

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 9 September 1980

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

BILLS (2): ASSENT

Message from the Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Constitution Amendment Bill (No. 2).
2. Constitution Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: ELEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 4 September.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [5.07 p.m.]: When the House adjourned on Thursday night, I was dealing with the dangers of the nuclear power industry and the threat that I, and many other people, believe it poses to present and future generations. I have a very bulky document of about 50 pages which lists in detail some of the thousands of so-called incidents—leaks, failures, accidents—that have occurred in the nuclear power industry throughout the world. Members are welcome to look at this document if they wish.

I have with me also a *Daily News* article which states that in 1979 alone there were more than 2 300 incidents in United States nuclear power plants, including operational errors and mechanical failures. I am sure that members have seen the other Press reports which have appeared recently. Hardly a day goes by when we do not hear stories about accidents or incidents, as they are called, and leaks in various reactors.

A story came from Japan last week. Japanese fishermen were protesting very strongly about allowing a ship to berth at a certain place because, in 1974, it developed a radiation leak on its test run. That story is as follows—

The Mutsu which has been docked for repairs in Sasebo, 960km south-west of Tokyo since 1978, has been idle since a defective radioactive shield caused a leak in its reactor on September 1, 1974—a week after it first left port.

I was listening to "PM" on the car radio on my way home last night, and there was a report of a proposal by Japan to dump 5 000 tonnes of radioactive nuclear waste in the Pacific.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I thought it was 10 000 tonnes.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Unfortunately, I did not see a report in the Press this morning. I was hoping that *The West Australian* might have picked up the report, and I could have been more precise about the quantity. I thought it was 5 000 tonnes, but Mr Gayfer may be right. It was a significant amount.

A professor from a university in Japan was expressing fears for marine life. He expressed the opinion that the containers in which the waste material was to be dumped would have a life of 10 years only; and after that there would be a real threat to the marine life in the Pacific. I might add the report also indicated that the Australian Government has not expressed any concern or protest to the Japanese Government; that is disgraceful and quite irresponsible.

On 11 August there were Press reports about two tonnes of uranium yellow cake being stolen from the Mary Kathleen uranium mine. The yellow cake was stolen in small quantities over two to three years; and the authorities have just discovered the loss. As *The National Times* pointed out quite rightly on 17 August, this exposes the weakness in the Government's promise about safeguards. That article, under the headline "Uranium safeguards go astray", was as follows—

The case of the missing yellowcake (as processed uranium oxide is called) is now before a Queensland court, in the form of a normal criminal charge, and there is no reason to suspect that any sinister international conspiracy is involved. But the fact that a couple of tonnes of the stuff could suddenly appear in the commercial market is not reassuring—and nor is Carrick's promise that if necessary the Commonwealth will now make controls mandatory.

The country echoed to the sound of the receding hoofbeats of bolting horses as the Minister promised to think about closing the stable door. Carrick, at his press conference, said that uranium oxide was "not dangerous." Well, it depends what you mean by dangerous.

But it is a disturbing thought that, until the deal hit the headlines last week, neither the politicians nor the media realised just

how wide open Malcolm Fraser's much-vaunted promises of safeguards really were.

Until now I have been talking about the dangers caused by leaks, accidents, and so forth. In February last year, a forum was held in Geneva. An article relating to that reads as follows—

At a Forum in Geneva, in February, 1979, scientists from the United States, France, the U.K., Germany as well as jurists, technicians, philosophers, economists, parliamentarians, earnestly attempted to evaluate whether the western world really needed nuclear power, and if so, how much and at what social, economic, or political cost. The Forum took place at the initiative of a body which calls itself "Group of Bellerive" whose vocation it is to reflect on world issues.

That forum did not apply itself so much to the dangers involved in nuclear power in respect of technical failures, and so forth. Apparently it was accepted that such things have been well established. The main issues to which the forum applied itself were: Does the western world really need nuclear power; and if the western world needs some nuclear power, what are the economic, social, and political costs? Incidentally, I am quoting from a publication called "Social Alternatives", published by the Department of External Studies of the University of Queensland. I have quoted from volume 1, No. 5, of 1979.

The first question was, "Does the western world really need nuclear power?" An argument has been produced to justify the terrible disasters which can befall human beings as a result of a nuclear accident or the failure of a reactor. That argument has been based on the fact that we need nuclear power and we cannot do without it—that the world in the near future will be so starved of energy that the dangers of that situation would be greater than the dangers inherent in the development of nuclear power.

One of the statements made at the forum to which I have referred reads as follows—

Michel Grenon of the prestigious International Institute of Systems Analysis in Austria, said that in relation to future energy needs:

The truth is that no one, let alone the experts, really knows. In our Institute we have witnessed the contraction of global demand scenarios from 300 000 M.T.C.E. (million tonne coal equivalent) to 16-24 000 M.T.C.E. within the last five years! In the first case, it would seem impossible to function without nuclear energy and eventually fast breeders. In the second-case,

the world reserves of fossil fuels, as tabled at the World Conference on Energy in Istanbul in 1977, would suffice to wait quite comfortably for the development of solar energy.

Further on in the article, the following comment appears—

In fact, over the last five years, even the official 'establishment' estimates of national demands have considerably contracted in relation to what they were in the early seventies.

I do not intend to quote the rest of the article. However, it is clear that doubt is being cast upon the justification for the use of nuclear energy. The experts are now starting to wonder whether in fact the need for nuclear energy exists.

The second question discussed at the forum in Geneva was, "If the western world needs some nuclear power, what are the economic, social, political costs?" The answer reads, in part, as follows—

Another hidden "cost", political this time, is the erosion of democracy. Large investments in nuclear programmes will cause inordinate power to accumulate in the hands of the managers of nuclear energy and central utilities. The heads of the state-owned utility which centralises all power production and distribution in France, for instance, form a highly trained remote technocratic elite who make decisions on behalf of a bemused, ill-informed public. What the person in the street sometimes regards as the power of technology over nature turns out to be the power of a technocratic elite over politicians and the public alike. As nations grow more and more reliant upon vastly complex technologies, the authority of the technocratic bureaucracy becomes more and more crushing. France provides the extreme illustration of such a case: Electricité de France, the national state-owned utility has become a State within a State.

Another political threat was exposed by N. Questiaux of the French High Court, the Conseil d'Etat. She warned of a threat to civil liberties as opponents to nuclear programmes become identified, listed and observed by the surveillance agencies required to counteract subversive acts; as information on radiation measurements are kept secret; as the treatment of suspects in forthcoming plutonium economies (the U.K., France, Germany) may precipitate intolerably the erosion of basic liberties.

Among numerous other socio-political side effects aired at Bellerive were the highly increased fragility of a nuclear electricity distribution network. In view of the opposition to sitings of reactors by local populations, the policy in Europe has often been to increase the size of reactors and concentrate their locations in peripheral areas. For political expediency, smaller units are not scattered across the countries. Consequently, the electricity distribution network becomes more costly and above all more fragile; dysfunctions in one vital link affect large geographical areas and can in fact paralyze a whole country as the now famous French incident of November 1978 demonstrated. For half a day, all life stopped from North to South, as one link after another failed following a breakdown of a transmission line near a reactor 'park' in Eastern France. The incident happened during a morning peak hour, on a cold and dark weekday; trains came to a halt, the underground in Paris stopped, freezers defrosted, factories fell silent, shop-lifters swung into action and out-of-action traffic lights caused monster traffic jams. The French thought World War III had started. The incident illustrated the fragility of an 'all electric' society relying on geographically concentrated sources of power. The apprentice revolutionary learned how to hold an entire country to ransom. Even if nuclear power were as safe as claimed by its supporters—if human error such as seemed to have occurred at Harrisburg could be neutralised—any society facing the nuclear choice must still reckon with economic, social and political costs which may outweigh the benefits, particularly if it should become clear that the world can in fact wait for the development of 'softer' technologies.

I believe that statement sums up some of the other problems we will face.

To complete this particular section, I should like to summarise the environmental liabilities of nuclear power as seen by John P. Holden, physicist and Professor of Energy and Resources at the University of California at Berkeley—

Environmental Liabilities of Nuclear Power

International Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Misuse of Nuclear Materials by Subnational Groups

Accidents and Sabotage at

reactors
reprocessing plants
waste repositories
spent-fuel transportation

Routine Emissions and Exposures at/from

mill tailings
reprocessing plants
fuel-fabrication plants (if plutonium is recycled)
reactors
uranium mines.

I referred to this issue in the last Address-in-Reply debate and I once again appeal to the Government to reconsider the question of the State's involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle and, in particular, I ask it not to saddle us with a nuclear power station right on our doorstep.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The member has just made a statement which is incorrect in fact. She said, "I ask that the Government not saddle us with a nuclear power station right on our doorstep."

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What is the point of order?

The PRESIDENT: What is your point of order?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I ask the member to withdraw that statement. My point of order is that the member's statement is incorrect in fact.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: Then I have been misinformed by the Senior Clerk as to how I should take the point of order. I will deal with the matter in the adjournment debate.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That will be something to look forward to.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I must hand it to Mr Pike; he does not miss any opportunity to try to disrupt the Opposition's argument whether or not he has a valid point.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Thank you for your compliment.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: On this occasion, Mr Pike had no basis for his point of order.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: We will hear about it during the adjournment debate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you going to tell us that the President is wrong?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the member proceed with her speech?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I take exception to Mr Pike's interruption by way of a point of order in which he accused me of saying something which is not true. I appealed to the Government to reconsider the situation in respect of the building of a nuclear power station on our doorstep and if 50 to 70 kilometres is not on our doorstep, I should like to know what is.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The Government has made no decision to place a nuclear power station on our doorstep.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The Government is having sites investigated in close proximity to the city.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: No decision has been made.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have also assumed the present Government will be in power for the next 10 years.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I doubt the Government will be in power for the next 10 years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have been told it will take 10 years to build a nuclear power station, so you must believe this Government will remain in power for the next 10 years.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Any Government which is responsible for carrying out an exercise as disgraceful as the recent convoy to Noonkanbah, is capable of starting anything within a few years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That's female logic if you like!

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Here is the male chauvinist!

Recently I asked the following question in the House—

Is the Western Australian Government in favour of the establishment of a home port facility for nuclear powered, nuclear-armed vessels in Cockburn Sound?

The Minister replied—

Yes, as part of a total naval defence force.

I then asked—

If so, what steps does it intend to take to protect the civilian population in the event of—

- (a) a nuclear attack on the Cockburn Sound facility; or
- (b) possible radiation leaks from nuclear-powered vessels visiting or permanently berthed in Perth waters?

To which the Minister replied—

- (a) The Government supports the defence policies of the Federal Government in respect of Western Australia. We welcome the upgrading of defence facilities and the further facilities to follow, and have every confidence that the Commonwealth, in conjunction with us, will ensure that any protection that is necessary for the public will be provided.

I believe that answer is an insult to my intelligence. If the Government really believes it can protect the public from the effects of a nuclear attack, it is either naive or ignorant; and if it does not believe it can do so, the answer is an insult to my intelligence.

I wish to register the strongest possible protest on behalf of the people in my electorate against the actions of the Court and Fraser Governments in encouraging in Cockburn Sound the establishment of a base for nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed vessels. The offence is even greater than it appears at first, because the base will not be an Australian facility; it will be a foreign facility, controlled by a country other than Australia.

On 6 August last, public meetings were held around the world in remembrance of Hiroshima Day and dedicated to the banning of nuclear weapons. According to my encyclopaedia, the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima on 6 August 1945, killed between 75 000 and 80 000 people. Many of those who survived the attack were crippled, burnt, or victims of radiation sickness, not to mention the genetic problems which occurred in future generations. In Nagasaki over 35 000 people were killed and many thousands burnt and maimed.

The two bombs which wrought that death and destruction were very minor compared with the horrific weapons commanded by the super powers today. According to United Nations sources, arsenals of nuclear weapons in the world represent 1.5 million bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima, which is enough to destroy every human being on earth 15 times over.

In the past, the rationale behind the insane nuclear arms race was that a war fought with nuclear weapons would be so total and so frightening that nobody would be game to start one. However, the thinking on the matter is changing. It would appear the super powers are now coming round to the policy that it might be possible to have a limited nuclear war on someone else's soil, or a war by proxy.

A frightening article appeared in *The Australian Financial Review* of 8 August 1980. It

is headed "The new terror: US embraces the 'winnable' nuclear war". The article quotes Ronald Reagan's promises and, in part, reads—

The message is that nuclear war is winnable.

