

I have a letter from the National Safety Council of Michigan which also tells the same story. I consider I have researched this subject very thoroughly. I have one from Illinois also. I honestly believe I have made out a case for this Bill to be accepted and passed through the House. I hope Parliament will adopt the measure. All drownings in Western Australia except one were as a result of unprotected swimming pools; in that one case a gate was left open.

I have also researched the matter legally and have found what Fleming on the Law of Torts has to say. I will not use his words, which are very involved legally, but the meat of his advice was that if a child has drowned in a private, unprotected swimming pool, his parents can sue the owner of that pool for funeral expenses. Of course, that would not involve a great sum of money. However, should a child be injured in a swimming pool and subsequently partially recover, the owner of the pool could be sued for a very great amount of money if the child had any disability as a result of the accident.

On pages 290, 291, and 292 of the pink pages of the telephone directory a great number of advertisements appear, all of which extol the virtues of swimming pools. Consequently, members will see that very many people are in this business. I will not mention names or any firms, but the advertisements range from "No Deposit" to "Easy Terms." Consequently, pools will become more and more popular, and people will be paying them off. The number of pools will increase greatly and, therefore, the hazard to little children will further increase. If the hazards do increase, then public outcry and demand will make us do something about it. My opinion is that it is necessary for us to act right now, before the situation gets out of hand when hundreds of more pools are built and perhaps dozens more children die.

It must be remembered that there are various ways to fence pools. Fencing does not necessarily mean wire netting. This kind of fencing may be all right in Widgiemooltha, or some remote country town, but perhaps not in Floreat Park. The important thing is to provide protection. Feature fencing, landscaping, and other methods which make for the protection of swimming pools are not unattractive, but they hide pools from public view and, consequently, from the temptation of little children.

I think I have stated a case for the introduction of this measure to give local authorities the power to make by-laws. I hope members will agree to the Bill as I think it has a humanitarian objective. We have nothing to lose in letting the shire

councils bring in their own by-laws. After all, they know their districts and their members are able to assess each district. Therefore, I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 9th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 3rd September, 1969

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

QUESTIONS (35): ON NOTICE

1.

BRIDGES

Fremantle

Mr. **FLETCHER** asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the present anticipated—
 - (a) commencement date;
 - (b) completion date,
 of the bridge planned from Point Brown, North Fremantle to the East Fremantle area?
- (2) Is another traffic bridge planned parallel to the existing traffic bridge, Fremantle?
- (3) If so, what is the anticipated date—
 - (a) of commencement;
 - (b) of completion?

Mr. **ROSS HUTCHINSON** replied:

- (1) (a) No firm programme has been approved. It is possible that construction could commence in the latter half of 1971.
 - (b) Approximately two years would be required for construction so that completion could be possible towards the end of 1973.
- (2) No, but when replacement is required it will need to be constructed alongside and parallel to the existing bridge.
- (3) Answered by (2).

2.

HEALTH*Kidney Transplants*

Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Do his replies to my question on the 28th August imply—
 - (a) that compatibility typing is compiled only in respect of patients who volunteer to donate tissue or organs after death; and
 - (b) that this is not so in respect of patients generally who may be potential donors to patients awaiting kidney transplants?
- (2) If "Yes", to (b), will consideration be given to general compatibility typing so that such data can, as in other States and overseas, be stored in a local computer for ready availability if required urgently?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) This proposal is considered to be premature at the present time, but some extension of typing beyond the "volunteer donor" group might be considered as the frequency of organ transplantation increases in this State.

3.

PORTS*Harbour Dues: BP Australia Ltd.*

Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Does BP Australia Ltd. pay wharf fees, tug fees or any other harbour dues?
- (2) If so, to what extent?
- (3) If not, why the exemption?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Annual tonnage rates on tugs, workboats, etc. owned by the company are paid as provided in the Fremantle Port Authority regulations.
- (3) Under the terms of the Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo Iranian Oil Co. Ltd.) Act 1952, the following are exempt from all port charges—
 - (a) ships owned by the company or under whole or part charter to the company and carrying cargoes to or from the refinery jetties in the outer harbour;
 - (b) goods delivered to the refinery for refinery purposes or products of the refinery shipped over the refinery jetties in the outer harbour.

4.

WATER SUPPLIES*Dams: North and South Dandalup*

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What progress has been made towards the construction of the—
 - (a) North Dandalup Pipehead Dam;
 - (b) South Dandalup Main Dam?
- (2) What is the planning for these dams this financial year?
- (3) When is it expected that the dams will be completed?
- (4) What is the estimated cost, size, and capacity of each dam?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) Design of the North Dandalup Pipehead Dam is virtually complete. Construction will be commenced in the current financial year and completed in the 1970-71 financial year.
- (b) Design of the South Dandalup Main Dam is well advanced. Construction will commence in the 1970-71 financial year and be completed in the 1972-73 financial year.
- (2) Major expenditure this financial year will be on the pipeline between North Dandalup Pipehead Dam and Serpentine. Some work, mainly on foundations, will be carried out on the North Dandalup Pipehead Dam.
- (3) North Dandalup Pipehead Dam—1970-71.
South Dandalup Main Dam—1972-73.
The pipeline from the South Dandalup Main Dam will not be completed for at least twelve months after the dam.
- (4) North Dandalup Pipehead Dam: Estimated cost—\$350,000. Size about 20 feet in height. Capacity—minor storage of no real significance.
South Dandalup Main Dam: Estimated cost \$3,500,000. Size: 130 feet in height. Capacity—at least 40,000,000,000 gallons.

5. PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE*Appointment*

Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Premier:

Has he made a decision regarding the appointment of a Public Accounts Committee about which he promised serious consideration?

Mr. NALDER (for Sir David Brand) replied:

Consideration is still being given to this matter.

6. *This question was postponed.*

7. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Collection

Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Premier:

Has progress been made regarding the inquiry into alternative proposals for the collection of road maintenance tax?

Mr. NALDER (for Sir David Brand) replied:

Yes. The inter-departmental committee is investigating alternative proposals to road maintenance tax and interested organisations have been invited to submit their views. Submissions from some organisations are still awaited but these are expected within a few days.

8. *This question was postponed.*

9. DROUGHT

Fowl Manure Stock Food

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that in the United States of America farmers are using dried fowl manure containing 40 per cent. protein mixed with additives as stock food?
- (2) If so, have arrangements been made to accumulate large stocks of dried fowl manure for similar use during the present drought?
- (3) If no arrangements have been made, what is the reason?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) It has not been considered necessary to utilise poultry manure for feeding of stock as ample supplies of conventional feedstuffs have been readily available.

10. EDUCATION

Kindergartens

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Treasurer:

- (1) What sum is paid annually for the assistance of the kindergarten movement?
- (2) To whom is the money paid?
- (3) What is the basis on which the amount is determined?
- (4) What terms or conditions are attached to the granting of the money?

Mr. NALDER (for Sir David Brand) replied:

- (1) \$278,000 in 1968-69.
- (2) To the Kindergarten Association of W.A. and to individual kindergartens for which grants are approved.

