a matter of history, but I am suggesting that this is one of the reasons I asked the Deputy Premier, through the Premier, if he was going to object to my motion. Here was one important issue in the history of this State in regard to which the Minister made an incorrect statement.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You do not want a top-level inquiry to establish that; you want a historian.

Mr. RUSHTON: Then we had great play made over the fact that this specialist committee had been appointed; a committee made up of worthy gentlemen who had already considered this issue. It is the responsibility of the Premier and the Government to appoint someone to make an investigation. The interest is there, and people in the private sector recognise the need for an inquiry. International people and other persons could be well worth considering in this regard. I thought, just as my leader has, that these gentlemen should be appointed to investigate and report upon the best utilisation of this region in the future. I have already said that the existing committee did not

have an opportunity to review an important part of the complex; that is, the Naval Base housing suburb at the top end of the Alcoa establishment. Therefore the committee was reviewing only part of the total concept; the whole concept has not been reviewed.

Surely it is recognised that there is some disquiet in this regard. Surely we are entitled to have this matter fully reviewed and a complete report submitted on the whole concept.

Mr. Graham: If that authority and the M.R.P.A. are at variance, whose view would you accept?

Mr. RUSHTON: Which two authorities is the Minister referring to?

Mr. Graham: The one you are talking about and the M.R.P.A. If one of those authorities approved it, what would you do then?

Mr. RUSHTON: I suggest that we should have a specialised body appointed to make an investigation. I hope the Deputy Premier has read the statement made by the Minister for Labour in regard to this question. He lauded the people who are the specialists as being well qualified and that there would be no necessity to review the report on this whole issue. However, they have not had this vital part of the development referred to them. So how can this be accepted as factual? Surely it cannot be. I am gratified that following the moving of my motion the Minister for Development and Decentralisation very quickly had the Commissioner of Public Health and the Director of Environmental Protection appointed as members of this committee. So we have got some reaction to this motion.

We then go on to the suggestion the Minister for Labour keeps on making; namely, that I am out of step with the local authorities in my district. What rubbish that is! We have heard of telegrams being explained in this House objecting to what the Government is doing, and yet the Minister has the effrontery to say that I am out of step with the local authorities that forwarded those telegrams. The Premier even had to apologise for saying that he had not received the telegrams. If that is not sufficient proof that the local authorities are condemning the Government for what it is doing at Naval Base as part of the Kwinana complex, I do not know what is. The Deputy Premier keeps on harping that I am out of step with my local authorities. What rubbish!

Mr. Jamieson: I think the reaction is that they will be glad when you go back to Armadale.

Mr. RUSHTON: That could be so, but from all the reactions I have received they appreciate the work I have done.

Mr. Graham: In connection with the industrial proposals, you are definitely out of step. You went off beam.

Mr. RUSHTON: The people know they have been sold a pup ever since the Minister for Development and Decentralisation visited the area and left. The Minister has done nothing else since; he has not even thought about Cockburn Sound.

Mr. Graham: You say anything that comes into that vacuum of yours.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is all very well for the Minister to say that. The only thing the Minister was concerned about was what was to happen at Mangles Bay and Point Peron; something from which the Premier obtained so much political mileage. When he was Leader of the Opposition he used that issue every week for political mileage.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have much pleasure in addressing you, Mr. Speaker, because on this very issue the people of Rockingham were greatly concerned about what took place there. The attitude adopted by the Government in regard to those people was, "Have this instead of that," and they are looking for something better. What we have to look to in the future is what can flow on from what the Deputy Premier presented them with.

Sir Charles Court: Ask them to tell us where they are going to shift the sewage works.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not want to be distracted as a result of this interjection, but the Premier said that if he were appointed to the Treasury bench the sewage works would be placed somewhere else, but this has not occurred. This was a big issue just before the election, but we know how false the Premier's statement was.

I did mention C.B.H., and in the reply to the motion by the Minister he gave some wrong figures again. He said that I had stated certain things would happen by 1973. I had referred to the year 1978. This fact is recorded in *Hansard*.