It also states—

Reagan promises that "other countries might not like us, but they will respect us".

It is also stated—

The main way the respect will be gained is by his promise to accelerate the nuclear arms race.

Another part of the article reads—

One of the weapons Reagan has promised to introduce is the neutron bomb whose intense radiation but low blast is designed to kill people while leaving property intact.

What a frightful thing. Not only is it frightening, but it appears we will not have much say in any war that is started.

In *The National Times* of 17 August 1980 there is an article headed "Carter's war plan ignores Australia". The article points out that decisions are being taken in Washington and we are not being consulted. We have been told by our State and Federal Liberal Governments that we should have a nuclear base on our doorstep. We will be made a target for nuclear bombs, and those bombs are capable of killing thousands and thousands of people. However, we will not have any say. The decisions will be made in Washington. We will be dragged into a war before we know where we are. The article in *The National Times* reads—

The risk of three American bases in Australia becoming nuclear targets has been increased by a secret directive by President Carter.

Carter's move, leaked to the *The New York Times*, was heralded by the media as a "new nuclear war strategy."

However, the United States did not tell Australia of the signing of presidential directive number 59 on nuclear war strategy.

The strategy calls for symbolic strikes against Russia with a premium on knocking out military targets rather than major population centres. As host to several American bases critical to US defence strategy, Australia could be high on the list of Soviet targets in such a limited nuclear war.

The fact Australia was not told of the signing appears to breach an understanding

reached with the Whitlam Government. Former Defence Minister Bill Morrison told *The National Times* he had made it clear to then US Defence Secretary, James Schlesinger, in July, 1975, that the operation of the bases in Australia was predicated on consultation before decisions were taken.

Morrison's move followed the failure of the US to tell Australia the bases had been placed on red alert during the Middle East crisis.

There has been no comment from the Fraser Government on the new strategy. Indeed, Foreign Affairs Department officials played down the move. "It was putting the presidential seal to an evolving policy," a senior official said.

The department confirmed that Australia was not told of the signing of the directive.

We will become a nuclear target, and decisions will not be made by our own Government, but by another Government. We will be dragged into conflict before we know where we are.

I have with me another statement which I do not intend to quote. It is an article which appeared in the *Daily New* on 17 June when a computer failure in the United States caused nuclear bombers to be placed on alert. They were ready to take off. The crews were scrambled ready for take off, and minute-man missile crews were alerted. That is only one of a number of occasions when computer failures have occurred in the American defence system.

This is the frightening and unstable situation into which the State and Federal Liberal Governments are dragging us. I do not want to become a target for any nuclear bomb. If nuclear armed vessels are to be stationed at Cockburn Sound the lives of many Western Australians will be placed at risk. The Government has no right to gamble with the lives of Western Australians.

Although I know my words will fall on deaf ears, I believe the Court Government should inform the Fraser Government that the people of Western Australia do not want their lives, and the lives of their children, placed in jeopardy. The Government should give its wholehearted supported to the effort to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [5.36 p.m.]: In supporting the motion I wish, firstly, to congratulate the members who have been elected for the first time. Perhaps I would have preferred to see some other faces, but it is essential to have two sides to any argument. I am sure in the months and years following the last

election we will listen to some interesting debates which could lead to some very telling marks being made on some individuals in this House with regard to what they judge their role to be, and what they judge to be the role of others in this House. I look forward to listening to future debates.

As other members have done, I congratulate the Leader of the House on his appointment. I am sure he will be a worthy leader and representative of the Government. I congratulate the Hon. Margaret McAleer on her appointment as Whip, and I extend my congratulations to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on his appointment. On a second occasion during the life of two Parliaments we have had a new member elected straight to the position of Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Referring to my own role in the last election, I want to place on record my sincere appreciation to those who assisted me during the election campaign and during the time we had to wait for the result of the poll in my province. It was the last to be declared. I particularly thank the Hon. Neil McNeill for the support he gave me right throughout the campaign, and during the weeks of waiting for the decision with regard to my province. I sometimes gained the impression that he was more nervous than I was! I was grateful for the care he showed, and the effort he put in during the weeks leading up to the election and on the actual day of the election. His assistance was deeply appreciated.

I will take this opportunity to mention a few matters which are worthy of consideration by Parliament and, more particularly, by the Government. On several occasions when listening to speeches on this motion we have heard references to housing. I want to make a few points on that subject.

From time to time a considerable number of people in my province find themselves in need of housing assistance. Indeed, the majority of people who go to my electorate office are seeking housing assistance. Many of them are seeking emergency accommodation as a result of the lack of employment opportunities, broken homes, and similar economic problems. Most members will be aware that there is a problem in obtaining emergency accommodation. Quite often it is necessary to find emergency accommodation very quickly.

One of the alternatives available south of the river is at Medina. I hope the Hon. Des Dans does not mind my referring to that section of his

province which is just across the border from my province.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The people in my province probably raise the same objections as the people in your province.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Many people are reluctant to go to Medina. When they refuse emergency accommodation in that area, they run the risk of not being able to obtain emergency accommodation at all. Medina does not have the best of reputations and that is very sad because I know many people who live there, and who are happy and content in the community. The shire does a very good job, and the recreational facilities are excellent. However, once an area—particularly a State Housing Commission community—gets a reputation, that reputation sticks.

Another problem is that many people suffering the emotional problems that go with the reason for the request for emergency accommodation feel lost if they are placed in an area where the transport is not good. Transport between Fremantle and Medina is satisfactory, but there are severe problems for people wanting to travel from Medina to other parts of the metropolitan area.

Empty housing units are always available at Medina. When I travel in my province from one section to another, I drive along Thomas Road which goes through Medina. I have noticed blocks of flats which have remained empty for years.

The suggestion I put forward is that the State Housing Commission should convert the blocks of empty flats in Medina to units which could be strata titled, and sold. The money received for those units could be put back into housing throughout the metropolitan area so that people who are in need of emergency accommodation will have some choice of where to live. It is frustrating for a person who needs family assistance to have to go to the opposite side of the metropolitan area. When offered that type of accommodation they quite often say, "No".

The fact that the blocks of flats are empty does not mean they would not be sought after as home units by young couples. If they could be converted and sold at a reasonable price, a tremendous opportunity would be available to young people who wish to reside in that section of the metropolitan area to get a reasonable start in a unit which they could afford. The return from the sale of the units would help to solve the housing problem in other areas.

The second point I wish to discuss on the subject of housing is accommodation for the aged.

I am aware that this subject has been mentioned by several speakers already. The proposition I put forward is that there is a need for our residential codes, under the Town Planning Act, to be reviewed so that single-bedroomed duplexes can be built on normal residential lots, and zoned specifically for use by the aged.

I know that other members have experienced similar difficulties when endeavouring to obtain accommodation for aged people, particularly those who are not well off. It is sometimes extremely difficult even for those who are well off. Many of the housing units available for elderly people are quite expensive. In many instances the people who go into that type of accommodation are aware that the money they put into it will be lost when they eventually pass away.

The massive developments which include many flats for aged people are a good idea. They serve the needs of some people. However, there are others who are far better off if they can live in the community amongst younger families. I know very well that many older people would prefer this sort of accommodation.

Let us look at what would happen if we made provision for this sort of development under our Town Planning Act. It would mean that on an average-sized 800-odd square metre residential block we could erect two one-bedroomed units. Such a building would be the equivalent of a three-bedroomed house, taking into account the smaller size of the lounge and combined kitchen, bathroom, etc. With a maximum of two people in each unit, the density of people on that block would be equal to that of a single residential block. Costs would be very greatly reduced.

It is possible still to buy an 800-square metre residential block for as little as \$7 000 in the suburbs today. Many blocks are available at less than \$10 000 a block, so the land component per unit would be between \$3 500 and \$5 000. There would be a saving in plumbing and other costs, and so a single unit could be purchased for a modest outlay.

The second point is that aged people who wish to buy such a unit in conjunction with a friend or just as a separate unit would have something to leave to their families. I have found that the main objection expressed by old people about buying into the accommodation offered by various organisations is that if they purchase such a unit, there will be nothing left to leave to their relatives. My proposal would encourage children to contribute to the welfare of their aged parents because money paid in to provide such

accommodation could then be recouped by the children when the unit was sold eventually.

The all-round benefits of such a scheme would be tremendous. I know that many people object to any sort of multiple residences such as duplexes. Probably some local government authorities would object to my proposal, but such blocks could be restricted as are duplex blocks in many local government areas.

The third point I want to raise in regard to housing relates to owner-builders. More should be done to encourage people to build their own houses. We are told that mass-produced houses are cheaper, but this is not so in actual fact. If we recall the situation of 20 years or so ago we would know many young people embarked on the project of building their own houses—either they did everything themselves or they used subcontractors for some of the specific trades.

During my early married life, within 400 or 500 yards of my house, five couples built their own houses. They would build so much and then obtain some money from the bank to go a little further, and so on. Today even the borrowing process tends to discourage people from doing this, particularly as much of the money for housing is lent by building societies. I have spoken to people who have attempted to build a house in this way, and they have not been encouraged. However, the savings could be quite considerable.

Recently I was speaking to a colleague of mine who had decided to build his own house. He did a great deal of it himself, and subcontracted out the work for which tradesmen were needed. I will relate the facts of this case to members, although I agree it is an extreme situation. This gentleman built his house for \$37 000. It was valued at \$95 000, and when it was valued for insurance purposes, that valuation was \$135 000. Certainly this house was in a remote part of our State, but the facts are as I have stated them.

I know of other cases of this kind. One gentleman had a quote from a builder for \$26 000 for his house. By building it himself using subcontractors he was able to build a house of a better standard than that originally quoted for, at a cost of \$17 000. Another house which cost an owner-builder \$21 000 to build was valued by the State Taxation Department at \$35 000, even before it was finished.

An owner-builder can save money because he has the time to shop around for materials. He can adapt his design to fit in with what is available. Of course he usually puts in a great deal of time himself. It does not really matter to him that he is putting on cupboard doors at 11.00 o'clock at

night; certainly a builder could not afford to do that. An owner-builder does not mind spending extra time on his own home. We should encourage more of this sort of thing.

This leads me now to comment on something I am not at all happy about. You will remember, Mr President, as will some other members who were here at the time, that in 1975 we amended the Builders' Registration Act. The proposed amendments were passed by the Legislative Assembly. When I first saw the amendments, I had the very strong impression that they would prevent owner-builders from building two-storied homes. I raised this point with the then Minister for Housing, who has now retired. At that time I was told I should read the parent Act and the amendments because quite clearly I did not understand what I was talking about. I persisted with my objections, but not strongly enough, and eventually the Bill was passed by the Legislative Assembly.

We then discussed the Bill in this Chamber. Luckily the Minister handling the Bill—now the Leader of the House—did not think I was stupid. When I approached him he said, "The Bill will do what you say it will." The matter was then reconsidered.

A number of members of Parliament actually met with some representatives of the Builders' Registration Board to discuss the amendments. We were told that it was the board's intention to stop owner-builders from building two-storied houses. The members of Parliament at the meeting said that they were prepared to compromise and support an amendment which required supervision of suspended concrete slab floors either by an engineer or by a registered builder. On that understanding amendments were agreed to in this House.

From memory this legislation was discussed in the dying stages of a session, and when the amendments were returned to this House, at a quick glance they appeared to be acceptable. However, I did not notice that the compromise amendment we had agreed upon was not included; and that the amended Act did not contain any reference to owner-builders and two-storied houses, apart from the original clause that an owner could build a dwelling house of any number of storeys.

On a few occasions since that time I have had words with the Builders' Registration Board about this matter. A friend of mine wanted to build a two-storied house. When he applied for a building permit from the local authority, he was told he could not build such a house without the

permission of the Builders' Registration Board. I telephoned the board, and I reminded the officer to whom I spoke of the provisions of the Act. This officer told me that the board must give permission for such a building. I went through the Act with this gentleman, and eventually the officer apologised and admitted that I was right. So the board had been stopping people from building two-storied houses without its specific permission after it had sought and been refused the authority to do just that.

I was assured that the situation would be corrected. However, about a year after that, I set out to build a two-storied house myself, using subcontractors. I submitted plans and specifications to the local authority, but I was told that I must obtain permission from the Builders' Registration Board before I could proceed.