(3) The 1968-69 grant consisted of—

- (a) An amount of \$220,000 for operating costs of the Kindergarten Association based on the number of student teachers in training and the number of children attending affiliated kindergartens.
- (b) An amount of \$12,000 for assistance to needy kindergartens.
- (c) A special payment of \$10,000 towards reduction of the overdraft outstanding on the new college.
- (d) Grants totalling \$36,000 towards the cost of construction of nine new kindergartens.

(4) Kindergartens assisted must be affiliated with the Kindergarten Association of W.A.

11.

EDUCATION

John Forrest High School

Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) When was the John Forrest High School built and at what cost?
- (2) Since the opening of this high school, what additions have been made and at what cost?
- (3) What improvements or additions are proposed at the school?
- (4) What were the number of students enrolled on the opening of the school and at the 31st August 1969?
- (5) How many classes are taught at the school and what are the respective class sizes?
- (6) How many teachers and staff are employed?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Embleton-John Forrest High School—
 - (i) Erected 1961-1963.
 - (ii) Cost \$602,305.
- (2) (i) 1964 change rooms—\$29,356.
 (ii) 1966-67 new science block—\$73,345.
 (iii) 1966-67 canteen extensions—\$4,885.
 (iv) 1967-68 five classrooms—\$48,369.
 (v) 1968-69 three classrooms—\$31,813.
- (3) A contract has been let for a new library.
- (4) February 1961—546 (then known as the Embleton High School). The 1st August, 1969—1,407.
- (5) Instruction groups vary in size according to the subject and the year of study. In a school the size of John Forrest Senior High

there would be approximately 300 class groupings ranging through all sizes to a maximum of 40.

Departmental statistics are based on the size of English classes—

In 1st year these average 37.7.

In 2nd year these average 34.9.

In 3rd year these average 30.3.

In 4th year these average 26.8.

In 5th year these average 19.5.

(Special class not included in above figures).

- (6) 74 full time and one part time teachers.

One bursar, one full time and three part time clerical assistants.

- (2) Are there any standards set for "C"-class hospitals to limit the number of patients for each—

(a) bathroom;

(b) toilet;

(c) room?

- (3) If so, will he state the existing position regarding these items under the present standard?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yes.

- (3) Regular inspections indicate that the standards are generally being complied with.

12.

RAILWAYS

Employees, and Tonnages

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What was the number of employees in the railways—salaried officers and wages staff—at the 30th June for each of the past five years?

- (2) What was the tonnage of freight handled in each of the above years?

- (3) What was the tonnage of—

(a) wheat; and

(b) stock,

handled in the same five years?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

Year ended

	30th June	Salaried	Wages	Total
(1)	1965	2,054	9,569	11,623
	1966	2,068	9,696	11,764
	1967	2,080	9,520	11,600
	1968	2,123	9,359	11,482
	1969	2,137	9,057	11,194

Tonnage (including livestock)

(2)	1965	5,229,230
	1966	6,383,509
	1967	7,872,978
	1968	8,910,464
	1969	8,934,477

Wheat

Livestock

(3)	1965	1,187,758	100,841
	1966	1,966,892	106,836
	1967	2,338,140	97,126
	1968	2,276,520	87,827
	1969	1,512,215	87,701

14.

NATIVES

North-West Reserves

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Are each of the townships in the North-West and Kimberley districts provided with native reserves?

- (2) What reserves are provided in the following shipping ports—

(a) Wyndham;

(b) Derby;

(c) Broome;

(d) Port Hedland;

(e) Roebourne;

(f) Onslow;

(g) Carnarvon?

- (3) Is there any increase in natives using the above reserves?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. Reserves are provided only where there is a significant Aboriginal population.

- (2) (a) 1 camping reserve.

(b) 2 camping reserves.

(c) 3 camping reserves.

(d) 2 camping reserves.

(e) 1 camping reserve.

(f) 1 camping reserve.

(g) 1 camping reserve.

- (3) Usage fluctuates to a degree that makes it impossible to generalise but there have been no recent long-term increases.

13.

HOSPITALS

"C"-class

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is there a maximum charge that can be made on inmates of "C"-class hospitals in the metropolitan area?

15.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Belmont Agency

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) For what period had Mr. G. Stratton been a member of the Totalisator Agency Board when he tendered his resignation?

- (2) On what date did Mr. Stratton resign?
- (3) Has Mr. Stratton been granted the Agency, No. 81, Epsom Avenue, Belmont?
- (4) If "Yes", was this grant given by the board to show its appreciation of Mr. Stratton's services?
- (5) Will Mr. Stratton be obliged to comply in every particular with the board's requirements of agents generally?
- (6) How many applicants for appointment as agent at 81 Epsom Avenue were considered when the appointment was being made?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) From the 7th December, 1960, to the 15th August, 1969.
- (2) 16th August, 1969.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Eight.

16. HOUSING

Rental Homes: Valuations

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Between January, 1966, and July, 1969, how many valuations of properties were made by the State Housing Commission in connection with proposals from tenants of rental homes who were considering purchase?
- (2) In what districts were the properties located and how many dwellings were valued in each district?
- (3) In what districts were valuations made twice or more between January, 1966, and July, 1969?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (3) I am advised that a considerable amount of research is required to provide the answers to this question. This will be undertaken immediately and the honourable member will be given the information by letter as soon as practicable.

17. NATIVES

Northern Division Aboriginal Consultative Committee

Mr. HARMAN asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Are all the members of the northern division Aboriginal Consultative Committee elected to such positions?
- (2) If not, why?

- (3) If so, will he explain the machinery for such elections?
- (4) How often are they held?
- (5) When was the last election held?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. Formal elections have not been held except on one occasion in Broome when the Aborigines, at their own request, were assisted to organise a formal election. In general Aborigines selected their representatives by their own methods.
- (2) The Aborigines involved represent a number of widely differing groups, each of which has devised a method of selection satisfactory to itself.
- (3) See answer to (1). In the Broome exception there was a formal casting of votes by ballot under the supervision of returning officers and in the presence of scrutineers.
- (4) See answer to (1).
- (5) In Broome, in April, 1969.

18. RAILWAYS

"Red Cap" Porters

Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) How many "Red Cap" porters are registered to operate at—
(a) Perth central station;
(b) Perth terminal?
- (2) Is he satisfied that the above are adequate?
- (3) What steps are taken to ensure that the number of such porters attending these stations is sufficient to meet the demand?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) Nil.
(b) Nil.
- (2) and (3). Persons interested in this type of work, which shows little return, are not available. If the honourable member knows of any persons who are interested, we will be more than happy to interview them with a view to putting them on.

19. WATER SUPPLIES

Rating Revaluations

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When revaluations are made in the various districts for use by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board for rating purposes, what method is employed?

- (2) Are the same valuers used as are employed by the Taxation Department for determining valuations for taxation purposes?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) With the exception of certain land in the Kwinana area covered by special agreement Acts, the valuations used by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board are made according to the provisions in the board's controlling Act.