I said 1978 and I mentioned certain projects. I referred to what was to take place in the steel industry, but I was pooh-poohed on that one. The Minister indicated now these figures were nowhere near factual; that it would be something far less; something like a projected population of 50,000 in this area. He said the steel tonnages would be down and all sorts of things would be going down; yet within two months the Minister for Development and Decentralisation comes up with another story.

Mr. Graham: I confirm what I said yesterday. You are not capable of reading the Queen's English; and if you are capable of reading it you are certainly incapable of understanding it.

Mr. RUSHTON: What he and the other Minister said—

Mr. Graham: You are talking about two different propositions.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister is producing this as a totally different concept. He is now finding a jumbo steel complex.

Mr. Graham: Where did you find it?

Mr. RUSHTON: This steel works is something which had been initiated. Is that what the Minister is denying? Goodness gracious! This is what we are being fed all the time. No-one has heard of a steel project in Kwinana! It was in the booklet which was published well before this Minister became involved.

Mr. Graham: The jumbo steel complex?

Mr. RUSHTON: Everything is jumbo with the Minister. How could we have anything else?

Mr. Graham: It would be one of the largest in the world.

Mr. RUSHTON: Everything is so large with the Minister.

Mr. Graham: This is B.H.P.'s, not mine.

Sir Charles Court: And negotiations started long before you ever became the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: This is an interesting time to refer to—

Mr. Graham: A pee-wee industry!

Mr. RUSHTON: —C.B.H. This is another project which the Minister claims was not in the pipeline when the Government took office! Why, the very groundwork was done by the Brand Government and so much good work by C.B.H.

Mr. Jamieson: I am glad you added that.

Mr. RUSHTON: Surely the Minister is not trying to claim that the Deputy Premier initiated C.B.H.

Mr. Graham: No-one ever claimed that.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is what the Minister said. He said there was nothing in the pipeline.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How much groundwork was done with regard to raising the finance?

Mr. RUSHTON: This was all part of the whole concept from the very beginning.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How much groundwork was done about the finance?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier can read about it if he desires. Does he think some magician's job was done?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You know very well—

Mr. RUSHTON: Did the Premier initiate C.B.H. at Kwinana?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is entirely different. You talked about groundwork, and the basis for this exercise was getting the money to go ahead.

Mr. RUSHTON: Goodness gracious! How childish.

Sir Charles Court: That is the least of the worries when you have something to build on.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How far can you build if you do not get the money?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Dale.

Mr. RUSHTON: Let me answer the Premier who interjected about C.B.H. What I am concerned about is what could take place from the loading jetty. The report indicates that the alumina will be loaded from the C.B.H. jetty, or adjacent to it; and either plan would be incompatible with the loading of wheat.

Mr. Graham: Do you think the project ought to be shifted?

Mr. RUSHTON: No. I am suggesting that alumina should not be loaded at the same jetty. I am sure the member for Avon would be appalled if this were to occur.

Mr. Gayfer: I spoke on this three months ago.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am appalled to think we will have alumina there at all because of the pollution to the nearby residential areas. If this is all the Government thinks of the people there, it should not be in office.

Mr. Graham: They were put there by your Government.

Mr. RUSHTON: What was put there? The loading facilities for alumina? Don't talk rot. If the Minister reads the report again he will find out.

Mr. Graham: When do you think Alcoa started?

Mr. RUSHTON: We did not have loading anywhere near the wheat—

Mr. Graham: You would not know.

Mr. RUSHTON: —not only because of the wheat, but because people are living nearby and should not be interfered with in this way.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Are you talking about something already there or something you think might be there?

Mr. RUSHTON: Read the report.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Can you answer that question?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am suggesting that as C.B.H. is there it should have the first priority. C.B.H. was established as a buffer between the heavy pollutant type of industry and the residential area of Rockingham. At considerable expense the organisation beautified and landscaped the area.

All I am suggesting is that if Pacminex should eventuate the stockpiling of alumina should not be allowed at the same jetty or close to it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Where are they operating?