Again I telephoned the board. This time I could not speak to the same officer—I think he was on holidays at the time. I then spoke to another officer who told me that I would have to obtain permission. I was told that I might be wanting to build a three-storied home, so the board would have to see my plans to make sure it was for only two storeys. I said, "For heavens sake, I have had to submit my plans to the local authority which employs a building surveyor to make sure that my plans comply with the Uniform Building By-laws. My plans do comply with the Uniform Building By-laws, and the law says I can build the house myself. Why are you trying to stop me?" I could not get an answer. Everything was held up until the gentleman who was in a position to make a decision returned to the office.

This gentleman apologised for what he termed the tremendous misunderstanding that had occurred. I reminded him that there had been a tremendous misunderstanding before. I was assured that this time the matter would be sorted out, and I assumed it would be.

Members may recall last year we again amended the Builders' Registration Act. We were told that one amendment we were considering was to enable an owner-builder to build a commercial or industrial building. This provision was being included in the Act to give permission for an owner-builder to build something he had not been permitted to build before.

The other day I visited my local council office and I was shown information sheet OB4, dated 29 January 1980. This form is issued to all local authorities and it defines the terms "dwelling on ground level" and "storey", and it then sets out the different categories of levels. It states—

CATEGORY A. DWELLINGS ON GROUND LEVEL.

If the proposed building is a single or duplex dwelling on ground level, and the owner being a person who is not registered as a builder, has completed the Statutory Declaration form C.76 as provided to the Local Authorities, a Local Authority (that is, a City, Town or Shire) may without reference to the Builders' Registration Board, issue a building licence.

The form then goes on to give details of other buildings which are not dwelling houses on one level.

The Builders' Registration Board has been requiring people who wish to build two-storied houses to comply with the following conditions—

Any application to the Board's office is required to be accompanied with:

- (i) The Statutory Declaration O.B.2. referred to above.

That is all right; that is what everyone has to do now. It continues—

- (ii) All the drawings, specifications, any addenda and supervisory contract applicable to the works.
- (iii) Information on previous construction experience on the type of building intended to be erected. Also details of the location of the works where such experience was gained. (Refer to application Form O.B.1.)
- (iv) An undertaking from a practicing structural engineer to supervise the structural aspects of the building.

I again telephoned the board and I asked what was going on. I was told that this form had been issued because this area of the law was a little gray, and it was not quite understood. In actual fact, the board is requiring owner-builders to follow the procedure which it sought permission to adopt in 1975 but which was refused.

When I asked under what authority this procedure was followed, I was told it was carried out under an amendment assented to on 21 December 1979. This was the amendment we passed last year which gave permission for the board to grant approval for owners to build certain types of buildings otherwise prohibited. So last year's amendment is being used as a mantle to exert authority over owner-builders who wish to build two-storied houses.

My patience now has reached the limit. I have been given assurances on many occasions that this matter would be sorted out, and that the board

would not use its influence and authority where it was not legally entitled to do so. However, at no stage has that undertaking been agreed to. I thought it was about time the matter was brought to this House to be aired.

The Hon. P. G. Pendl: You are referring to the board, are you?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am referring to the activities of the Builders' Registration Board in respect of owner-builders.

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Before we adjourned for tea, I was referring to the Builders' Registration Board and the way in which it had been acting towards owner-builders wishing to build two-storied homes. To make it clear that the board sought this authority to which I have referred but was not granted it, I shall quote the following from section 4(1)(a)(aa) of the Act—

No person who is not registered under this Act shall—

- (aa) construct for himself any building other than a dwelling house or a building comprising two dwellings on ground level

In other words, owner-builders can build themselves a dwelling house or a duplex. The amendment which was put to us in 1975 and which was agreed to by the other place before it was finally withdrawn stated as follows—

by deleting the words "a dwelling house or a building comprising two dwellings on ground level" in lines two, three and four of subparagraph (i) of paragraph (c) of subsection (1) and substituting the words "a single storey building comprising one dwelling or a single storey building comprising two dwellings";

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the member to speak up as it is difficult to hear him.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: That is the amendment the board wanted and that is the authority it was not given. That section of the Act had not been amended and the understanding now is as clear as it was then; that is, a dwelling is a dwelling.

If one looks at the information sheet OB4 from which I quoted earlier one can learn the requirements for anyone making use of the amendments we passed last year, supposedly to allow owner-builders to build a commercial building or an industrial building. The requirements are as follows—

Any application to the Board's office is required to be accompanied with:

- (i) The Statutory Declaration O.B.2 referred to above.
- (ii) All the drawings, specifications, any addenda and supervisory contract applicable to the works.
- (iii) Information on previous construction experience on the type of building intended to be erected. Also details of the location of the works where such experience was gained. (Refer to application Form O.B.1)
- (iv) An undertaking from a practicing structural engineer to supervise the structural aspects of the building.

I think I have already shown quite clearly that owner-builders do not need this authority to apply for a permit to build a two-storied dwelling.

What concerns me is that we passed this amendment last year to give people the right to build a commercial or industrial building. From looking at questions being asked of applicants, it is very unlikely that an ordinary person would be granted authority for such buildings to be erected. It is my intention to ask questions later to determine how many permits have been granted to owner-builders since 29 January to build commercial or industrial buildings for their own purposes. Any applicant who is not a registered builder would very likely not have the experience requested in part (iii) above.

It seems to me that difficulties are being placed in the path of owner-builders before they start. The experience I have gained of the Builders' Registration Board and the way it acts in regard to this matter will make me extremely suspicious of any other amendments to the Act it asks us to pass. Mr President, I can assure you and the board that any further amendments the board places before us will be gone through with a fine tooth comb. If something is not done about this matter quickly, I will have a lot further to say about it. I object strongly to a body such as this using an authority it does not possess and continuing to use it even when officers admit that they do not have the authority. It is time the board members pulled their socks up and abided by the rules contained in the Act and did not make up their own rules as they go along.

My next comments relate to the recent municipal workers' strike. I do not wish to comment on the strike as it related to rubbish collectors—that is a matter of strict industrial concern. My comments relate to the concern caused to many people by the strike by those people who dig graves. A very good friend of mine had the great misfortune to have his son killed in a very tragic accident during the period of that

strike. Needless to say, the tragedy of losing his son was very significant; it was a very trying time. Members have heard the Hon. Lyla Elliott speak of the troubles encountered by people at times when a loved one has died. The family is placed under considerable strain.

It was a disgraceful situation to have the strain of such a strike added to that already facing the man to whom I have referred. Many people wanted very much to give their loved ones a burial promptly, but were unable to do so. Families were subjected to a week of indecision as to whether or not the burials would take place.

The man to whom I referred phoned me during that week asking what he could do because his family was falling apart under the strain. He approached the Trustees of the Fremantle Cemetery asking if the family could dig the grave, but he was told they would not be allowed to do so because the cemetery was closed. Altogether it was a disgusting situation. Unless a person has been through such a tragic set of circumstances he would find it difficult to understand what was involved in having this man ring me, not just as a friend, but as a member of Parliament, asking for assistance. It is difficult to understand the stresses and strains placed on the family because of the strike by these grave diggers. I hope these people will think very carefully before they do this sort of thing again.

I wish to place on record my thanks to the Deputy Premier for the assistance he gave to the family in arranging to have the grave dug thus enabling them to have their son buried. I also thank the Opposition for arranging a pair for me to allow me to attend the funeral last Thursday. Unfortunately, as things transpired I was unable to take advantage of that fine gesture, but I do thank the Opposition for its consideration.

I support the motion.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [7.40 p.m.]: It had not been my intention to contribute to this debate tonight and as the Leader of the Opposition might know, I never intend to say very much; but we will see what happens as time goes on and as I look at the notes I have jotted down during the evening. First of all, I join with others in welcoming new members to this very illustrious Chamber. After serving a period in the Assembly and then coming into this Chamber I have come to enjoy and appreciate this Chamber's contributions and traditions. I am sure even the opponents amongst us who constitute some of the newly elected members who seem to disagree on the whole concept of this House will learn to appreciate its worth and the very reason for its

existence. It might take some longer than others to do this, but I daresay everyone will come to the realisation sooner or later that the Chamber does have a purpose to fulfil. I am sure the new members will then enjoy being part of this Council.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It certainly does serve a purpose.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I will talk about Mr Hetherington in a minute. One does learn to appreciate this Chamber as time goes by and one usually changes his manner as he experiences time in this House.

For the benefit of honourable brethren here—I say brethren because this could apply to members on both sides of the House—I will relate again a story I have told many times before. I might add at this stage, however, that perhaps in time members will not indulge in spitting nasty comments to one another across the Chamber like warring cats or lions. I hope they will eventually simmer down and allow logic to enter their discourses rather than continue to attack thus indicating their mistrust all the time. I honestly believe members can learn to appreciate the views of others and to appreciate that people from all walks of life have a right to be heard in this House and that their own utterances are not necessarily sublime. All members contribute to debates with some degree of authority. These include Mr Hetherington and our other learned friends such as school teachers like the Hon. Mr Pratt and many others in the Chamber.

I have related the story before of the time I walked down the corridor with a newly elected member on my left when I passed the Hon. Mr Hawke, the Hon. Mr Tonkin, and the Hon. Mr Moir who were sitting down to morning tea, as was the habit in those times. Bert Hawke said, "Good day, Mick"—which happens to be my Christian name—"Who's your mate?" My mate still had the blood dripping from him from the election campaign. He just looked to his left and kept on walking down the corridor. Bert Hawke said, "He'll keep; we even tame lions here", and his words could be heard all along the corridor. And it is true—the lions can be tamed. Now I would like to talk about Mr Hetherington. I am sorry he is no longer the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He received a great deal of ribbing whilst he was Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I think he came through it all remarkably well. He gained experience in that office which was thrust upon him and did a better job than most of us would have if we had been confronted with such a situation. However, Mr Hetherington

is no longer Deputy Leader of the Opposition, so things change indeed. *C'est la guerre*.

The position has changed for the Hon. Graham MacKinnon also. He was Leader of the House and was one of the oldest serving Ministers in this Government. He is a man for whom I have a terrific amount of time and over the last 18 years I have worked with him very closely. Our closest association was during the time he was Minister for Health and I know that over those years no-one could have acquitted that portfolio with greater respect than he. His subsequent portfolios were Education and Public Works, just to mention a few. I wish to congratulate the Hon. Graham MacKinnon on his terms of office. I can understand how he must feel to be sitting on the back benches with Mr Leeson, Mr Brown, Mr Olney, and me. However, he is amongst friends.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Very honourable companions.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr MacKinnon will find that he will experience a deal of the ribbing which takes place on the back benches, but I believe he will enjoy his sojourn.

Mr MacKinnon was a great ambassador for this House and State. We all owe Mr MacKinnon a great deal for the service he has given.

I should also like to congratulate the Leader of the House (the Hon. Ian Medcalf) on his elevation to that position. No-one commands more respect than Mr Medcalf and I know the job that he has ahead will be a difficult one. It would be bad enough having one lawyer in Opposition, but when there is a bevy of them, it is rather difficult, especially when one has been elevated to the position of Queen's Counsel into the bargain. I do not know much about that level of life except that I believe it will be very interesting in the future.

I can remember whilst I was in the Assembly—as I am sure Mr Brown will also remember—the times we had with Mr Guthrie and Mr Bertram spitting at each other across the Chamber. Indeed, everyone wondered when the lawyers would stop dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's" and get down to the legislation. I believe the Houses of Parliament are for people to speak common sense; after all that is the situation which should prevail in the Westminster system. It does not matter if a few mistakes are made here and there, as long as the sense of the Bill is quite clear. We appoint judges to interpret laws and they will be interpreting laws for a long time to come. It is just the same as Mr Olney, Mr Berinson, and Mr Dowding interpreting some legislation now. I have no doubt we will hear

something more from them and Mr MacKinnon, who is researching the same document.

We will miss a few faces across the Chamber of course. We will miss the Hon. Don Cooley who sat near me on the back benches. Mr Cooley was a great gentleman who got down and joined in debate especially with Mr Masters who would be grinning on the other side of the House. We will miss that banter which took place. It was good banter which did not get down to the gutter level. It was not that type of spite. Certainly, they both used to grin and Mr Cooley often would be grinning below the belt whilst his face looked very savage above the desk.

The Hon. George Berry is a great man and we will miss him. Mr Berry was as honest as they come. Mr Berry never missed reading a Bill through the Committee stage and no doubt, Mr President, you will remember when he sat in this Chamber and often said that there was something wrong with a certain clause. All the lawyers in the world may have read it, but the Hon. George Berry could still find a mistake and carry the point through. He rarely spoke, except during the Committee stage and always contributed when his chance came.