In the main the basis of assessment on improved property is a fair annual rental, but in the case of unimproved land and improved land where it is not possible to establish a fair annual rental, a percentage of capital value is used.

- (2) I have been informed that there is a special section in the Taxation Department whose principal duty is the making of valuations for the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board and the Country Water Supplies Branch of the Public Works Department.

20. COMMONWEALTH AID ROADS AGREEMENT

Changes

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

Will he advise the House concerning all changes which have been agreed to as between the State Government and the Commonwealth and the State Government and local governing bodies since the legislation relating to the Commonwealth Aid Roads Agreement was passed?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

There have been some differences with the Commonwealth in regard to the declaration of urban arterial roads. However, following an exchange of correspondence and discussion with the Minister for Shipping and Transport these have been largely overcome.

There have been no changes agreed between the State and the Commonwealth.

As between the State Government and local governing bodies, agreement has been reached on loan repayments and administrative expenditure. These matters were the subject of the statement I made in this House on the 5th August, 1969.

21. CHILD WELFARE

Adoption of Children Act: Amendments

Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

Further to my recent question is he now able to advise when the 1964 amendments to the Adoption of Children Act are expected to be proclaimed?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

No, but it is anticipated that when the rules are finalised, the amendments will be proclaimed.

22. HEALTH

Kidney Machines: Use of Fluoridated Water

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware of the co-operative Canadian-United States studies showing severe bone breakdown leading to spontaneous fractures, along with neurological and other complications, from the use of water in artificial kidney machines containing the one-part-per million fluoride level introduced by fluoridation?

- (2) Is he aware that the United States Public Health Service has issued statements admitting that fluoridated water should not be employed for artificial kidney treatment (hemodialysis) without prior removal of the fluoride?

- (3) Has his department issued any similar warning here?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) These allegations have been brought to the attention of the department and inquiries are being made as to their validity.

- (2) No.

- (3) No harmful effects attributable to the use of fluoridated water in artificial kidney machines in Perth have been observed and no warning has therefore been issued; but the matter is being investigated.

23. IRRIGATION SCHEMES

Revenue and Costs

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What were the operating costs of the—

(a) Harvey;

(b) Collie;

(c) Waroona,

irrigation schemes for each of the financial years 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69?

- (2) What was the annual revenue for each of those years?
- (3) What is the expected operating cost and the expected revenue for 1969-70?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Operating costs—

	Harvey	Collie	Waroona
	\$	\$	\$
1965-66	133,564	99,339	29,538
1966-67	152,934	137,240	37,626
1967-68	144,482	107,434	35,016
1968-69	176,914	121,352	40,507

(2) Revenue—

	Harvey	Collie	Waroona
	\$	\$	\$
1965-66	97,832	85,597	25,881
1966-67	112,326	101,530	31,749
1967-68	111,080	98,971	31,796
1968-69	123,099	104,195	33,572

(3) Estimated operating costs—

	Harvey	Collie	Waroona
	\$	\$	\$
1969-70	188,000	138,000	50,000
Estimated revenue—			
1969-70	119,700	119,000	40,000

24. IRRIGATION SCHEMES

Increased Rates

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Was the Irrigation Commission made aware that increased rates and charges were being contemplated for the various irrigation schemes?
- (2) If so, what was its opinion?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. The fixing of rates and charges is not a matter on which the commission advises the Minister; however, the commission has been aware for some years that consideration has been given to amending rates and charges to reduce the loss on irrigation undertakings.
- (2) Answered by (1).

25. HOSPITAL

Wooroloo

Mr. McIVER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) In view of the concern and opinions expressed by various organisations regarding the proposed closure of Wooroloo Hospital, can he advise whether the Government has or will review its proposals in this regard?
- (2) If the position is to be reviewed will he make an early announcement so that the inconvenience and concern being experienced be reduced to a minimum?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2). Every consideration has been given to all representation made in connection with the matter raised by the honourable member.

All aspects have already been reviewed and the original decision confirmed, that is to close the existing facilities as a hospital by the 30th June, 1970, and, at the same time, to continue a small hospital to serve the community in the district.

26.

FRUIT FLY

Compulsory Baiting Scheme

Mr. HARMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When was a poll held to determine whether the areas of Maylands, Inglewood and Mt. Lawley would adopt a compulsory fruit fly baiting scheme?
- (2) What were the results of this poll and how many persons of the total number involved so voted?
- (3) Since the inception of the scheme in those areas has there been a drop in the number of orchard registrations in these areas?
- (4) Does the department still continue to receive complaints of fruit-fly infestation in the areas subject to the scheme?
- (5) As several local authorities are interested in the scheme (see Question No. 3 of the 24th October 1968), what does he regard as "reasonable period" to determine the success of present scheme operating in parts of the metropolitan area?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The 24th June, 1965.
- (2) The results of the poll were as follows:—
- | | |
|--|------|
| (a) Total number of votes recorded in favour of the proposal | 1,96 |
| (b) Total number of votes recorded not in favour of the proposal | 36 |
| (c) Total number of informal ballot papers | 7 |
| Total number of ballot papers admitted to the scrutiny | 2,39 |

- (3) There is no evidence of a decline in orchard registrations in these areas. No detailed check has been made.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The position will be reviewed at the end of the 1969-70 season.

The main factors which influence the level of fruit-fly control are—

- (a) Seasonal conditions.
- (b) Length of baiting season and efficiency of baiting which are dependent upon adequate scheme finance and supervision of baiters.
- (c) The co-operation and orchard hygiene practised by the public.

27.

DAIRYING

Dairy Industry Scheme

Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When is it expected that the dairy industry scheme, to which he is reported as having referred at the opening of the Australian Society of Dairy Technology conference this year, will be operative in this State?
- (2) What is the total amount of money which will be received by Western Australia from the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of implementing this scheme?
- (3) Will it be possible to implement the scheme by Executive Council decision or will legislation be necessary?
- (4) Will he enumerate the purposes for which the scheme funds may be used?
- (5) What rate of interest will be charged to those who participate in the scheme?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) We are awaiting advice from the Commonwealth.
- (2), (3), and (5). Answered by (1).
- (4) A copy of a public statement by the Minister for Primary Industry is submitted herewith for tabling.

The statement was tabled.

28.

ROAD

Welshpool-Fremantle Closed Access Highway

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Works:

Further to answers given on Wednesday, the 20th August, re the Welshpool-Fremantle closed access highway, would he table plans of this road, showing road intersections, existing roads to be closed off, and any other details associated with the proposed highway?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Since there are well over 100 drawings involved, many of which are in the course of preparation,

it is suggested that the honourable member call at the Main Roads Department office where the plans may be inspected.

29.

TRAFFIC SYSTEMS

Compensation for Financial Loss

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Premier:

- (1) What compensation, if any, is paid to citizens who suffer significant financial loss or ruin by reason of the introduction of the traffic "clearway" or "no standing" system in main traffic arteries within the city, bearing in mind that the said system is designed to benefit the public at large?
- (2) If none, will he introduce legislation to provide for compensation in these cases?
- (3) If "No", why?