Mr. RUSHTON: Read the report. I do not have the time to read out the report the Government's committee made.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: This is interesting. Where is Pacminex operating?

Mr. RUSHTON: The suggestion is that if Pacminex should proceed it will go there.

Sir Charles Court: You brought this to Parliament.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you know where?

Mr. RUSHTON: It does not matter where.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are doing a lot of guessing.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Bill states it will be loading from this point. Has the Premier no regard for the legislation he introduces? I am saying I am concerned and I hope the Premier will take steps to ensure this does not eventuate. I have answered that matter—

Mr. Brown: Marvellously!

Mr. RUSHTON: —which the Premier raised. The member for Cockburn, who is the Minister for Labour, said that only shacks had existed at Kwinana beach before 1955. He has proved himself to be totally out of step with his own electorate because I have been going there since 1950 and to the north of Office Road the biggest majority of the homes were there even then. Some more homes have been built, in my opinion unfortunately, but the Minister tried to indicate that only a few shacks existed before 1955. That is totally wrong.

Mr. O'Neil: Town planners prepared his speech.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is hardly fair to sheet home the blame elsewhere.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister for Development and Decentralisation said so.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier has accepted the blame which is occasioned by the Minister's reply; it was debunking many things I suggested. It contained implications and statements which were incorrect and on that basis alone I appeal to the Premier to review the intention of the Government to reject my motion.

I have referred briefly to the Minister's reaction to the motion and as members must realise he made no real statement nor did he give any basis for rejecting it. To summarise, the fact that a specialist committee had already reviewed the whole situation has been disproved because it has not looked at the whole concept. It had not even considered the housing projects at Naval Base and other areas.

As my leader has said, surely such a review is timely. Surely the same member or someone else with the respect, confidence, and support of the Government should tackle this task.

Mr. Graham: You are suggesting they have not been doing their job up to now?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have not said that.

Mr. Graham: What are you suggesting?

Mr. RUSHTON: I said that it had been disproved that the gentleman on whose opinion the Minister based his rejection of my motion, had reviewed the whole Kwinana complex. The Minister has disputed other matters such as the future of the Kwinana area. All these statements have been proved to be wrong even by the Minister's own words. He supported me very handsomely last week by talking about the steel industry to come. That in itself is sufficient reason for my motion to be carried so that the Government in all good faith might do what it can to supply us with a realistic report.

Mr. Fletcher: You are about 12 years late with your motion.

Mr. RUSHTON: It seems strange for the member for Fremantle to interject at this stage.

Mr. Fletcher: It is not surprising at all. Many of the problems arose because of the previous Government.

Mr. RUSHTON: I could refer to the comments of the Minister for Labour relating to Point Peron, but time is relatively short and I will not be sidetracked on that aspect except to say that we must all look to the future of this area. We would all agree it has a very important future part to play for everyone in this State. A tremendous population will be dependent on the area and to me it would be criminal to have people living in conditions which were incompatible simply because of bad planning on the siting of industry. Therefore at what might be called this late hour I am asking the Government to have more concern and give more thought to the placing of industries and residential areas in the future so that we do not have a conflict of industrial pollution—whether the problem be great or small—and residents.

I wish briefly to summarise the points I have raised to indicate why we should do something about this issue now. Wharves are to be established at Point Peron and I believe this is because such establishment will be economic and therefore expedient. Stage 1 involves the establishment of wharves at Mangles Bay, with the back-up of Point Peron. Stages 2 and 3 are to be projected out into the sound towards Garden Island. As the Premier is interested in Point Peron I suggest to him that when the next stage is reached it might not be expedient or economic to follow the plan and that in-

stead the wharves might be established further towards Rockingham. This could well be the next step and this is why I am anxious. The wharves might not be confined to the stated area in Point Peron, but might utilise much of the beach we now have. These matters should be made known now instead of allowing people to commit themselves further in the area and then be trapped as a result of lack of thought and planning.