The Hon. Roy Cloughton and I served together on many committees and we will miss him also. Then, we have "Princess Grace". I could not let a word go by without mentioning the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Amazing Grace!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The Hon. Grace Vaughan is another delightful character we will miss. She held a Master of Sociology degree, and goodness knows what else. She used to give back as good as she received and when she finished a speech she would come round and say, "You know, you are a dreadful so-and-so". This banter was something which made up the House, and it was good.

The Hon. Ron Thompson was one of the great Ministers in this House. He did not serve as such in my time, but I have been told he was a great Minister. His contribution on police matters was well noted. The Hon. J. M. Brown now represents the Hon. Claude Stubbs' area. No more honest an individual ever walked. He has the respect of every member of this House, and we shall certainly miss him.

Another member we will miss is the Hon. John Tozer. The Hon. John Tozer put a lot of work into his speeches. He must have been in this place from five o'clock in the morning at times. When we read his speeches we will realise the amount of work which went into them. The only trouble is

all that work did not save him his seat, and he has gone to greener pastures. Mr Tozer's position has been taken by the Hon. Peter Dowding and of course the Hon. Peter Dowding's turn no doubt will come and he will cease to be a member in this House as Mr Tozer did.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Is that a promise or a threat?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is not a threat; it is a fact of life. I believe the member missed my comments previously. We all walk a tight-rope here. The only true definition of a politician is that he must be able to sit on a barbed-wire fence and have both ears on the ground. He must be sure he does not slip off the fence, because it will hurt.

Things have changed in this House. It is silly to cry about what has passed, but nevertheless it is true that this place is becoming more like a mausoleum during the week than ever before.

The House is not the same as it was. There is no comradeship as there was before. Perhaps there should not be any comradeship. Perhaps the warring nations should never be seen to mix. Perhaps, we should come into this Chamber each Tuesday with our coats off and our sleeves up, ready to get stuck into each other.

In the past, we were here for four days of the week. This was the only place where one could get typing and filing done. We had to share rooms then and I think it was good. Members had someone to talk to instead of sulking when they had lost a vote or had been rebuked.

I believe the situation changed when we went into electorate offices. In my opinion these electorate offices became electioneering offices. They became a facility supplied by the public to help the parliamentarian in his next election. Electorate offices were set up in places like Bayswater, Morley, and South Perth—just to quote a few examples. These offices were set up and supplied by the taxpayers of this State.

This action completely disrupted the unity of the workings of Parliament House. How stupid it is that I have an electorate which is 300 miles by 200 miles in area—and my colleagues in the Labor Party, if they had their way, would make it twice that size—and people say, "Don't you have an electorate office in that area?" My electorate has 26 towns and shires and I would not know where to have my electorate office.

In my opinion it is fair enough to work from town to town, and it is just as easy for me to come to the city and work in a place which has already been fully provided—and that is a room in

Parliament House. I would not know where I would put my electorate office—Northam, Narrogin, Wylkatchem, or Kulin. How ludicrous can it be that a member of Parliament representing a city electorate has an electorate office—or an electioneering office, as I call it—three miles or even one mile from Parliament House?

This is absolutely stupid and it is costing thousands of dollars to the taxpayers. I can remember when there was talk of extending Parliament House. The plan was to extend the front of the building to provide room for members of Parliament. The cost was to be \$800 000 and another \$800 000 to air-condition the whole place. Some members will find out how hot this Chamber can be in summer and that it is not only from the heated debate. Despite these plans, the Premier of the day, because of pressure, decided to have electorate offices. The cost was double what it would have cost to extend the building. However, the electorate offices were set up with the necessary secretaries and typewriters.

It may be that a member in an area such as Mr Dowding's electorate has to catch an aeroplane virtually to come over the equator to get down here. But it does not make any sense in the metropolitan area, where nobody is more than 20 miles from Parliament House, for 98 per cent of members to have an electioneering office in their electorates with their names printed across the front—offices which are provided by the taxpayers of Western Australia.

When anyone proposes legislation requiring the Government to contribute towards party funds, all raise their hands in horror; but that is exactly what is going on now by a backdoor method. Some of these offices are decked out quite well and the costs of running them are enormous. We could easily cater for all members in this building, where everybody should be, in my opinion. Members should be contacted at Parliament House. I have to travel 150 miles a week to my office down here, and I do not receive any expenses for it, either.

That is my idea of what is going on here at the present moment. It is knocking out altogether the comradeship which existed and which is necessary between colleagues in one's own party or on the other side of the House. Without it, everybody will be running off the rails and at one another's throat, and that is not the name of the game for a Westminster-type Parliament.

While I am on this subject, another matter should be mentioned. We should have a four-year term for the Assembly, and if necessary an eight-

year term for this place, although there could be a better time arrangement for this place. Certainly the Assembly should have a four-year term, and the sooner we get down to it the better off we will be as a State. It will also be less costly for the people, who are absolutely sick of going to the polls year after year.

I might tell new members on my side of the House not to pray for a change of Government if they think they will be able to get up and say what they like when they are in Opposition. Years ago I prayed for a change of Government, and it was good for about two years; but in the third year I could not get back into government quickly enough. So members should not have any illusions about which side of the House is best. Reference to *Hansard* will show that I was unable to have a toilet built in Avon while I was in Opposition. Those who are now in Opposition think they are unfortunate—and they are.

In the first year of a Parliament we are undoubtedly continuing to implement the decisions of the Government in the previous Parliament. In the second year the Government has a chance to put forward its policy. There is barely enough time to get going in the third year. The year after that one may be no longer on the Government side and another party is claiming credit for the good policies and disclaiming responsibility for the bad policies of the previous Government. In addition, a terrific expense is involved in running an election. All these aspects should be considered.

In reply to a question of mine last year, the then deputy Premier (the Hon. Des O'Neil) stated that the matter had been raised on several occasions and no-one had come up with a suitable answer. To hell with that! Something needs to be done for the economy of the State, the peace of mind of the electors, and the satisfactory running of the Government, especially one in its first term. In my opinion, a four-year term would be ideal, but certainly not a five-year term, which applies in England and Tasmania. Four years is a compromise, and that should be the policy of the Government. I tried to have it accepted as a policy of my own party at the last election, but for some reason I could not make first base. Surely to goodness it should be given a better hearing.

I have sat in this Chamber over the years and listened to the Hon. Des Dans talking at great length about the advantages of the socialist workers' scheme in West Germany—but I will admit he has not done so in the last 12 months or so. He has lent me papers and we have looked at them together.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not the socialist workers' scheme in West Germany. I have said something about the Social Democratic Party in West Germany.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Well, the Social Democratic Party and its worker participation system for worker representation on boards. I have not heard him speak about it lately.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We did not sit for about eight months.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am not being derogatory about it. I am interested in it, as everybody should be.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have given you many papers on West Germany.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I was also interested in Mr Hetherington's remarks on 2 September. I am treading on dangerous ground in referring to a speech in a debate during this session. On page 805 of *Hansard* he is reported as saying—

I am aware that there are some firms which show the way to the rest and if the majority of firms follow the lead we would do a great deal better. At times of economic dislocation there is much fear and tension. We have to do something about the conciliatory process.

In due course, with the introduction of technological change and increased productivity we will have to introduce industrial democracy so that we can deal with the dislocation which will occur. We will need to ensure that everybody can share in the decision making which will affect them.

No doubt he was referring to worker participation, although he did not use precisely that term. I was greatly intrigued by those words.

When I was in Frankfurt only two years ago, I was interested to note how unpopular the scheme had become, not only among the so-called capitalists—the employers—but also among the workers. The unemployment rate was rising sharply in West Germany. Something was going wrong with the system. Something was definitely going wrong at the decision-making level.

I noticed on page 36 of *The West Australian* on 1 August an article by John Dornberg of Munich, in which he said—

The "English disease" may not yet be infecting Germany, but during the past three years or so there have been unmistakable signs that an era has come to an end here.

It was called industrial peace and it had lasted 30 years... During the three-year period from 1974 to 1976, for example, Germany lost only 25 working days per 1000 employees due to strikes, compared with 40 in Sweden, 243 in France, 353 in Great Britain, and 508 in the U.S.

I have heard those figures before; the Hon. Des Dans has referred to them. The article goes on to mention something that is apparent when one travels in Germany. It says—

But for the past three years or so Germany's unions and organised management associations seem to have entered a new era of confrontation.

The "model," it seems, is no longer working. Labour has been moving on a course of more "class consciousness" and a bigger share of the pie. Management has displayed an eagerness for showdown.

The article goes on to refer to the system which came into being under the 1951 Act, about which some of us know a little. That Act provided for a 21-member supervisory board for every 20 000 workers, equally divided between capital and labour. Eight members were appointed by the shareholders and four each by the workers and trade unions. Four more members, two appointed by shareholders and two by labour, were independents.

The 21-member board broke down; it did not get off the ground. A watered-down version of it came into being about 1952, giving the employees a third of the seats on the board, and that is as far as social democracy went in that period of 25 years. The stage was then reached where an advisory board on worker participation was set up to advise the main board. While we hear so much about the ideal of worker participation, it is a great shame to see it breaking down. From my understanding of business, it must break down, and I regret to say I believe that will always prove to be the case. I do not think it has been given a better opportunity to succeed than it has been given in Germany, but I doubt that we will hear very much more on this score.

The real reason I rose to speak tonight is the conditions prevailing in the country areas at the present time. I never cease to be amazed at the complacency of people in the city and their lack of understanding of what is happening to the wealth of the nation just over those hills. I believe people do not generally realise that Western Australia, and in fact Australia, still rides on the rural producer's back. I will not argue figures here—they can be read in many ways—but there

is no doubt, in view of the wheat and wool cheques, that the rural industries are the greatest money spinners we have. Here in Western Australia, iron ore still has a way to go before it passes the regular, steady income which is injected into the system by the farmers.

Very little mention is made of the huge catastrophe—and I use that term because that is what it is—which is about to hit the agricultural areas if rain does not fall out beyond those hills in one week. It is bad enough for those in the central wheatland areas who are striking drought for the first time for perhaps 70 years, in some cases, but the problem is compounded by the fact that in the northern part of the State, up in the Perenjori, Morawa, Mullewa, and Coorow areas, for the first time in five years it looked as though they were going to get bread and butter because they had magnificent crops up till a month ago, but now it appears there will be nothing.

In fact, people in the south who still have stock are starting to look to the north not for pasture lands, but for crops, which a few weeks ago it was hoped would make wheat, but which are now having stock turned on them. The catastrophe is so great that it must be infinitely worse than the one which was experienced in 1914 when we had the celebrated drought in all the agricultural areas of Western Australia.

The land is so much vaster in extent now and I hate to think what the cost will be to this country. Only a fortnight ago I took 18 Victorians by bus into Mr Brown's province; we went through the Kellerberrin and Merredin areas and saw they are a complete write-off. That was a fortnight ago, and I do not know what the area is like today. It must be a veritable dustbowl by now. Further south the situation is much the same; in fact, it goes virtually all the way through to Ravensthorpe, and that is a long way.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It goes a bit further than that.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Wordsworth would know because he travels further south than I do. I should imagine it goes all the way to Munglinup and has reached the Esperance plains by now. This is a real catastrophe, and I do not know what the State will do.

It is not like the past four years. Certainly there are pockets of people who have just about been driven around the bend by four consecutive years of drought. God help them this year; they look like getting off the land. In addition there are huge areas of the State that have never before been affected by drought.

I do not know what will happen to the economy of the State next year when the entire farming community pulls in its belt and spending chops right out as indeed it will, and when stock will be killed off because there is nowhere to send it. Stock can be sent from the central area to places with present big stock-carrying capacity such as Morawa and Perenjori; but they can be sent there only for a time and then they must be returned to the south or sent away for slaughter.

Certainly the central wheatlands have a small advantage over the northern areas in respect of stock which is worth something at the present time provided the animals have flesh on them; but stock is worth nothing if there is nowhere to send it so that it may be fattened and turned into meat.

In addition, with the opening up of 3.5 million more hectares of land over the next few years, the position will fast be reached where stock will be hard to find. I do not know if the northern parts will have a harvest of any great extent this year; possibly they may if we all get down on our hambones and pray for rain. That is the only thing that will pull us out of this mess. If the northern areas do not get rain, they will not want stock, and God knows where they would get it from if they did want it.