Mr. NALDER (for Sir David Brand) replied:

- (1) No compensation is payable.
- (2) No.
- (3) Public roads are provided for the movement of traffic and it is not considered reasonable that they should be utilised for commercial parking purposes to the detriment of the public at large.

30.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Litter: Non-returnable Bottles

Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) In view of the conversion by cool drink manufacturers and breweries to the use of non-returnable bottles, is he aware of local government authorities' concern at the impending increase of dangerous litter being left at favourite resorts?
- (2) Has the Government any move under consideration to endeavour by legislative action to minimise this impending litter problem?
- (3) Has consideration been given to having imposed on non-returnable containers, for various drinks, a deposit returnable on delivery of such containers to local government depots?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Traffic Act and the Local Government Act have sufficient powers and severe enough penalties to minimise the problem, if put into effect.
- (3) No.

31. GOVERNMENT CHEMICAL LABORATORIES

Staff

Mr. JONES asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

In view of the fact that Mr. Paul Donnelly retired on the 29th August, 1969, will he advise what reorganisation has taken place to fill the position he occupied?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

On the recommendation of the Minister's officers, the Fuel Technology Division is not being continued as a separate division, but is being amalgamated with and incorporated in the Engineering Chemistry Division, which for years has been concerned with utilisation of Collié coal.

32. ROAD TRANSPORT

Bokal-Burekup

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a permit been issued to cart grain by road from the Bokal storage bin to Burekup?
- (2) If so, what does the permit prescribe and why is it necessary to cart the grain by road in view of the fact that a mid-week train service from Collié to Wagin and return has been cancelled due to a decline in traffic in the area?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No. It is understood that some dairy farmers have been obtaining grain from the Bokal storage bin. They would be entitled to carry this back to their own properties without a license.
- (2) Answered by (1).

33. TEACHERS

Resignations, and Leave

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Education:

Further to answers given on Tuesday, the 5th August, would he state—

- (1) How many resignations were received in the first six months of 1967, 1968, and 1969?
- (2) What is the total number of applications and acceptances for the first six months of 1967, 1968, and 1969 for—
 - (a) long service leave;
 - (b) extended leave without pay;
 - (c) study leave;
 - (d) compassionate leave;

(e) sick leave;

(f) any other leave without pay?

- (3) If the figures for the current year in (2) show an increase over the past two years, could he give an explanation as to why leave has not been granted rather than forcing resignations from the department?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) To 30th June 1967—not available.
1968—154.
1969—195.

- (2) (a) Long service leave—

	Applications	Approved
1967	77	77
1968	72	72
1969	85	85

(b) to (f) Statistics are not recorded and no figures are available.

- (3) See answer to (2).

34.

TOWN PLANNING

Shire of Gosnells

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Why is the line defining the south boundary of that area of the Shire of Gosnells, recently rezoned urban, not consistent where it crosses the Roe Freeway?
- (2) Where a property owner is affected by the rezoning so that part of his property is outside that area zoned as urban, will he agree to the extension of the rural area of the property to the street alignment and classify as urban?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The honourable member's question is not clearly understood as the southern boundary of the Shire of Gosnells has no relation to the Roe Freeway. If he will rephrase the question I will see that it is attended to.
- (2) As stated in the submission of the amendment and report on objections concerning the Cannington-Armadale Corridor, the definition of the urban zone is intended to be a broad indication of the extent of that zone. The actual boundary of urban development will be established in the future, having regard to the suitability of land and the provision of services and on the basis of local planning and design.

35.

RAILWAYS**W.A.D.C.: De Leuw Cather & Co.
Involvement****Mr. TONKIN** asked the Premier:

- (1) Will he refer to the replies which he gave on the 28th August to the member for Perth and in which he stated that De Leuw Cather & Co. were involved in the Western Australia Development Corporation and had a director on the board of that company and compare this information with the statement made in the House on the 26th March by the Minister for Railways to the effect that De Leuw Cather & Co. had been a shareholder in W.A.D.C. but had ceased to be so?
- (2) Does not the constitution of the W.A.D.C. require that a director must be a shareholder?
- (3) If "Yes", will he explain the apparent conflict between his replies and the statement above referred to as having been made by the Minister for Railways?

Mr. NALDER (for Sir David Brand) replied:

- (1) The comments made on the 26th March, 1969 by the Minister for Railways during the debate on Perth Railway Station lowering were based on the information known to us at that time. Information received since indicates that although De Leuw Cather & Co. withdrew from the Perth Railway Station lowering as consulting engineers for the proposal, the company's participation in W.A.D.C. continues.
- (2) and (3) The constitution of W.A.D.C. regarding the requirements for directorship of the company, or for that matter the other partner concerned—namely J. O. Clough & Son—is not a relevant point in the negotiations for lowering of the railway and has not been discussed with the companies.

If the Leader of the Opposition so desires, the local representatives can be approached for this information.

QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE

1.

"OTHELLO"**Poster**

Mr. CRAIG (Minister for Police): Yesterday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked if I would table a poster that had been considered obscene by the police and I said I would endeavour to do so. I have secured a copy of the poster

but I would refrain from tabling it. It is, however, available to the honourable member should he desire to see it.

Mr. Graham: I have since obtained one for myself.

2.

**MIDLAND JUNCTION SALE
YARD****Quota System****Mr. GAYFER** asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Arising out of the conference of farmers held at the Subiaco Civic Centre at which the Minister for Agriculture advised that he would be pleased to meet a representative gathering of all concerned at the Midland Junction abattoir, can he inform the House whether such meeting has been held and whether a quota system has yet been devised at the Midland Junction sale yard?

Mr. NALDER replied:

At the meeting called by the Farmers' Union and held at the Subiaco Civic Centre a question was asked as to whether or not it would be possible to plan a quota for sheep entering the Midland Junction sale yard. It was also asked whether it would be possible to convene a meeting of interested parties. I said I would be prepared to do this and that I would endeavour to do so at the first available opportunity. I would have done so this morning had that been at all possible. I did endeavour to call the interested parties together yesterday, but this was not possible because of the difficulty in getting the representatives together. I am, however, endeavouring to see whether it is possible to call such a meeting at a time suitable to all concerned.

3.

IRRIGATION**Rate Increase****Mr. RUNCIMAN** asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Minister seen the account of the reaction of farmers as published in *The West Australian* this morning in the Waroona, Harvey, and Collie irrigation districts to the sudden and steep rises in irrigation rates and is it correct, as stated by a prominent Farmers' Union representative, that the average farmer on 100 acres of irrigation will have to pay an increase of \$400 to \$500?
- (2) If not, what is the correct figure?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I have had replies prepared to the honourable member's question which, because of their

detail, I would like to hand in. The reply describes generally what will happen to the farmers. The particular answers to the honourable member's question are that I have seen the account in the Press and it is not true to say that the average farmer will pay an increased amount of \$400 to \$500. The amount will vary from district to district as the answer will indicate. I have details here for private viewing as to what Mr. D. P. Eckersley would pay if he used the same amount of water this year as he did in the previous year, and it does not amount to anything like \$400 to \$500.