The indications are that the area at Mangles Bay is not large enough to cater for the wharf establishment. A couple of hundred acres have been provided, but my fear is that the whole of Point Peron will go. Let us face the facts now. What is to be the future of this area? The Premier used to be most anxious about Point Peron. Let him be anxious now and obtain another opinion and report to establish for all time the future of the area instead of just nibbling at it. This nibbling is dangerous because once the project is commenced it will not be possible to turn back. We must establish something concrete on which we can rely after all alternatives have been studied. For instance the fear in the Naval Base suburb is that we will be inhibiting even the ship building industry which has been established and any other industry which could be established there.

This is what I am concerned about. It could be that the area in front of Naval Base could be reclaimed to cater for container ships. This is unproved to me, but it is an alternative to Mangles Bay. If we commit Mangles Bay for the establishment of the three wharves we could not turn back. We could not undo the reclaimed area in the future.

On this subject the last quarterly publication of the Navy Journal gave close attention to the ecology of Cockburn Sound and the article disclosed what is being done by the Commonwealth; but our State Government has done nothing. They have been yelling about Garden Island and the environment and they have the effrontery to be challenging the Commonwealth concerning what it is not doing, but at the same time we are to establish wharves in Mangles Bay without first having obtained any environmental protection report. There is to be one now, but we do not know when it will be. When the Government accepted the wharf concept, there was none, and the Minister for Works gave me wrong information. He implied there had been a report but there was not. We have gone through this before. I suggest this is another point to prove my case.

The Navy which has a big involvement and investment in the area has done nothing about ecology protection for the State wharf project. I am worried about the beginning being based on wrong facts. Once it starts, we are gone.

I have touched briefly on the interest the Premier once had in Point Peron. As a result of his past interest I hoped he would say to his Ministers that it is worth while and that an independent opinion should be obtained. In the years ahead, when the Premier has retired or something else happens to change his position in the Parliament, he would not want to be known as the person who desecrated Point Peron. He was known as its saviour and he would not want to become known as its desecrator. Something must be done about this. The future of Point Peron is part of the whole complex, but Point Peron itself is worthy of extra thought.

What is to be the future of Rockingham beach? I believe I have covered this. If the Mangles Bay planning is not sound, Rockingham beach will disappear. What is the future of the explosive depot for Garden Island? My leader has mentioned that the Minister for Mines was mixed up over this. I attended the Commonwealth inquiry where I heard senior men from State departments discussing this very factor.

A month or two afterwards we saw the Minister for Mines attacking the Minister for Defence in the media and saying that this was not the position. I have never seen a retraction of that statement. The Minister for Defence was right. The State Government had been interested in doing something on Garden Island with the explosives depot. This issue should be considered in the total report I am seeking.

The Minister for Labour suggested Garden Island did not come into the previous planning. When we read the original reports and the booklets on the Kwinana complex we find that Garden Island was very much in the thoughts of the people designing the future of Cockburn Sound. They saw great advantage in Garden Island being used in certain ways. It is still available for negotiation with the Commonwealth Government but the State Government does not appear to have been negotiating. My leader has asked what has happened to the dockyard. The submission in the report is on false ground. The Government did not negotiate with the Commonwealth on the dockyard, but simply popped it into the plan. This shows how loose and unauthoritative the Government's statements have been.

The next point I make concerns the viability of the Cockburn Sound harbour. It does not take much ecology to cause the viability to be lost. If this matter is not handled properly as far as the ecology and environment is concerned, we could lose the advantage of Cockburn Sound. Some people may think we are screwballs to worry about this, but the environment of the harbour is very important to the future of the port. Without sound management, we will be in the dredging busi-

ness before very long. If we lose the grasses which hold the sands we will really downgrade the harbour. The State must present a far more positive approach to this point. Up to the present time the Government has not indicated that it will do anything about it. There should be a full review now for this reason, also.