Some of the central wheatlands which may return to prosperity will be looking for stock next year, and I do not know where it will be obtained. However, definitely the effect on the economy of this State will be terrific as people take the stock off the land. Trainloads of stock are moving down the road all the time, leaving the farm. There is nothing more we can do. I sold 4 000 stock in the last three weeks; I am lucky because at least I had that stock to sell. Some of the people up north who could have carried that much sold their stock four years ago and have had nothing since. This is the devastation that is occurring in the country at the moment.

Many of us in the south can live off our fat, but that will not do the State much good because it will not bring anything to the people living on the other side of the hills. The sooner city people wake up that somehow or other belts just have to be pulled in, just as the country people have to do, the better off they will be.

Nobody wants pity. We all know what farming is about; one month it is a famine, and the next month it is a feast. But some of these poor people are facing their fifth year of drought. Mr President, how would you like to have a glorious crop coming on—the sort of crop you can throw your hat into and it will sit up on top of it because the crop is so thick—the type of crop you have not

seen for 40 years, and suddenly you receive no finishing rain and in a fortnight the crop turns blue and disappears back into the ground, then the rest of it curls up and the wind blows it away?

One has to live through this type of thing to understand it, and this is the first time I have known it to be so general right throughout the farming areas. On Thursday I went to Newdegate in Mr Knight's area. I chartered a plane to fly down there, and we flew low to look at the paddocks. The amount of wind devastation there is frightening, and it is possible that place will be nothing but a dustbowl for the next few months. Already farmers are grading across the prevailing wind, using large graders. They are creating ditches to stop the sand from moving. Some fences are covered in sand; even some farm implements left out have sand building up alongside them, and some dams are full of sand.

I am not over-dramatising the situation; this is fact. This situation will be accentuated 10 times more if we do not receive an inch of rain within a week—that is how serious the position is.

The company about which I know something—Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited—which was complimented by the Hon. James Brown earlier this session, is renowned for being the greatest continuing employer in the building industry in this State. This year CBH is spending \$21 million on construction programmes; last year it was \$18 million, and the year before that I think it was \$22 million. This record of spending large amounts on construction projects goes right back to the huge Kwinana project.

In the last three years CBH has done most of its building in the country. There will not be anything like that next year. This prosperity and this great work on the part of CBH will have to come to a stop. We will have to close our gates and endeavour to live off our fat, and the effect of this will be felt throughout the industry, within the railways, and within the coffers of the Government.

Members who represent city electorates are accustomed to situations which arise day by day automatically as the pay cheques come in. I will admit city people have worries; they have social problems, etc. But they do not know what it is like suddenly to find there is no money and everything is cut off and one has no-one to whom to turn other than the banker; and if the banker will not accommodate one, possibly one can turn to the Government for help, or else one must leave the farm. This has happened in the Wimmera in Victoria, and it will happen here. Things are in a

bad way, and the sooner we start to realise that there must be a drastic tightening of belts, the better it will be.

Country people must have their SEC power, and even though the SEC runs at a loss, country people start looking for a cheap method of generating their own power in such times. Certainly that cannot be the case with water, because they must have water. I hate to think what the net result will be, because it is not the income that farmers do not receive this year which will worry them most; what worries them most is the fact that it will be 12 or 18 months before another cheque comes.

This leads me to the expansion of water services. I assure the Hon. Graham MacKinnon that I will not give my full lecture on the wonderful attributes of the 1946 comprehensive scheme which was initiated by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke and then, regretfully, pushed out of this Chamber as the result of a vote in which some Country Party members took part. However, I will say this: Nothing has been done to extend the comprehensive water scheme for about eight years now. Not one dime has been spent in that time, whereas before that we were spending the equivalent of \$1 million, \$3 million, or \$4 million a year.

We have a huge drought upon us, and we have parts of the comprehensive scheme which have not moved for the past eight years. If farmers did not clear land and build fences little by little, year by year, they would never get anywhere. Why the devil the Government or the Public Works Department—whichever is responsible, and everybody blames the Government—does not at least keep on expanding the scheme perhaps by only a couple of miles each year is beyond me. It could at least extend the pipeline from point A to point B, not to take in huge areas, but just to keep it moving. The cost to complete the scheme would make one's mind boggle. Stage 3 of the scheme involves 625 000 acres, and the cost was estimated at \$6.250 million, or \$10 to the acre. That was eight or nine years ago, and the project now would cost four times that much if it were to be completed.

However, while a farmer cannot afford to refence his farm all at once, he can do a little at a time, and this is what should be done in respect of the comprehensive water scheme. This year we have a huge drought and no extension of the scheme. People will be required to burn up energy careering down roads in trucks to cart water. Thank God they will cart much less than would have been necessary had they held all their stock; but still they must live and their rainwater tanks

are empty. Every country person knows that it is not possible to fill a rainwater tank with only 5½ inches of rain.

If catchment areas collected rain water, we would never need pipelines in this area. The dams are there, but all the eroded catchments in the world will not fill the dams in a drought.

The Agaton water scheme has been planned, and the details have been printed and have been sent out to the public. We have gone to Canberra for assistance to the extent of \$52 million, but everybody throws up their hands in horror and says we will never get it. I do not believe we will get anywhere unless some move is made somewhere, little by little, bit by bit, year by year. The Government is taking money from country people by way of rates and taxes, and is giving nothing back.

Electricity and water are no longer luxuries, but necessities, and I will never know why farmers should not be entitled to them after living in the bush and paying taxes for so many years—as have their fathers before them.

When we want a huge project in this State, we seem to be able to find the money. An amount of \$100 million would complete the comprehensive scheme and the Agaton scheme right now. That is not all that much brass when we stop to think about it; it is the equivalent of \$20 million only five or six years ago.

We have got to start to realise that if we want the cow to produce milk, we must feed it and not chop off its food, otherwise we will not get anywhere.

The people in the bush at the moment do not want something for nothing; but at the same time if the entitlement is there—and I believe it is—at least they should get something if only little by little. The job should be tackled quietly and done a little at a time so that the system is gradually extended.

I was talking to a farmer yesterday who showed me his electricity bill. I have yet to see mine. That farmer has three houses and his sheds on his farm, and his electricity bill is \$7.98 a day. He showed it to another farmer down the road, whose bill is \$6.50-odd a day. These people contribute; they do not get the electricity for nothing. Water would also cost them a great deal. We have just got to get around to extending the comprehensive scheme as soon as we can.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They would have been on the contributory scheme in the first place, I guess—at great expense.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It would still have been at great expense. As Mr MacKinnon would know, it is a terrible expense. That is one of the reasons the scheme was dropped. Regrettably, the farmers in those days thought the expense was too great. Those were the days before the clovers, in 1946, when the horses were still in use.

Just after the war, the people started to have their pounds coming in, and they thought everything was wonderful. They had not caught up with the idea that costs were rising at the same rate. They had their political representatives vote out the Hawke scheme. They have nobody to blame but themselves. However, the sins of the fathers should not be visited on the fourth and fifth generations, or whatever the Bible says. We cannot go on in that way, year in and year out.

The carrying capacity now is 10 times what it was in those days; but the PWD still asks us to prove ourselves. It has been said to me, "If you can come up with a set of figures and prove to us how much your carrying capacity will increase by our providing you with water, we will consider bringing it in." I do not know how it will increase and neither does anybody else. I will guarantee my pappy, who was on that land before me, never realised we would be carrying two sheep to the acre with a 14-inch rainfall. That is the effect of it. I do not know where it will all end. Perhaps the Hon. Neil McNeill, who is a Bachelor of Agricultural Science, may be able to tell me what the future holds; but I do not think anybody knows.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He will probably tell you to shift down to where he is.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On one point I must agree with the Hon. Tom McNeil. We are becoming a little tired of the situation concerning the televising of football. The football finals are on at present; and the only way many people in my electorate, and certainly many people in the electorate of the Hon. Jim Brown, can see the football is to hop in their cars and come down to Perth. There is a so-called energy crisis. Six people were killed on the roads the other day. However, if we want to see the football we have to come in 150 miles.

There are 800 000 people living in the metropolitan area. However, they are not expected to fill the ground. They want to bring the people from the country in to Perth. They want the 200 000 country people to be brought in at any cost. The people in the back blocks are the ones who are expected to leave their homes, where the dirt is blowing away, the fences are being covered, and they cannot remove the muck from

their eyes if they go outside. They cannot sit in their own lounge rooms and look at a football game in the city on television to while away their time.

Somebody has said that the gap between the city and the country is "getting awful big". I will say it is, really and truly. It is an ever-widening gap. After all, the people in the country see the football every Saturday afternoon; but when the finals come, the old people in the homes, and those who are in hospitals, and the youngsters are not able to see the games. We want the youngsters to play our national sport rather than that soccer game one sees every day of the week and every night. As a matter of fact, soccer is shown on television when the Australian Rules football is being played. One can look at the soccer; but we want our youngsters to play the national game, and carry on. They need encouragement to play our game.

The people in the country have to come to Perth to see a football match. There is talk about an energy crisis, but that does not come into it. The people cannot afford to stay overnight in Perth; so, dog-tired as they are, they turn around and go back—that is if they are lucky enough to gain entrance to the ground. It is too crazy for words. We cannot seem to be able to do anything about it; but it is about time we did.

I would like to say a few words about interstate railways. I do not know if the members of the Labor Party have a policy about them, or if they are quite content to leave the situation as it is. If I were in their position, I would try to find an answer to this problem. Recently I travelled on the east-west railway—the *Indian Pacific*. I learned that there was one deluxe cabin on board. As a matter of fact, I travelled in it; and it was delightful. It is called the honeymoon suite, but unfortunately I am a bit old for that sort of enjoyment. Nevertheless, to use an Australian term it was quite a "curl of the mo" experience, that is for sure.

I decided I would have a look at the second-class or economy area. There is one deluxe cabin, and there are several first-class cabins which are twinettes and roomettes. Then there are the second-class compartments which have four beds in them. It is a little archaic when one considers the esteem in which the train is held throughout the world.

The *Indian Pacific* is one of the great tourist attractions of the world now that the *Ghan* has gone or is going. The *Indian Pacific* provides one of the greatest railway rides one can possibly have in the whole world.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Certainly the slowest.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is not as slow as that. They tell me it is a lot faster than the one from Vladivostok to Moscow, for example.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have never been on it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Neither have I. I said, "They tell me". It is certainly a lot faster than the *Canadian Pacific*.

If we are to have that sort of railway, we should entice the people to use it. There should be more than one deluxe cabin. Everybody was queueing up for places in the deluxe cabin.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: How did you get it?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Because nobody wanted it from the Western Australian side. They did not know it was available until I obtained the use of it, and then everyone else on the train wanted it.

For the return journey, I decided I would go into the Sydney office because it is not possible to book the deluxe cabin at this end. One has to go into the Sydney office to book it for the return journey. I was told, "No, it is taken." I asked, "Is there a waiting list?" I was told, "Oh, yes, there is quite a waiting list." I said, "Well, that is okay. It was a fair try."

In that office, the Western Australian section is a small room right at the end of a counter. I was amazed to find that it was not exactly what I would expect in a first-class, world standard booking lounge. I said this to somebody who was there—I do not want to name him—and he said, "We have a beautiful booking lounge here. You have never seen anything like it." We left the office, and walked along the platform a little. He switched the lights on, and lo and behold there was the most luxurious booking office I have ever seen in my life. It has a marble floor, and a map of Australia on it. It has the crests of the States of Australia and several cubicles for bookings. There is a booking office and a manager's office; and there is a Western Australian office with "Western Australia" printed on it. This is in Sydney, and it is the main booking office for Westrail and the *Indian Pacific*. It is the kind of thing that everybody should be seeing when they go to book on our great Australian railways.

That booking lounge has not been opened for years, purely and simply because an official in Sydney decided it was a little too expensive. It was closed down, which is absolutely ridiculous. Somebody from this end should go to Sydney and have a look at the situation there, because the railways are not being promoted.

I suggest to Mr McKenzie, who is the Labor spokesman on railways in this House, that on our next trip we go down there together and have a look at that booking lounge. He will receive a shock. No-one on the staff in Sydney knows why the booking lounge is not being used.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Do you know they are closing the local one in City Arcade?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is ridiculous.