The SPEAKER: I think we had better table the balance of the answer.
The balance of the answer was tabled.

4. MILK Price Increase

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the concern of whole-milk producers in the irrigation districts arising from the steep increase in irrigation charges?
- (2) Will farmers be given an opportunity to pass some of these charges on, for example through an increase in the price of milk?

Mr. NALDER replied:

I thank the honourable member for prior notice of this question, the answers to which are—

- (1) Comments in this morning's Press have been noted.
- (2) Changes in the price of milk are the responsibility of the Milk Board.

KWINANA INDUSTRIAL AREA

Residents' Grievance

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn) [5 p.m.]: I have a grievance concerning a matter which has recently received prominence in the newspapers. It deals with the situation which appertains to the Kwinana beach area adjacent to the industrial development along Cockburn Sound. This is not a new problem, by any means. It just so happens it has been highlighted by a local newspaper over the last 24 hours or so.

The problem which obtains in the area at the moment has existed for some time, and will continue for some time in the future. The matter has been raised in this House in the past by members on both sides, but because it is of a particular intensity at the moment as far as the local residents are concerned I believe it warrants being raised in the House on this occasion.

The grievance is that the Government has failed to take heed of past warnings as to what is likely to take place in the area, and has failed to initiate any action likely to alleviate the problem which has developed. The situation of the people in the area has been well set out in newspaper articles, but I believe a few more facts are necessary.

It is interesting to note that on the 20th May last year a public meeting was held in the Medina hall. This was as a result of the fears of the residents that they were likely to lose their land and be forced from the area. Numerous calls have been made on members over the past two or three years in relation to this matter. Informal meetings are taking place in the Kwinana area at the moment, and a public meeting has been called for the evening of Monday week, the 15th September, under the auspices of the Kwinana Shire Council. This is an indication of the state of mind of the owners involved in this particular, small area of land; and I believe they have cause for their anxiety. Everyone, including the residents, knows that industry is moving into the area and the residents are therefore likely to find themselves in bother.

However, other factors have also intervened which I think point to the need for the Government to take some initiative to alleviate the fears of the residents.

Conflicting statements have been made concerning what is likely to develop in the area. The *Daily News* tonight reported that some residents claimed they were told by various Government agencies, the local council, and others, that the properties they were purchasing were zoned as residential.

In the same paper is a statement which I feel should be answered. Referring to certain residents, the article reads—

They were assured by the estate agent, who in their presence phoned someone they believed to be a cabinet minister, that the area would remain residential.

Such a statement should not be left unanswered. A similar remark, which seemed reassuring to the people concerned, was made over 12 months ago at the meeting to which I have referred, held in the Medina hall on the 20th May. At that meeting Mr. Lloyd, the Commissioner of Town Planning, when answering questions by ratepayers, was reported to have said that—

He felt that the 200 homes existing in the Kwinana Beach area at present, would be unlikely to be taken for many years.

I quoted that statement from page 561 of *Hansard* for 1968. It was recorded on the 21st August. However, I feel that it is worth repeating. The Commissioner of Town Planning informed the people at a public meeting that he felt the 200

homes then in the area would be unlikely to be taken for many years, with emphasis on the "many."

Statements have been made by local residents and a Government official that the particular area was not likely to be troubled, at least in the foreseeable future. However, on the converse side is the situation which developed last year when the nickel refinery was being established. Again I quote from *Hansard* of that year at page 565. On that page is a quote from a newspaper article, and it reads as follows:—

Industrial Development Minister Court yesterday defended the Western Mining Corporation's arrangement with the government to acquire—

And this means to resume—

—private land on the company's nickel refinery site.

He said W.M.C. could meet insurmountable obstacles if owners of private land on the company's Kwinana site refused to sell in a bid to hold the company to ransom.

Briefly, the situation was that to that stage no offers had been made to the people concerned regarding the purchase of their properties. The Government had made the move to acquire the land for industry.

The situation is quite plain. On the one hand land in the area was supposed to remain urban for quite a considerable time, while on the other hand people were faced with the fact that before Parliament was an Act designed for the purpose of acquiring residential land in the area. Therefore on the one hand residents were being assured by estate agents and others that it was quite safe to purchase property, while on the other hand the Government at any time could move in and resume their land.

The third problem which worries the residents, and this is a point which I believe should be answered in some way or other, is that under existing agreements for compensation for resumption—and I think most residents would agree that at some time or other their properties are likely to be resumed—they could not be adequately settled elsewhere. Again I would like to quote information from page 560 of *Hansard* for 1968. A Government valuer stated that resumption figures for land in this particular urban area were below the prices asked for comparable positions in the Rockingham-Safety Bay area.

The situation is quite plain. If only the local value pertaining was paid for the land in this particular area, people would be unlikely to be able to settle themselves in homes of a similar standard elsewhere. This position is helping to cause confusion amongst the people.

This problem is highlighted again in today's *Daily News*, where it is reported that an aged pensioner (R. C. Elders) has had his property up for sale for a month, but has not had a taker.

Another brief example concerns a gentleman who had a property in the electorate adjacent to mine, but he lives in my electorate. He owned a block of land in Charles Street before the land was rezoned industrial in 1963. He was trying to sell but could not get a taker. He was approached by the Department of Industrial Development and was offered \$1,800, but this amount would not have been sufficient for the purchase of a comparable property anywhere else. When I examined the situation I found that land on either side of this particular block was owned by the Department of Industrial Development, and this probably explains why no one else was prepared to buy his block. Ultimately he sold it to the Government. Because of representations made, two increases were offered. He was first offered \$1,800, then \$2,000, and he finally sold it for \$2,200, which was sufficient to establish him on low-priced land in Medina or Calista, but was not sufficient to allow him to establish himself in any other part of the metropolitan area.

The problem has been raised many times. Mr. Ron Thompson, M.L.C., repeatedly referred to it in another place before I was elected, and it was raised on several occasions in this House by a member on the Government side. I myself have referred to it four times, once on the 10th September, 1968, during the debate on the establishment of the nickel refinery. This can be found at page 977 of *Hansard* for 1968. Another occasion was on the 23rd October, 1968, during the debate on the Kwinana Loop Railway Bill, reported at page 2001 of the same *Hansard*. In both those debates I spent some time emphasising the problem concerning this area, and asking that something be done.

I have three points I would now like to submit to the Government and on which I would like it to take some action.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired!

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.10 p.m.]: I want to comment very briefly on the points raised by the member for Cockburn. As he said, this is nothing new, and I was not surprised he seized this opportunity to try to stir up a little more trouble.

Mr. Taylor: The trouble is there.

MR. COURT: That is the point I was about to make. The trouble is not new, as the honourable member himself said. I would venture to suggest that had there not been this stirring up as a result of

the letter from the M.R.P.A., the honourable member would not have raised the subject today.