I also wish to touch briefly on the question of the Naval Base suburb. I cannot think of another issue upon which there is more oneness of opinion in the whole of the State. Industrialists from the Kwinana complex have come to me and asked what the Government is about. They do not support the idea of the Naval Base suburb. I have spoken to people, wherever I go, who ask me why the Government would ever do this. I have searched for the answer and the only reason I can find is that the Government wants a few million dollars. It is not interested in the people who are in the State Housing Commission homes. It is as crude as this.

This area of 1,500 acres should be a buffer zone between heavy industry and the residential areas. It should be kept for light industry and, in this way, the progression would be from heavier to light industries.

Mr. Graham: What are your qualifications for saying that as against the decision of the M.R.P.A. that it should be residential?

Mr. RUSHTON: I answer the Minister in this way: This afternoon we could not receive from the Minister's officers a report as to why it should be. We cannot succeed in having a report brought to Parliament. The Minister will not table any report to show why the M.R.P.A. has suggested this. I am entitled to express my point of view. I have talked with engineers, ecologists, and housewives and their views vary from those expressed at a meeting this afternoon. We cannot obtain a really substantial reason. The only reason I can gather is that the Government wants a few million dollars and wants to use the land for industrial development.

Mr. Graham: That is completely wrong.

Mr. RUSHTON: I ask the Minister to produce the report.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Dr. Carr gave you the reason this afternoon. I was there and heard it.

Mr. RUSHTON: Does the Premier think it was a substantial reason?

Sir Charles Court: The only reason was the limestone outcrops.

Mr. RUSHTON: If that is a satisfactory reason for the Premier, his acceptance is badly based. Dr. Carr did not give any reason.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Yes, he did.

Mr. RUSHTON: He did not give a substantial reason why some 15,000 people should have this way of life.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Would you like to hear the reason he gave this afternoon?

Mr. RUSHTON: We heard it this afternoon.

Sir Charles Court: He said the topography was unsuitable for industry.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is not only the limestone but the prevailing wind and the fact that it is exposed.

Sir Charles Court: He said there would be wonderful views if the land were used for residential purposes. He did add that.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is idle for the honourable member to say Dr. Carr gave no reason. He was asked a specific question and he answered it.

Sir Charles Court: He was singing in the key of G.

Mr. RUSHTON: Is that the only reason the Premier and his Government have?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are twisting it.

Mr. RUSHTON: Let us be frank.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Yes, let us be frank. That is what we want.

Mr. RUSHTON: Does the Premier believe what Dr. Carr said today about the reason for this development?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am not saying whether or not I believe it. Dr. Carr gave a reason, but you said he did not.

Sir Charles Court: The member for Dale referred to a substantial reason.

Mr. RUSHTON: I referred to a substantial reason. If this satisfies the Premier, I may have made a mistake in saying Dr. Carr did not give a reason. I am saying now that Dr. Carr did not give a substantial reason as to why this should be so.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are saying in effect that you do not accept what he said as a reason for the change.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: All right.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is a crucial issue in the whole complex and it is certainly crucial for the whole region. Why should the report not be submitted?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Kwinana and Rockingham Shires are sending telegrams to the Premier.

Mr. Graham: For what reasons?

Mr. RUSHTON: They see it as the wrong thing.

Mr. Graham: They want development in their own areas instead of in the other fellow's area. It is petty jealousy and parochialism at its worst.

Mr. RUSHTON: Does the Deputy Premier think that the viability of Rockingham is not important?

Mr. Graham: Do you think everything must stop to suit one particular local authority?

Mr. RUSHTON: I will take the Deputy Premier on in connection with this point. This stupid Government has demanded that Navy houses be built in Kwinana and not in Rockingham, and now the Deputy Premier has the temerity to suggest this. Of course there is another alternative on this issue. The Premier does not know what he is about. He believes that to put 15,000 people in an area adjoining Alcoa's industrial fence is satisfactory.

Mr. Graham: That is completely untrue and you know it.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have looked at the ground.

Mr. Graham: You are talking rubbish and you are not capable of anything else.

Mr. RUSHTON: How far away is it?

Mr. Graham: There has been no design of the area yet. The honourable member would not have a clue, nor does anyone else know for certain.