If the authorities want to make the railway pay, they might have to do a few things like increasing the number of deluxe cabins and promoting the train generally. What would be wrong with converting one of the carriages into deluxe or super deluxe cabins? Possibly the second class could be cut out, and the costs could be evened out a little. It would not be necessary to charge a higher fare except for the deluxe cabins; but the railways could if they wished. They should attempt to make the *Indian Pacific* the super train that it should be and could be. It has every reason to be a super train, because there is no other train ride like it anywhere in the world.

The Hon. T. Knight: Did you get your deluxe cabin on the way back?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No. There was a queue a mile long.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Eight-month waiting list.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: What about going over?

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Take pot luck.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Well, I took pot luck, and I obtained the use of the cabin. I am glad I did. I suggest to any member of the House that he should try to obtain the deluxe cabin when travelling.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: In the honeymoon suite?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Pike will appreciate it.

The Hon. T. Knight: When I tried they said it was booked, but it was empty all the way back.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I will tell you something else. We are the only people in the country who have to get the permission of the chief traffic manager to travel on it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is interesting to know. So much for that.

I will not speak at any greater length, as I said I would not take very long. I had only a few notes here. Nevertheless, as I started, so I finish by welcoming the members who are new to the House. I am sure we will all fit into the spirit of debate. There will be some perilous times; but

members should remember that it is all good banter.

Some of the banter contains some sense. Everyone has his or her own character; and each of us is elected here by the people. No matter from what walk of life members come—whether they be brilliant academics or just ordinary bushwhackers—they all have their own expressions and their own way of life. They all have something to contribute to the debate. I am sure the debate in the House will be harmonious; and you, Mr President, will be allowed to enjoy another term of office, as I know you enjoyed the last one.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. N. F. Moore.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Nuclear Power Station: Establishment

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.46 p.m.]: During my speech earlier tonight I was taken to task by the Hon. R. G. Pike who tried to take a point of order and accuse me of stating an untruth to this House. He indicated he intended to speak on this matter in the adjournment debate and prove what I said was wrong.

Between that time and the present time, I have carried out some research and have come up with some interesting facts. I do not wish to delay the House; but I take exception to people who cast doubts upon my integrity and veracity.

In every policy speech for the last three years, the Premier has referred to nuclear power. If members go back and look through previous debates in *Hansard*, they will find there is no question about the Premier's support for a nuclear power station in this State. There is no doubt about the Liberal Party support for a nuclear power station in Western Australia.

Every time a member of my party speaks in opposition to nuclear power, the interjections from Government members make it quite clear where they stand on the need for nuclear power or a nuclear power station.

On 16 August 1977, Mr Barnett asked a question of the Premier in regard to the establishment of a nuclear reactor in Western Australia. The question reads, in part, as follows—

Is it his intention to encourage the establishment of a nuclear reactor in Western Australia?

The Premier replied, in part, as follows—

Yes, provided nuclear power is judged to be the best cost energy source at the time, and provided all relevant environmental and safety standards are met.

On 28 November 1979, the Labor Party moved a motion in the following terms—

That in the opinion of this House, planning for a nuclear power plant in W.A. should not proceed, because a nuclear power plant in W.A. cannot be justified in terms of need, cost and potential risk and because of overwhelming public opposition to the Government's proposals to build a nuclear power plant in this State.

The National Party moved an amendment and, when the Premier stood to speak, he opposed both the motion and the amendment. He said—

It is a fact of life that with nuclear power generation we have to have a unit which has a very large capacity and when we fit any unit into a grid system, the largest unit we have is the one that determines the security of that particular grid. In other words, we have to make sure that if the largest unit, through sabotage, technical or mechanical failure, is out of action, the grid system can service the community it is destined to serve.

This is why we have projected as far forward as 1995, because it appears from the growth pattern of power required for this State up to that point, we would be overcommitting our coal resources and doing Collie a disservice in the absence of big coal finds in the future if we do not provide alternatives. Therefore, it is not by accident or chance that we have nominated that date as the potential one when we will need to have such a plant not only installed, but also commissioned.

Later on in his speech, the Premier said he could not remember who the scientist was but there was scientific evidence to show nuclear energy was safer than solar energy. Mr Brian Burke interjected in the following terms—

Nuclear energy is not safer than solar energy.

Sir Charles Court then said—

I want to tell the member for Balcatta that it is safer than solar energy. All the scientific research on these forms of energy generation has demonstrated that if we are looking at

the matter in terms of human safety, solar energy is more dangerous by far than nuclear energy, if we take the total cycle.

That is an incredible statement to make. Later on in his speech, Sir Charles Court said—

I want to make a point that, whilst it will not please the mover of the amendment, the Government cannot accept the qualification he envisages, because it believes the National Party wants to have a little bit each way; it wants to support uranium mining on the one hand, but, on the other hand, it does not want to commit itself to power generation. To my mind, that is inconsistent.

If we are prepared to sell uranium products to other countries for use in power generation, we should be prepared to undertake power generation ourselves.

On 31 October 1979, Mr Crane addressed a question to the Premier in regard to a nuclear power station. I will not read the complete question and answer; but in the final paragraph of his answer, the Premier said—

The Government firmly believes that nuclear power has a logical part to play in solving Western Australia's future energy problems and is taking the necessary steps to ensure that the State can proceed with the installation of a nuclear power plant when required and with appropriate safeguards for ensuring the health and safety of the community.

On 1 November 1979, Mr Jamieson addressed the following question to the Premier—

In view of the potential risks of nuclear reactors, as evidenced throughout the world and most recently at Lucas Heights, what basis does he have for wanting a nuclear power station and a nuclear research station in Perth, taking into account that nuclear power cannot be justified in Western Australia in terms of need, cost, or safety?

The Premier replied—

I wish only that time would permit me to give a complete and full answer for the next half hour on the various points that the member has raised. In view of the fact it is neither practical nor desirable to do so, I shall content myself with being brief.

First of all, there is no risk. I invite the member's attention to the fact that the safest method by far for power generation in the world today is nuclear. It has the best record till now and potentially in the future.

So far as our reasons for wanting to attract either a nuclear power station here by 1995 and/or a research plant are concerned, modern technology is such that Western Australians have a right to participate in this technology—*young scientists* in particular—in this State. We believe that in meeting the needs of the nuclear research reactor and of the scientific knowledge that would be developed in this State, a power plant will be necessary by 1995 if we are to have a balanced availability of energy from a number of sources.

If one does the calculations in relation to power needs of this State by 1995, it becomes quite obvious that not only do we need to develop the coal which will give a long life to Collie, but also we need every form of energy we can amass, whether it be gas, oil, or nuclear. It is in that context that we have made the decision to go ahead.

That was on 1 November 1979.

I could quote from a number of Press statements; but I will not do so, because time is moving along. However, I should like to finish on the following point: I want to refer to the document that was quoted by the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bill Hayden) when he was in Perth. It was a document from the Regional Director of the Federal Department of Trade and Resources in Western Australia to a senior officer in Canberra.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: It was leaked!

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You ought to ask the Hon. Bill Withers about stealing documents and he will tell you!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Point of Order

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Apparently there is a member in this House who is not aware of Standing Order No. 87 which says—

... all imputations of improper motives and personal reflections on Members shall be considered highly disorderly ...

The PRESIDENT: Will the member withdraw that statement?

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr President, with respect to you, the Hon. Bill Withers admitted he had in his possession a document for which he could not account.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: In view of your objection, Sir, and in deference to you, I withdraw it.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I wish to refer to this document which is from a Mr T. H. Goss, Regional Director of the Federal Department of Trade and Resources to a senior officer in Canberra. It was a report of a meeting where he accompanied a Mr R. Swift who was a senior diplomatic officer in the Australian Embassy in Washington. It was a meeting with the Premier (Sir Charles Court) and the Minister for Resources Development (Mr P. V. Jones). In this report, under the heading "Nuclear Power Generation" the following statement appears—

The Premier said that he had made a number of announcements on this issue in a deliberate move to provoke early public debate on what is naturally a very contentious subject. The Premier said that it is intended that a site be selected within the next 12 months.

This meeting took place on 11 April last.

There are many references I could provide to this Chamber, which provide evidence of the Premier's support for the establishment of a nuclear power station close to Perth. However, this is the adjournment debate and I do not wish to keep the House any longer than necessary, so I will not quote all those documents.

I suggest it is time the Liberal Party accepted the fact that this is the way the Premier is leading the State, and admitted the situation honestly. I believe members opposite realised, as a result of the market research carried out before the last election, that the establishment of a nuclear power station close to Perth was not a popular issue with the people of this State. The Government realises that more and more people are becoming afraid of nuclear power, so it wants to have it both ways, by going ahead and planning for a nuclear power station and introducing the Nuclear Activities Regulation Bill, selecting sites and paving the way for its establishment, whilst trying to convince the public it will not happen.

The Government is not interested in the attitude of the public on this issue. On many occasions in this Chamber we have seen examples of the fact that the Government is not democratic, because it is not interested in the opinions of the people. I believe this is one issue on which the Government should listen to the opinions of the people, because their families are involved and they feel strongly about the matter. The Government does

not have a mandate to proceed with the establishment of a nuclear power station.

Therefore, I repeat what I said earlier: I hope the Government will have another look at its attitude to where we are going and not establish a nuclear power station in this State.

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [8.57 p.m.]: I commence my remarks on the adjournment debate by saying that my comment in regard to the Senior Clerk of Parliament was incorrectly made and was a misunderstanding of the situation on my part.

To deal very briefly with the comments made by the Hon. Lyla Elliott, I should like to point out it is indeed significant that the last date quoted by her regarding a statement made by the Premier concerning the establishment of a nuclear power station was November 1979. The other document of substance, so-called by the member, was a leaked document and to that allegedly correct document I intend to pay no regard. I direct my attention to the last date on which the Premier was quoted by the member as having made a statement in regard to the establishment of a nuclear power station in this State and I shall quote from the Liberal Party policy dated 7 February 1980. That date is very important because the current policy was established in that document.

I should like to say to the member in particular, and the House in general, that, unlike the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the National Country Party do not place a "half Nelson" on their members in regard to how they will vote in this place. Since that is the case—and I believe that has been obvious in this House for the last week or so—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How has it been obvious?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: —I come now to the point of the adjournment debate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope you are not reading your speech, but that you are only speaking from notes.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I thought the activities of the Hon. Sandy Lewis evidenced that from members opposite there is a tremendous amount of "gab", but no crossing of the floor.

I come now to the point of the adjournment debate. In this matter the Hon. Lyla Elliott is simply punching pillows. The fact of the matter is that I objected to a statement made by the member. I wrote it down as the member made the statement, amongst others, all of which were confirmed by her speech in the adjournment

debate tonight which purported to indicate that the Liberal-National Country Party coalition in this State is committed in absolute terms to build a nuclear power station. The comment made by the member—and an examination of *Hansard* will reveal this—was as follows: "I ask the Government not to saddle us with a nuclear power station right on our doorstep." Prior to that, subsequent to it, and certainly in the adjournment debate tonight, the member spoke as though it is a *fait accompli* that the Liberal-National Country Party coalition in this State has determined to build a nuclear power station. The fact of the matter is that that is simply not true. It needs to be said, and to be said again and again and again. It must be remembered that the previous State Labor Government made a decision to begin an investigation into the establishment of a nuclear power station in Western Australia. Members opposite may say—as they must—"Yes, that is true, and we have changed our minds". We accept that.

I come back to the point: It behoves any Liberal or Country Party member of Parliament to repudiate any statement made along the lines that there is a commitment to build a nuclear power station.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you mean to say that political parties stick to their policy statements?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The facts must be made known to the people of Western Australia. I conclude by saying that the Minister for Fuel and Energy, in this State, made a policy statement.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will cease their interjections.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I want to hear his point of order.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He claimed there was one.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to refrain from constantly interjecting on the member who is on his feet and, in particular, to stop interjecting when I am speaking. I call on the Hon. R. G. Pike.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I apologise, Mr President, for remaining on my feet while you were standing. I was looking towards the member who was interjecting and I was unaware that you had risen.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You do not take much notice of him anyway.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You do not either, by the look of it.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: To continue my speech, I repeat again that the Minister for Fuel and Energy (the Hon. P. V. Jones) made a policy statement on this matter about a month ago which clearly enunciated the policy of the Government. I conclude the adjournment debate by repeating to the House—and I hope to the people of Western Australia—what he said.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How do you know you are concluding the debate?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I said, "As far as I am concerned".