Mr. Taylor: But I would have done so next year or the year after, until it had been handled satisfactorily.

Mr. COURT: That is not the point.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the point then? It is not obvious yet.

Mr. COURT: If members of the Opposition would refrain from interjecting—

Mr. Bickerton: Perhaps the Minister would like to quieten down.

Mr. Tonkin: No, he wants to rubbish the member for Cockburn.

Mr. Rushton: The member for Cockburn wants to rubbish the Minister.

Mr. COURT: The point I am trying to make is that the Government is fully understanding of the problems of the people who live in this area. It has been my experience—and if the member for Cockburn has been in close touch with the residents, it will have been his experience also—that most residents appreciate the fact that for many years, going back to 1953, it has been understood that this general area would be an industrial area.

Mr. Taylor: It was not rezoned until 1963.

Mr. COURT: True, and many people have bought land since then and, in fact, have proceeded to build on it. I understand that some are building still.

Mr. Tonkin: Your Government was in control from 1958 to 1963. What did it do about it?

Mr. COURT: The tendency is always for people in these well-known industrial areas to hope against hope that industry will not encroach on their property. I have every sympathy for these people. Some of them have come to the Department of Industrial Development from time to time and asked that their land be acquired, and, where practicable, the department has negotiated not a resumption price, but a negotiated price of a commercial nature.

I defy anyone in that area to produce evidence that in any approach made to the department regarding the sale of land, or the place on it, he has been treated any way but fairly. The Department of Industrial Development has not limitless funds with which to acquire these areas, but where the people have wanted their land purchased, the department, under my instructions, has endeavoured to meet their wishes.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the letter sent out by the officer of the M.R.P.A. contained language as strong as it did, but I understand, from the check I made of the situation, that this gentleman was trying to make the point to the shire, and

through the shire to the people, that people who wanted to build in this area, or who sought to do so, should acknowledge that they were attempting to do so in a highly industrialised atmosphere.

For my part I feel some of the words used might be a little incorrect, but I am firmly convinced, following the inquiries I have made, that the officer concerned was acting in good faith in an endeavour to get the message across that this was an industrial area.

Several Opposition members interjected.

Mr. COURT: The member for Cockburn will realise that I did not interject when he was speaking because I knew his time was limited.

Mr. Tonkin: And because you knew you had the right of reply.

Mr. COURT: The member for Cockburn should realise that the wheat conveyor system does not go as close to the area as has been said in the Press. It is quite a distance away.

I have said on a number of occasions that at this point of time the Government has refused permission for iron ore to go over this area. The member for Northam is interested in this ore going through this area. However, as I have said, a request has been made concerning the ore being shipped at this particular point in Kwinana and we have at this point of time said that we do not want it to go there because it is a dusty type of commodity to handle.

I mention this to evidence the fact that perhaps words are being used which might have caused some unnecessary concern to the people who live there. I am not overlooking the fact that this is an industrial area and, if we want industry, we must provide industrial areas.

It is well known throughout the world that there is an incompatibility between ordinary urban and amenity areas and industrial areas. This is why we have zoning, and the general tendency in the world today is to keep the two separate. Urban and amenity development do not go well when established immediately alongside industrial areas.

Mr. Taylor: Could the Minister advise what is likely to happen to those people who were established in the area before industry, and who are still resident there?

Mr. COURT: I understand that some of the people want to continue to live there. I think we must be realistic and accept the fact that one day—I would not like to hazard a guess as to which day—regardless of the Government in power, this area will logically be used for industrial purposes. I have no doubt at all that as the properties in the area are acquired from time to time, they will be acquired on a fair and equitable basis.

I defy anyone to say that those concerned were not treated very fairly in respect of acquisition—mainly by negotiation—in connection with the Western Mining Corporation's refinery site.

In that case, as in all these cases, the Government has instructed the people who handle these matters on behalf of the Government to err on the side of generosity, and not to be tied as they might be where straight-out public works are involved. They have been instructed to not be tied too tightly to the straight-out theoretical or academic aspect of valuations. I defy anyone to say they were not fairly treated in respect of that particular area.

In conclusion, I want to say that the Government will clarify, as quickly as practicable, exactly what the programme will be in that area. There has never been any intention to hide the facts; we have always been quite frank. Since 1953 the area has been approved as an industrial complex. On top of that, people are protected by the laws which relate to such things. I refer to the Clean Air Act, and pollution measures generally, which are applicable to the industries in the area. I do not think any Government can go beyond that.

I, for my part, was rather upset to think that the people had been disturbed in this manner by the overemphasis in the letter from the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority on the question of so-called intolerable conditions. However, I am firmly of the opinion that the officer thought he was doing a service to the community by emphasising the matter. I also think it is unfortunate that the impression has been given, wrongly, that iron ore is about to be carried over the system. We have a long way to go before we will agree to such a proposal, and we will have to be convinced that iron ore can be handled without unnecessary inconvenience to the urban population, or industry itself.

The wheat conveyor system is a fair distance from the particular area. If my geography is correct the distance is about half a mile and it does not go over the area as claimed in the articles published. I think most people in those parts acknowledge that they took a risk when they built there, and they did not think that industry would encroach on them in the form that it has.

There was no real reason for those people to think that industry would not encroach on them and most of those to whom I have spoken acknowledge that this was the case. They hoped against hope that it would not be so soon.

We come back to the inevitable point that industry has to go somewhere if people are to have jobs and careers. The Government will do all it can to minimise the effect of this particular industry.

WATER RATES AND SEWERAGE RATES

City and Country Areas: Grievance

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [5.18 p.m.]: My grievance arises out of some correspondence I received this morning, and it is in connection with the cost of living in the city as compared with that of living in country areas.

I refer, particularly, to water rates and sewerage rates. I have with me a notice received by a resident who lives in the suburb of Claremont, and another notice received by a resident of the town of Corrigin—which is in my electorate.

Both persons are widowed, and I know both houses very well. They are practically of the same vintage, the same condition, and the same construction. However, the Claremont house has a net annual value of \$398 which gives an annual water rate of \$16.90, and an annual sewerage rate of \$29.85. The total is \$46.75. These figures are based on the water rate being 4.25c in the \$1, and the sewerage rate being 7.5c in the \$1.

I now turn to the house situated at Corrigin where the water rate is \$30—7.5c in the \$1.

Mr. Tonkin: Do not forget that the member for Avon supported that.

Mr. GAYFER: The annual sewerage rate is \$60—15c in the \$1. The annual value is \$288, and the total cost to the Corrigin resident is \$90 as against the cost to the metropolitan resident of \$46. This situation had not been brought so graphically to my notice until the present illustration.

As some thought is being given to Budget measures I would ask, in the interests of fairness; in the interests of decentralisation and the necessity for people to live in country areas and to retire to country areas; and in the interests of trying to keep people from coming to the city areas, that some degree of uniformity be reached in the rating of the metropolitan and of the country areas.