Mr. RUSHTON: Some members accept that the Kwinana complex is a most important part of our State and that the future of the whole region is equally important.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is.

Mr. RUSHTON: There will be a tremendous growth of people in the area. At this point of time we have a grave responsibility to look after the people in the future and to look after industry for the future. We must ensure that the social life of the people, including areas for recreation and enjoyment, is protected. This is as important as their employment. Surely it is not asking a great deal to suggest the Government should satisfy itself beyond all doubt on this question.

Mr. Bickerton: When did the Government insist that the Navy houses be built at Kwinana?

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not have the time to answer the Minister for Housing.

Mr. Bickerton: When did the Government insist that the Navy houses be at Kwinana?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government insists on their being at Parmelia.

Mr. Bickerton: The Navy can build wherever it likes.

Sir Charles Court: If it builds outside the agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I ask the House to support the motion for very good reasons. A case has been made, without doubt, for

the people of this region who will play a major part in our future. For this reason, they deserve our support.

Mr. Bickerton: It is a pity the Contraceptives Act was not brought in years ago.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Nalder
Sir Charles Court	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Reid
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brown	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Cook	Mr. McIver
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moller
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Graham	Mr. Harman

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes

Noes

Sir David Brand	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Thompson	Mr. Bryce
Mr. R. L. Young	Mr. Bertram
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Burke

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Guidelines: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 19th April, on the following motion by Mr. Reid:—

- (1) That the Minister for Agriculture take immediate action to give greater flexibility of funds between debt reconstruction and farm build-up.
- (2) That the Minister should give immediate approval for funds from rural reconstruction to be made available to sons of farmers for assistance to purchase family properties.
- (3) That the Minister instruct the rural reconstruction authority to use more realistic product valuations when assessing farm viability.
- (4) That rejected applicants be reconsidered under the suggested improved guidelines.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [9.30 p.m.]: We have before us a very interesting and constructive motion moved by the member for Blackwood. I was disappointed in the reply given by the Minister because I felt he did not realise the importance of

this matter to the rural community, part of which is still suffering from the effects of the difficulties experienced during the last two or three years.

It is interesting to look at some of the incidents which took place about the time of the establishment of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme. I have before me the leading article in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 5th February, 1971.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is an interesting article because it reveals the situation at that time. It commences—

The rural recession casts a shadow over the State election campaign.

It also says—

This was the background against which the Deputy-Premier and Country Party Leader, Mr. Nalder, presented his policy last night. He had a good story to tell but it was not a dramatic one. . . .

It continues further—

Mr. Nalder was entitled to claim that W.A. was the first State to respond to the rural challenge. It helped to give birth to the Commonwealth-State \$100-million reconstruction scheme and urged State autonomy in the use of the funds that will be made available.

Now the Press thought that the Leader of the Country Party had a good story but an undramatic one. However, further down I believe there is a dramatic story. The article continues—

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tonkin, has accepted the scheme tacitly but to avoid hardship or abandonment of farms he proposes to use Treasury funds to supplement incomes.

And note this—

This would expose a straightened Treasury to an unknown liability but, in a more important sense, by encouraging men whose outlook was hopeless to stay on . . .

Members will notice that *The West Australian* was afraid that the Treasury funds would have to meet an unknown liability. It need not have worried because nothing was done.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Rubbish! Treasury funds have been used to the benefit of hundreds of farmers.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Nothing was done along the lines promised by the Premier. I will tell the Minister about this in a minute. The Minister evaded this question in his reply by listing some minor accomplishments. But these are totally out of line with what we are discussing.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Minor things! Keeping hundreds on the farms!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is nothing compared with the promises. The Minister understands this.

On the 30th May, 1972, I wrote a letter to the Premier of Western Australia about the Rural Reconstruction Authority and some farmers whose names I do not intend to read out. I wrote—

Your Policy Speech included the following promise:—

"I pledge my Party to face up to all farmers' problems, especially debt problems.