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I suppose that is something for which to be grateful.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The policy statement of the Liberal Party states the following—

We are therefore following the only responsible course in making all the necessary preliminary investigations in preparation for a decision on nuclear power when the time comes that the decision must be made—around 1985.

What we are doing at this stage is getting ready—nothing more and nothing less—as any responsible Government should.

Any other approach would be irresponsible in the extreme.

I consider it to be important that that should be made known. It puzzles me that the Opposition should make such a fuss of this matter if, in fact, members opposite are dinkum. They should be glad the Government has made no commitment. I have quoted from a document from which even the Premier cannot deviate because it is committed Government policy. The point raised by the Hon. Lyla Elliott relates to a stage not later than November 1979, prior to the last State election—other than the document which blew out of a window.

I speak as a back-bencher when I say that the determination as to whether or not we have a nuclear power station, when it is made, will be made by a meeting of the combined parties and not by one individual. So, it is incorrect for the Opposition to imply that any other situation is the case. A decision has not been made.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Charges: Pensioners

161. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister representing the Treasurer:

Further to my question 70 of 19 August 1980, requesting the Government to review the concession allowed to pensioners on electricity charges, will the Minister list the several forms of assistance to pensioners and low income earners as referred to in his answer to the question?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The State Energy Commission provides a direct financial concession to pensioners through the pensioner rebate scheme for domestic electricity fixed charges. The scheme provides a rebate of up to \$5.50 each quarter, depending on the level of consumption.

Additional assistance is provided through its customer advisory service programmes which include the mobile safety clinic for free safety checks on portable appliances and the repair of cords and plugs, group presentations dealing with household budgeting and ways of reducing energy costs in the home, individual personal advice on the selection, care, and economic operation of household appliances.

ANZAC DAY TRUST

Football and Racing Proceeds

178. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Deputy Premier:

(1) In each of the years since 1961, what amounts of money have been made available to the Anzac Day Trust from race meetings held on Anzac Day, or the Monday declared to be a public holiday in lieu of Anzac Day, in both the metropolitan area and country areas?

- (2) In each of the years since 1961, how many games have been played, and what amounts of money have been made available to the Anzac Day Trust from the gate takings of games the Western Australian Football League played on Anzac Day, or the Monday declared to be a Public Holiday in lieu of Anzac Day?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that under the Sunday Entertainments Act of 1979 the WAFL does not need Government approval to play on a Sunday, and as a result is contemplating a reduction in the number of league games to be played on Anzac Day by playing games on Sunday 26 April and Monday 27 April?
- (4) Does the Minister consider this action to reduce the number of games to be played on Saturday 25 April 1981 as an attempt by the WAFL to evade its responsibility to the Anzac Day Trust?
- (5) If the answer to (4) is "No"—
- (a) is the WAFL prepared to fulfil its obligation to the Anzac Day Trust by donating 60 per cent of net proceeds from all games played on that weekend;
- (b) if not, why not?
- (6) If the answer to (4) is "Yes"—
- (a) will the Minister consider amending the Sunday Entertainments Act 1979 to prevent the WAFL from playing football on Sundays; and
- (b) will the Minister consider amending the Anzac Day Act to incorporate football played by WAFL over an Anzac Day long weekend?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

	\$		\$
(1) 1961	16 084	1971*	8 623
1962	19 178	1972	53 592
1963	24 060	1973	48 488
1964	32 478	1974	65 389
1965*	26 812	1975	75 603
1966	26 287	1976	75 599
1967	28 617	1977	90 569
1968	29 270	1978	88 047
1969	25 352	1979	96 477
1970	52 571	1980	128 478

* In 1965 and 1975 Anzac Day fell on a Sunday. The racing clubs gave to the trust the proceeds of meetings on Saturday, 24 April or Monday, 26 April.

	\$
(2) 1961 State trial match	412
1962 No matches played	
1963 No matches played	
1964 (Saturday)—	
4 matches—normal League round	2 720
1965 No matches played	
1966 No matches played	
1967 No matches played	
1968 No matches played	
1970 State trial match	389.22
1971 No matches played	
1972 No matches played	
1973 No matches played	
1974 One match of league round	2 674.80
1975 One match of league round	1 233.23
1976* (Sunday)—	
4 matches—normal league round played on Monday, 26 April	3 727.00
1977 No matches played	
1978 No matches played	
1979 No matches played	
1980 No matches played	

* In 1972 the Public and Bank Holidays Act was amended—No. 63 of 1972—to provide that when Anzac Day falls on a Saturday or Sunday the next following Monday is also a public holiday.

The amendment to the Anzac Day Act, No. 1 of 1976, caused 60 per cent of nett proceeds from fixtures played on the Monday—when 25 April fell on Sunday—to be payable to the trust.

- (3) The Chief Secretary has been advised that a decision regarding matches to be played over Anzac weekend in 1981 has not yet been made by the WA Football League. It is the policy of the WA Football League to play split round matches over long weekends when they occur during the football season. It has long been the practice over the Easter and Foundation Day weekend to play two matches on the Saturday and two matches on the Monday.
- (4) No. If the WA Football League follows normal practice, two matches will be played on Saturday and two on Monday.
- (5) Answered by (4) above.

- (6) It is not proposed to amend either the Sunday Entertainments Act or the Anzac Day Act.

HOUSING

Country Towns

179. The Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

In relation to the following towns—

Merredin;
Northam;
Collie;
Bunbury;
Albany; and
Geraldton—

- (1) How many State Housing Commission homes were built during the past five financial years?
- (2) How many State Housing Commission homes are proposed to be built during the current financial year?
- (3) What is the current waiting list for homes?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) SHC Units Built
(Completions) 1975-76 to 1979-80

Commonwealth-State Housing

Town	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	Total
Albany	4	22	21	15	21	83
Bunbury	2	33	35	14	20	104
Geraldton	26	65	49	10	34	184
Collie	3	6	—	5	4	18
Merredin	17	20	3	3	—	43
Northam	2	15	30	—	6	53
Totals	54	161	138	47	85	485

Aboriginal Housing Scheme

Town	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	Total
Albany	—	3	—	—	4	7
Bunbury	—	—	—	—	—	—
Geraldton	11	3	2	4	1	21
Collie	—	6	8	—	—	14
Merredin	—	—	—	—	2	2
Northam	—	—	—	—	4	4
Totals	11	12	10	4	11	48
Grand Total	65	173	148	51	96	533

- (2) A further 38 dwelling units will be completed during 1980-81 being 1979-80 carry over programme.

	Commonwealth-State Housing	Aboriginal Housing Scheme
Albany	4	2
Bunbury	5	3
Geraldton	10	3
Collie	—	2
Merredin	5	—
Northam	2	2
Total	26	12

(3) Aboriginal housing applicants
as at 31-8-80:

Town	Families	Married Couples	Pensioner Couples	Single Pensioner	Total
Albany	6	—	—	—	6
Bunbury	22	2	1	—	25
Geraldton	32	1	—	—	33
Collie	22	1	—	—	23
Merredin	4	2	—	—	6
Northam	19	2	—	—	21

Commonwealth-State housing
applicants as at 31-8-80:

Town	Families	Married Couples	Pensioner Couples	Single Pensioner	Total
Albany	75	13	16	15	119
Bunbury	130	14	4	15	163
Geraldton	50	12	6	9	77
Collie	32	22	2	3	59
Merredin	6	6	2	2	16
Northam	19	2	4	10	35

(e) National Employment
Strategy for Aboriginals
(NESA)

- (ii) Craft (Commonwealth Rebate for Apprentices Full-time Training)
- (iii) CYSS (Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme)
- (iv) School to Work Transition.

In addition the Western Australian Government has in years to 30 June 1980 increased funding for capital work to provide employment opportunities and it has encouraged project investment on a scale which will cause a new wave of jobs to occur in all traditional categories and in some new skills and qualifications.

- (3) Answered by above.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Employment Opportunities

188. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Premier:

- (1) Is it the policy of the Western Australian Government to engage in schemes to encourage employment opportunities?
- (2) If so, what schemes or contributions or actions has the Western Australian Government taken to encourage such employment?
- (3) Is the Government aware of Federal employment creation schemes and job training schemes, and does the Government give these Federal schemes its specific support?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) Advantage has been taken of the following schemes funded by the Commonwealth with the State Government contributing additional funds as required to create employment opportunities and better equipped young persons for the work force.

(i) Neat (National Employment and Training System)

- (a) Special Youth Employment Training Programme (SYETP)
- (b) Education Programme for Unemployed Youth (EPUY)
- (c) Pre-apprenticeship Assistance
- (d) Commonwealth/State Trade Training Programme

POLICE

Video Cameras

189. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Does the Western Australian Police Force have one or more video cameras suitable for portable use, and if so, how many and what make?
- (2) For what purpose were these units acquired?
- (3) Are the units attached to any particular branch or group within the Police Force, and if so, what branch or group?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) Yes.
The number and make are not divulged for reasons of security of police operations.
- (2) General police work.
- (3) Yes.
Video Section, Scientific Branch.

POLICE

Aboriginal Aides: Noonkanbah Station

190. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is it a fact that Aboriginal police aides were used—
 - (a) to assist the movement of the Noonkanbah convoy;

- (b) to guard the drill site at Noonkanbah; and
 - (c) to patrol the Noonkanbah area during the drilling programme and prior thereto?
- (2) If the answer to any of the above questions is "Yes"—
- (a) which police aides were involved;
 - (b) from which stations were they seconded; and
 - (c) upon what dates or for what periods were they away from normal station duties?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
 - (b) Yes.
 - (c) Yes.
- (2) (a) to (c) It is not considered proper to name various members of the Police Force taking part in any specific exercise nor the police stations from where they came, as such could have a long term detrimental effect by discrimination being shown towards them.
- Police operations are a matter for the Commissioner of Police and the specific planning and operational necessities will not be divulged.

RECREATION

Australian Institute of Sport

191. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) Does the Minister consider the establishment of the new Australian Institute of Sport, scheduled to open in Canberra in January, as of benefit to young sportsmen and women from this State?
- (2) If "Yes," why?
- (3) In light of the institute being placed in Canberra and only of real benefit to Eastern States sports people still obtaining an education, does the Minister consider the time has come to instigate our own State sports lottery to cover State needs?
- (4) Is the Minister aware that the Australian Sports Institute will cater for eight major sports and, as Australian Rules Football is not one of them, does the Minister intend suggesting to Mr Ellicott that it be included?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) It would have been more beneficial and cost effective to have developed decentralised programmes whereby particular functions and sports could be allocated in the States best equipped to provide the service. However, the central institute will give limited opportunity for attendance by Western Australian sports-persons and should, through exchange of coaching expertise and other resources complement the operation of the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation through the Western Australian Institute of Sport.
- (3) No.
- (4) The Minister is aware of the sports to be initially included and does not intend to suggest that they be varied at this stage.

COURTS: PETTY SESSIONS

Justices of the Peace

192. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Are justices of the peace still being used on a regular basis in metropolitan Courts of Petty Session in lieu of magistrates?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) in which courts do justices sit regularly; and
 - (b) on how many occasions have justices sat in such courts in each of the last two years?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

COURTS: CHILDREN'S

Special Magistrates

193. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) How many—
 - (a) full time; and
 - (b) part time;
 special magistrates sit regularly in Children's Courts in the metropolitan area?

- (2) Of these, how many are—
 (a) stipendiary magistrates;
 (b) qualified legal practitioners; and
 (c) laymen or laywomen?
- (3) Is the system of part time special magistrates working satisfactorily.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) (a) Nil.
 (b) 10.
- (2) (a) one ex-stipendiary magistrate.
 (b) Five.
 (c) Two men and two women.
- (3) Yes.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT

Amendment

194. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Will the Minister consider amending the Industrial Arbitration Act 1979 to make provision for the granting of financial assistance to any person wishing to challenge the rules of an industrial union under section 66(2) or to seek an order as to the performance of union rules, as is the case under corresponding provisions of the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

No. A person has the choice under the Industrial Arbitration Act 1979 to join or not to join a union. It is therefore not appropriate to provide financial assistance to a person wishing to challenge the rules of a union which that person has voluntarily joined.