Whether this is a case of Government policy or local government policy matters not; the anomaly exists and I urge the Government, if it is at all possible, to carry out a close inspection of the rates pertaining. Deep sewerage is now being installed in some of the country towns, but this is only a recent innovation. I would ask that this matter be examined and some consideration given towards a more equitable distribution of the costs.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.22 p.m.]: There is more than a little sympathy extended to people in country areas in regard to the charges made for water and for sewerage services. However, it should not be thought that the situations which exist in the country and city are exactly parallel.

Over a number of years, and under different Governments, various people have attempted to try to bring about a scheme whereby there could be uniform rating for water, in particular. As yet, no-one has come forward with a proposition which would be fair to all.

While the honourable member has quoted figures in regard to water rates applicable to one city dwelling, and one country dwelling, I can assure him that many city dwellings are rated at a very much higher level than the one he has quoted.

The other point I want to make is in regard to decentralisation. This Government, and all Governments in the past, have tried to assist in the aims of decentralisation. Governments have assisted country people by bearing a very high proportion of the operating costs involved in the supply of water throughout the country areas of the State. I could not give an exact figure at this time but the loss, each year, runs into millions of dollars. This loss is incurred in providing a water supply to country areas, and the loss is increasing. With the extension of water supplies to places which are regarded as being uneconomic, the loss will be very much greater. The State bears the burden of this loss on behalf of the country areas.

So the situation is not quite as black as is pointed out by the honourable member and it should be understood that not only this Government, but other Governments have been interested in this matter. The people, by and large, do bear a very high burden of the cost in the interests of country residents, and I would say they will continue to do so. I will try to see what can be done but there is no easy, or royal, road to a solution of the problem associated with uniform rating.

IRRIGATION CHARGES

Increase: Grievance

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.25 p.m.]: The protest made by the member for Avon is timely for my purpose because I propose to express my concern at the action of the Government in increasing, substantially, irrigation charges for water in the south-west.

The increase puts an additional burden upon a section of primary producers who are already substantially overburdened with rising costs. The increase has come at a time when the Government should be directing its attention to ways and means of reducing the cost of production for this particular section of the rural community. However, the Government is acting in the opposite direction by increasing costs.

I would remind the member for Avon that in 1964 this Government, of which he is a supporter, brought a Bill to this House

to amend the Country Areas Water Supply Act. On that occasion I went to some trouble to point out to the House that the amendment would result in substantial increases for the supply of water to country people. I presented some tables to the House indicating the very substantial increases in water charges which would result from the legislation.

At the time, I pointed out that in Victoria the Government was prepared to incur substantial losses in connection with water supplies in order to assist country people. I also pointed out that we were then subject to grants from the Grants Commission, and that the Grants Commission took a very favourable view of losses on country water supplies, and did not penalise the State because of those losses.

Despite all that argument the Government went ahead and amended the Country Areas Water Supply Act, and the member for Avon was one who voted for the Bill. Reference to *Hansard* will show that the second reading of the Bill was only carried by 22 votes to 21. So, had the member for Avon voted against the Bill the charges about which he complained, could not have been imposed.

Mr. Gayfer: If the Leader of the Opposition had been a little more convincing, perhaps I might have taken another view.

Mr. TONKIN: That is all very well. I suggest to the member for Avon that he read *Hansard* again, and read the argument which was put up and then, when the opportunity offers itself, get up in this House and point out the details to the Minister.

Mr. Gayfer: Is the Leader of the Opposition talking about sewerage costs, because that is what I based my grievance on a while ago?

Mr. TONKIN: The honourable member did not make that clear, and I understood he was protesting against water charges. If he was not protesting against the high water rates, then I am. Added to the increased charges for the supply of water we now have these increased charges for irrigation.

I regret that it was not possible for me to examine the answers which the Minister for Works gave this afternoon in reply to questions asked by the member for Murray, but I am very keenly interested in this question. I cannot believe that the people who are to be subjected to the increased charges would be so wide of the mark as to quote figures which they would know would ultimately be disproved.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Last night the Leader of the Opposition was quoting things that were quite silly.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh, was I? Well, Mr. Speaker, you will not permit me, of course, to refer to that debate so I will not attempt to do so.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Leader of the Opposition has special preference, I suppose.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Minister wants to join in with red herrings like that, let me tell him that they will not take me off the track. I am determined to follow up this matter. Now, the Minister is on a spot in regard to this question and he will find out, before he is finished, that he will be glad to substantiate the statements which were made by a spokesman on his behalf. I think we ought to be told the identity of this anonymous spokesman who spoke on behalf of the Minister, and whether he had the Minister's authority and approval to say what he did. I do not accept the statements which appeared in the paper as coming from the spokesman, and spoken on the Minister's behalf. Why did not the Minister speak?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I could not be contacted at the time.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister could not be contacted; he was playing hide and seek somewhere.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What a lot of nonsense! You are becoming childish in your old age.

Mr. TONKIN: Did the Minister say something?

Mr. Williams: He said you are becoming childish.

Mr. TONKIN: Surely the Minister realises that he has an opportunity to get up when I sit down and say what he wants to say, so long as it is within the Standing Orders—and, of course, there is some doubt about that. However, the point is that without any figures being submitted to justify the course it is taking, the Government is loading onto that section of primary producers which is already overloaded with costs an additional burden which will be difficult for it to bear.

I want to make this point: the Minister for Agriculture yesterday was endeavouring to show that every member of a Cabinet was responsible personally, and supported every decision of that Cabinet. This matter of imposing an additional cost for irrigation would have to be a Cabinet decision, so I think I am right—on the Minister's own reasoning—to assume that the Minister for Agriculture and other Country Party members in the Cabinet approve of what is being done.

Mr. Gayfer: Is that a statement or a grievance?

Mr. TONKIN: It is both.

Mr. Brady: And it is true.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot have it both ways. He tried yesterday to pin on me a statement that because I was a member of a Cabinet I was in favour of something which a certain Government did despite the fact that when it was done initially I expressed my opposition to it.

If there is any soundness in the Minister's reasoning—and I do not say there is, but this is the Minister's own reasoning—he must be supporting this increase in irrigation charges in country districts. I would like to know why, because he is supposed to be representing country people and the rural industries, which, I repeat, are already overloaded with high costs and rising costs. The Government should not be contributing to this; it ought to be prepared to subsidise these industries, which are already bearing high costs.

In my opinion there is no justification for placing this heavy burden upon the dairy farmers who, by any standards at all, are in the worst position of any primary producers throughout the whole of Australia. We should be looking for ways and means to assist them, and not drive them to the wall.

I believe that the costs which are being imposed are very substantial costs indeed. No wonder they are protesting in the south-west; and I hope they will continue to protest, even though the Minister for Industrial Development dislikes protests and charges members on this side with being responsible for stirring them up. That is an old dodge. When I tried to tell the Government that there was a drought in this country, what did the Minister for Agriculture say? He said I was trying to panic the situation. The Minister appealed to me to tell him where the drought was. "Name the areas," he said.