We propose to endeavour to institute a form of payment from the Treasury to the farmer to bring his net income to a stated minimum. In this way, farmers with no real alternatives would not be forced to leave their farms or endure income-shrinking poverty."

The situation has been reached by the above farmers where they must now depend on the above promise, having been refused aid on their third application to the Authority.

I will appreciate your advice as to what information you require and what you can do urgently to save walking off the property.

I received a very remarkable reply from the Premier in which he completely evaded the promises in his policy speech. His letter was dated the 12th June, 1972, and commences as follows:—

In reply to your letter of 30th May, I would like to draw your attention to the Rural and Agricultural decisions of the 25th Conference of the Australian Labor Party as contained on page 63 of the Constitution, Rules and Standing Platform of the Party.

I did not ask the Premier for the Australian Labor Party constitution or the decision of some conference; I asked him about his promises made prior to the election.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: This was to tell you that if you voted Labor at the next Federal election we would be able to solve the problem.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That interjection is right up to the Premier's standard. As soon as he is on the spot he points a finger somewhere else.

Mr. Nalder: At the Federal Government.

Mr. O'Neil: It is no good blaming the Federal Government if the Labor Party can't win office.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If I had thought of it I would have brought along a mirror to hold up to the Premier. He could then see himself rather than somebody else. I will continue with the letter—

Under the heading "Financial Assistance"—

- (a) That long-term loans at reasonable interest rates be made available to *bona fide* primary producers where it can be shown that such loans would make for viability.
- (c) Some form of payment from the Treasury should be made to the farmer to bring his net income to a stated minimum. In this way farmers with no real alternatives would not be forced to leave their farms or to endure income shrinking poverty. A requirement of this proposal is for the farmer to give the Government first refusal of the farm in the event of sale, and the total amount paid would have to be recoverable from this or from his estate.

Members will observe that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You have quoted from the platform often enough. If you were fair you would quote now and indicate that this is a precis of the Labor Party's intention.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am quoting a letter from the Premier himself. I cannot alter his letter.

Mr. H. D. Evans: This situation came about with our platform.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Does the Minister wish to deny that the Premier wrote this? It has his signature on the bottom.

Mr. W. G. Young: Perhaps the Minister for Agriculture wrote it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I will continue with the letter—

You will observe that (c) is an intended provision by which farmers who are no longer viable but do not wish to relinquish their residence on a farm, may possibly be able to remain.

The possibility of overcoming the problem connected with the implementation of such a provision is being examined currently.

And it is signed by the Premier. In his letter the Premier said that the implementation of such a provision is being examined currently, and yet prior to the election he said something entirely different in his policy speech. Why go back on his promise to something which means absolutely nothing? He did not fulfill his promises.

At the 12th June, 1972, the situation was being examined currently. Of what use is that to the farmers I am concerned about?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you think that people who had great debts would be able to withstand creditors? Do you think the creditors would allow this policy? That is one of the problems.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am debating the merits of this particular case. The Premier said he would see that no-one walked off his farm.

Mr. O'Neil: The Premier should have appreciated the problem before he made his promise.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I have heard the Premier in this House say that a promise is a promise. Well, a promise he makes before an election is not a promise. There is no other inference to be drawn.

The Minister should have adopted an attitude of seeking to provide ways and means to overcome the difficulties in administering the Rural Reconstruction Act. His officers are the finest we could wish for, but this does not make the scheme work.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Where has it fallen down?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is what I would like to know.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It has been a magnificent success.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister should know where it has fallen down. The motion was moved so that the Minister can tell us why it is falling down.

I wrote to the Premier about another farmer in similar terms and I received a similar answer.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You are saying that every farmer, irrespective of his financial position, should be kept on the farm?

Mr. Nalder: You were saying that two years ago.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I read out to members that the Premier said this when he was Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Let us look at what you are implying. Do you say a farmer should be kept on his farm irrespective of his financial position?

Mr. O'Neil: He is simply telling us what the Premier promised.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am quoting the Premier's remarks when he was Leader of the Opposition. He said he would see that every farmer in this position would have sufficient income to carry on. That is what he promised. I would like to point out what he did not do afterwards.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You are quite able to quote the full policy when you want to.