The Legal Aid Commission will consider taking a case to the Industrial Commission for a person suffering financial hardship.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Deputy President

195. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Does the Government intend to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act 1979 to make provision for the appointment of a

Deputy President of the Industrial Commission so as to avoid problems similar to that created recently by the death of the president?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

The question of appointing a Deputy President to the Industrial Commission is a matter that will be considered by the Government in its continuing review of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT

Amendment

196. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Will the Minister give consideration to the proposition that the Industrial Arbitration Act 1979 should be amended to allow appeals involving questions of law only to be made directly from the Industrial Magistrate and from single commissioners to the Industrial Appeal Court as was the case under the repealed legislation so as to avoid the unnecessary cost and delay involved in having to take all such appeals to a full bench of the commission before they can be taken to the Industrial Appeal Court?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

Appeals involving questions of law can adequately be dealt with by the full bench of the Industrial Commission because of the legal qualification of the president. The purpose of the appointment of such a legally qualified person was to enable the expedient passage of matters involving legal interpretation with the Industrial Appeal Court providing an avenue of appeal against the legal interpretations given by the full bench, should they be deemed necessary.

The Minister is not aware of any delays with appeal proceedings.

GAMBLING

Illegal: Penalties

197. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is it the Government's policy to stamp out illegal gambling establishments?
- (2) Is the Minister satisfied that the penalties provided by the existing law are adequate to deter people from conducting illegal gaming houses?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that it is usual practice for the keeper of an illegal gaming house to pay fines of patrons charged with being on the premises?
- (4) Would not the imposition of more substantial monetary penalties be likely to put an end to that practice and render law breaking less profitable to the keeper?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) The Government policy is one of proper law enforcement which has regard to the nature of offences committed, the level of police resources which ought to be employed, and the level of police activity acceptable to the community. A discretionary — but not discriminatory — approach to law enforcement in the fields of social offences has been advocated by eminent police authorities.
- (2) Under existing law, the keeper of an illegal gaming house is liable to a penalty of \$1 000 or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for any term not exceeding 12 months. This penalty is considered adequate.
The monetary penalty is often imposed by the courts; imprisonment very rarely.
- (3) Yes. This is believed to be so.
- (4) The imposition of severe monetary penalties would, in all probability, force activities of illegal gaming houses underground and the criminal element could move in and take control. There could be threats and intimidation of proprietors and players; this would ultimately lead to violence.

At present, strict supervision is maintained to ensure that criminals do not become involved with the running of illegal gaming houses.

Penalties for persons found on the premises of a common gaming house could be increased from \$20 which is the maximum fine under present legislation, and the matter is under consideration.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Aboriginal Lawmen: Views

198. The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

In view of the Minister's letter to the Director of the WA Museum and memorandum from the Director which was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 3 September, will the Minister advise me of the following—

- (1) What are the names of the Aboriginal tribal lawmen who advised the Museum of the ritual sites on the Noonkanbah pastoral lease?
- (2) To which tribes do those Aboriginal lawmen belong?
- (3) Is any drilling taking place on those ritual sites?
- (4) Did any of the original lawmen advisers named in the answer to (1) object to work on the site now being drilled?
- (5) (a) Who was the person or body who lodged the official objection to drilling on Noonkanbah?
(b) Was that person or body a local lawman or body of lawmen and if so what were their names and tribal affiliations?
- (6) Is the Minister aware that significant sacred or ritual sites are only small areas which require protection in the view of Aboriginal lawmen and that lawmen are not opposed to development work for the common good outside of those areas?
- (7) Is the Minister aware that lawmen at Noonkanbah agreed to mining development work on Noonkanbah?

- (8) Has the Government been able to speak with Noonkanbah lawmen to ascertain their views since the intervention of non-Aboriginal advisers to the community, if not why not?
- (9) Is the Minister aware that the advisers have gained world wide support through biased media reporting contrary to the original wishes of the community lawmen?
- (10) Is it true that Museum officers have recently worked in the Kimberley seeking significant sites without being in the company of Aboriginal tribal lawmen?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) While the Museum maintains records of Aboriginal lawmen who provide it with information concerning secret/sacred sites, they do so under terms of confidentiality and the Museum does not release their names.
- (2) The Museum states that—

The Aborigines by whom information was provided were the relevant elders whose clan territories include the area in question. Those territories are—

Gudji, Bindalinmun,
Ngulgu and Gurubay
Gurubay.

The Museum also states that—

Affiliations with the land are through clans, and therefore tribal genealogies are not of prime importance and were not collected for all informants. It is known, however, that the community consists of people mainly of mixed Walmadjari and Nyigina descent with Bunaba and Djaru tribes also represented.

- (3) Drilling is taking place on the so-called "area of influence" at Noonkanbah as distinct from those sites in the area of influence which have been identified by the Museum as having special sacred ritual or ceremonial significance.

- (4) The Museum recommendation was based on information which it obtained from Aborigines which it contacted.
- (5) (a) The Museum Trustees.
(b) See answer to (5) (a) above.
- (6) The size of areas varies from place to place, however, these areas are usually limited in size.
- (7) Yes. Approval was given on various occasions.
- (8) The Museum's investigations took place in 1979 and there have been no discussions with the community since then.
- (9) I am aware that advisers have gained world-wide notoriety through media reporting, however, I do not know if this was contrary to the wishes of the community.
- (10) As a matter of principle, in investigating sites of significance to living Aborigines in the Kimberley or elsewhere, the Museum involves relevant Aborigines; however, it may well investigate archaeological sites, for example, containing rock art or artefacts without having Aboriginal people present.

LAND

—Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd.

- 199. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

With reference to his answer to question 111 of 20 August—

will he provide a substantive answer to the question?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

I refer the member to the Minister for Mine's letter to him of 28 August 1980, a copy of which is below, in which answers were provided to his question.

Dear Mr Dowding,

On Tuesday August 19, 1980 I advised, in answer to your Question No. 111, that I would provide the information you requested after the Mines Department had clarified the position.

I now find I can answer all of your questions and am pleased to advise as per hereunder:

Question 1: Is the Minister aware that Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd. holds a 75 000 hectare parcel of land stretching from Coolgardie to Coonana and south to include Kambalda under freehold title?

Answer 1: No, I am not aware of any company called Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd. However Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited is the registered proprietor of seventeen separate locations covering approximately 73 000 ha on the Eastern Goldfields whilst Hampton Trust Limited is the registered proprietor of two locations covering approximately 10 800 ha in the same vicinity.

Question 2: Is the Minister aware that Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd. is not an Aboriginal Group and involves no Aborigines?

Answer 2: Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited and Hampton Trust Limited are not Aboriginal Groups.

Question 3: Is it a fact that the title held by the company includes the ownership of the minerals on it, and does the company, therefore, not have to comply with the conditions of the Mining Act?

Answer 3: Yes, the title includes mineral rights other than gold, silver and precious metals as does all land alienated prior to January 1 1899 and the locations are exempt from the provisions of Part VII Mining on Private Land—Mining Act 1904.

Question 4: In view of the special title of the Company, is it a fact that the company enjoys a privilege that no other person or company could be expected to enjoy from an area of that size in Western Australia?

Answer 4: Yes, by virtue of the Mining on Private Property Act 1898 and an Agreement dated June 18 1890 the registered proprietor was granted a permit to work all the metals reserved by the Crown.

Question 5: Has the Minister or any of his predecessors taken any action whatsoever to change the terms upon which Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd. holds this land?

Answer 5: No.

Question 6: Is this an example of the Government's policy of one law for all Australians or is it a policy of providing protection to the privileged few?

Answer 6: I am advised that the present situation has existed since 1890.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Jones,
MINISTER FOR MINES.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

Honorary: Swearing-in

53. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Referring to the Administrator's advice that he has now assented to the Constitution Amendment Bill providing for an increase to 15 in the size of the Ministry, can the Attorney General say whether the additional Ministers provided for have yet been sworn in?
- (2) If not, can he say when their appointment might be anticipated?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

Proposals: Parliamentary Review

54. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Attorney General:

The Attorney General will have recently heard Lord Scarman of the English Law Commission urge the need, either by committee or some other means, for

regular parliamentary review and report on proposals of Law Reform Commissions.

Will he give serious consideration to that proposal in respect of our own commission; and, if so, would he be prepared to undertake a statement to the House in due course on his conclusions?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

I am indebted to Mr Berinson for supplying me with the particulars of the question he proposed to ask.

Along with him, I did have the pleasure of hearing Lord Scarman last week, and he did refer to this matter. I understood him to say particularly that when trouble was experienced in getting law reform reports accepted in England, a couple of favourable members of Parliament were found who managed to put them forward in private members' Bills.

So far as our Law Reform Commission is concerned, it produces an annual report which is tabled in Parliament. That report contains details of the commission's reports during the year, the number which have been accepted, and other relevant details. It is open to any member to raise an issue in relation to that at any time.

On several occasions I have produced a ministerial statement in relation to the activities of the Law Reform Commission. I am more than happy to repeat that procedure to give members an opportunity to make further comments.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

Matters Referred

55. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Leader of the House:

Would it be possible for him to make available publicly the particulars of matters referred by him to the Law Reform Commission when they are referred so that a running tally of matters that have been referred may be kept?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

Those matters would, I understand be included in the annual report of the Law Reform Commission. It is my usual practice to make public reference to the fact that I have referred a particular matter to the commission. There is no

secrecy about it. However, the media do not always find that particularly newsworthy.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: I am thinking about members finding out.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I am more than happy to make the information available.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Mr J. Hagan: Statement

56. The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

(a) In view of the reported statement from Geneva by Mr J. Hagan in *The West Australian* of 5 September 1980, which states—

The drilling site was one of the Noonkanbah Community's utterly sacred areas representing the very essence of their law and culture.

Is that statement correct in respect of either—

- (i) recordings under the Aboriginal Heritage Act and official maps; or
- (ii) documented statements from the tribal lawmen of the Walmajeri, Gidja, and Bunaba tribes from the Noonkanbah district?

(b) If the answer to (i) and (ii) is "yes", what are the dates of documentation?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(a) and (b) No, the drilling site could not be described as an utterly sacred area.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Is it the Museum or the Minister who has cooked that one up?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

BIRDS

Rare Species

57. The Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) What is the habitat in Western Australia for the following rare fauna—

Abbott's booby (*Sula abbotti*)
 plains wanderer (*Pedionomus torquatus*)
 Coxen's fig parrot (*Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni*)

Dorothy's grasswren (*Amytornis dorothea*)
 eastern bristlebird (*Dasyornis brachypterus*)
 rufous bristlebird (*Dasyornis broadbenti littoralis*)
 western bristlebird (*Dasyornis longirostris*)

- (2) At what time of the year are they sighted?
- (3) When was the last time of sighting of each species?
- (4) Has the Minister some proprietary interest in the western bristlebird as George Masters, in 1868, collected 10 specimens at King George's Sound and also a nest of eight eggs?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. I do not think I could have given him precise details without some notice of the question. The answer is as follows—

- (1) The rare fauna as listed does not occur in Western Australia except for the—
 - (a) rufous bristlebird—(*Dasyornis broadbenti littoralis*)—which is known to occur on the Cape Naturaliste-Cape Leeuwin Ridge;
 - (b) western bristlebird—*Dasyornis longirostris*—known to occur at Two People Bay and Fitzgerald River; and
 - (c) the possible stranding of Abbott's booby (*Sula abbotti*) on the northern coasts.
- (2) The birds occurring in Western Australia are sighted throughout the year.
- (3) Rufous bristlebird—*Dasyornis broadbenti littoralis*—was reported in Serventy and Whittles *Birds of Western Australia* as being collected in the early 1900s. There have been continued reports of sightings since that time. Western bristlebird—*Dasyornis longirostris*—is seen regularly by research workers and the ranger at the Two People Bay nature reserve.
- (4) No. I have no knowledge of my forebears being avid bird watchers.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Drill Site: Protective Area Status

58. The Hon. PETER DOWDING to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

My question is supplementary to the question asked by the Hon. Bill Withers. Is it a fact that the Trustees of the Western Australian Museum, the cultural materials committee, the investigating anthropologists, and the Aboriginal community at Noonkanbah all sought and recommended "protected area" status to the area on which the drill site is located on the basis of that area's sacred importance to the Yungngora community?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

I am not in a position to be able to answer the question. If it could be placed on the notice paper I will obtain an appropriate answer.

BIRDS

Rare Species

59. The Hon. A. A. LEWIS to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

This question is supplementary to my previous question. Why would the species not seen in Western Australia be named in the rare fauna list in the *Government Gazette* of 29 August if they do not occur in Western Australia?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I would have thought the member would know that the list published in the *Government Gazette* of 29 August was necessary under article 3 of the agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of Japan for the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction, and their environment. The species listed need to be given special protected measures throughout Australia.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why do we need them? We haven't got any.