Mr. W. G. Young: You are embarrassing the Premier with the policy speech.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is not the first time. The policy speech is not worth the paper it is written on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Rural Reconstruction Scheme was intended to give farmers a chance to succeed and there may be ways in which the Minister could help the situation. I think there should be a revision of some of the prices put on farm produce.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Look at the wool prices we used last year. Would you like those revised too?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Some of these have been revised three or four times to the credit of the officers who, as I said, are doing an excellent job. However, no benefits are flowing to the farmers yet and some of them are now in a hopeless position and cannot see daylight despite the Premier's promise and despite the assistance available under the Rural Reconstruction Scheme. In my opinion the scheme should be accelerated because I notice in the report laid on the Table of the House on the 30th June, that over \$1,250,000 was on hand. What is the good of having it on hand?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Tell us how many unfilled applications there are?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister should know that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You should too.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: More funds will be available, and yet there is \$1,250,000 on hand.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Applications which have been approved still have to be met. There is a time lag. For heaven's sake read the book before you start to quote it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I have given this a good deal of thought, as the Minister can see. He is unable to give me an answer.

I am very concerned because I am asked for assistance from many farmers waiting for help under the Rural Reconstruction Scheme. I am sure some of them are worthy of help. There may be an element of doubt with a few but these applications should be looked at again in the light of the revised price of their produce.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Every assistance is being given.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I urge the Minister to have a look at the scheme. The Minister has asked me what is holding it up; what is the spanner in the works?

Mr. H. D. Evans: What hold-up?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Some of these applications go back months.

Mr. H. D. Evans: By April of this year the backlog had been caught up with.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: There would be no farmers left at all if the backlog had not been caught up with. I do not think the Minister realises the urgency of the situation.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Are you saying it is possible to handle these applications more rapidly than they are being handled at present? You are talking nonsense. You do not know what is involved. There is a great deal of documentation in regard to deceased estates, and so on.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not referring to the obligations in regard to deceased estates. The cases that have been referred to me do not involve deceased estates that are tied up.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Have they a proposition?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Yes, they have.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What is the problem?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I want the Minister to tell me. I want him to investigate the position. I would like to know how much progress the Minister has made in regard to rural reconstruction.

Mr. H. D. Evans: How many current applications are outstanding?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If the Minister would care to look at some of the cases I have had put before me he will realise how many are outstanding.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You are playing with words. You are making criticism in an area where a magnificent job is being done.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Let the Minister ask some of these people I am dealing with about the situation and he will soon see that my criticism is justified.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I think in the Federal sphere it is called nit picking.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister shows a lack of concern for these people who are in dire straits at present. Before the election the Premier said quite joyously that he would ensure that they would not suffer. However, at present they have nothing and the Minister does not care. The reason for the motion is to wake up the Minister and let him realise that these people have an urgent need. That is the reason for my supporting the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. W. G. Young.

HIRE-PURCHASE AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

Honorary Royal Commission: Printing of Report—Order Discharged

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Order be discharged from the notice paper.

Motion put and passed.

Order discharged.

BULK HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 9.49 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 24th August, 1972

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.37 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to deal with questions at a later stage of the sitting.

The PRESIDENT: Leave granted.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 5th September.

Question put and passed.

FUEL, ENERGY AND POWER RESOURCES BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to introduce new legislation to make provision with respect to the establishment and functions of a fuel and power commission of Western Australia.

A fuel and energy committee has been in existence for some considerable time, but the commission proposed in the Bill will operate on a wider scale.

In December, 1969, the consultants Kinnaid, Hill, DeRohan and Young Pty. Ltd. were commissioned by the State to explore and report on the energy patterns that can be expected in Western Australia up to 1985. Currently, Western Australia is 28 per cent self-sufficient in fuel, but the report showed that this figure will fall to 20 per cent by 1975 and to 14 per cent by 1980 unless further resources are discovered.