Mr. Nalder: You could not name one—not one! It is still back in your lap.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister was endeavouring at that time to find out whether there were drought areas by ringing up the local authorities so they could tell him. Members will recall that the Minister said he did not have the time to run around the country to see for himself.

Mr. Gayfer: Neither did you have time to run around.

Mr. TONKIN: I knew there were drought areas without running around.

Mr. Nalder: At the time you mentioned it, not one local authority had declared its district a drought area.

Mr. TONKIN: That has nothing to do with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.35 p.m.]: I think I should say something in reply to the grievance of the honourable member. Firstly, I would like to explain what the Government does in regard to subsidies for industry. I think most members of this House would appreciate—and I am afraid I will have to except the Leader of the Opposition, because he has not appreciated this—that the Government of this State

does subsidise irrigation of water for the industry, just the same as it subsidises the water supply throughout the country areas of the State. Indeed, at one time the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister for Works himself and should understand these things.

Let me say this: These subsidies are important subsidies, and the State bears them. As Minister for Works, I am largely responsible for any increase in, or any delay in increasing, the charges for this service. It is my responsibility for the time being to determine what course of action to take and I accept the challenge that this office gives.

I could no longer contemplate the subsidies with equanimity, because they were growing too large, and a lack of action on my part could have been regarded by some as irresponsible.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the amount of the loss?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I shall tell the Leader of the Opposition. Would he like the figures for any one of the last four years?

Mr. Tonkin: Give me the lot.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: How long have I got, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Ten minutes.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will give last year's figures first and then, if I have time, go through the others. The operating costs for Harvey in 1968-69 were, in round figures, \$176,000. I emphasise that these are only operating costs. The revenue for Harvey in 1968-69 was \$123,000. So in operating costs of \$176,000 there was a difference of \$53,000.

Mr. H. D. Evans: What about the value to the State of the increased production?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is why we do this, of course; that is why we subsidise in terms of millions of dollars for country districts.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you going to increase the railway freights because the railways lost \$6,000,000 last year?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This is another subsidy. Subsidies on industry can go too far and become a disaster. In the Collie district in 1968-69 the operating costs were \$121,000, and the revenue—a better figure—was \$104,000; a difference of \$17,000. The operating costs at Waroona for the same year were \$40,000, and the revenue was \$33,000; a difference of \$7,000.

The estimated operating costs in 1969-70 for Harvey are \$188,000, as against an estimated \$119,000 for revenue; in Collie the operating costs are estimated to be \$138,000, against revenue of \$119,000; and in Waroona it is estimated the operating costs will be \$50,000 and the revenue \$40,000.

The same sort of picture applies to the preceding years. As a matter of fact, last year and the previous year I said we should try to economise to absorb these costs, and we did to a great extent; but the costs can go too far, and I would be a poor old Minister indeed if I never put up the charges for this service.

I wonder how many of those members of the Opposition, if they got into a responsible position on this side of the House, would act in the way that the Leader of the Opposition would like them to act; or if the Leader of the Opposition gets to this side of the House, does that mean he becomes responsible? Why cannot responsibility apply to the other side of the House?

I say again that it is well known that if subsidies get too big they can prove disastrous to the industry concerned. We can bolster an industry until we get to a point where the subsidies become almost meaningless and are a great burden on the whole of the community. I, myself, largely take the responsibility for the present increase, and the Government backs me. We must act as a responsible Government; we do not seek a bubble popularity in this, we must act responsibly.

I have had to act responsibly in main roads matters, and I have members looking at me sideways whenever I walk through the corridors of the House, because they come to me with their problems; and yet I have to do my job as I see fit. I will continue to do that while this Government is in office and whilst I am in office.

Resolved: That grievances be noted.

BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and read a first time.
2. Ord River Dam Catchment Area (Straying Cattle) Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.
3. Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. O'Neil (Minister for Labour), and read a first time.
4. The Perpetual Executors Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.) Limited Act Amendment Bill.
5. The West Australian Trustee Executor and Agency Company Limited Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Burke, and read a first time.

BILLS (6): THIRD READING

1. Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill.
2. Wheat Marketing Act Continuance Bill.
3. Metropolitan Market Act Amendment Bill.
4. Soil Fertility Research Act Amendment Bill.

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

5. Forests Act Amendment Bill.

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

6. Water Boards Act Amendment Bill.

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

ONE-PARENT FAMILIES

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [5.48 p.m.]:

I move—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon one-parent families in so far as State legislation and administrative practice is involved, or is likely to be involved, and to make recommendations for any changes apparent from such inquiry.

Before I put forward the arguments in support of this motion, I wish to make it quite clear that it has been motivated by my deep concern for the plight of one-parent families in this State. I hope the motion will be carried so that people in this category can begin to look forward to the day when emotional and financial stability, hope, pride, and a sense of belonging without stigma in the community, will replace the despair, frustration, misery, and poverty which reign among them today.

It is not my intention to attempt to score politically at the expense of people in this category. I hope members will treat the motion on non-party lines, because Parliament, if it so desires, has the opportunity to investigate all the problems besetting these people. I hope the motion will focus the attention of the public upon the problems confronting this section of the community so that a greater appreciation of them can be gained by the public, which will lead to a better understanding of those in this plight.

The range of persons covered by the motion includes widows with children in receipt of social service benefits—particularly those widows with more than two children—wives who have been deserted by their husbands; widowers who

have lost their wives, or husbands whose wives have deserted them and their children; and unmarried mothers.

I am not concerned with the reasons that people become one-parent families. I know that in many cases it is because one partner has died, but in most cases it is because the father has deserted the family. In this motion my concern is the plight of these people and how we can take steps to achieve some measure of relief and assistance for them.

The first step I decided to take was to find out the number of people who would be covered by the motion, but I found it difficult to obtain a fairly accurate figure. Nevertheless, I have some figures here which I am sure will be of interest to members. The annual report of the Social Services Department for the 1968 financial year lists its female recipients of benefits, classed as widows, as follows:—

Widows whose husbands have died	1,395
Women who were living in a <i>de facto</i> relationship and whose partner has died	67
Deserted wives	726
Divorcees	289
Women whose husbands are in the Claremont Mental Hospital	8
Women whose husbands are in gaol for a period in excess of six months	36
	<hr/> 2,521

On the 18th February, 1969, the Child Welfare Department was assisting 413 deserted wives with children; 49 families where the father was in gaol; 13 divorced women without maintenance, and 113 unmarried mothers.

Some further figures show that the Summary Relief Court was dealing with nearly 3,000 maintenance accounts and the turnover for the year was approximately \$1,000,000. Working on the basis of an average of three units to a family, the only deduction I could make from those figures was that some 10,000 people, plus those of whom we have no knowledge and who are probably not in receipt of assistance from the State or Commonwealth Governments, would be the subject of this motion.

The first group of people I wish to cover are the unmarried mothers. Again it has been difficult to determine just how many unmarried mothers there are in this State. As I have already said, we only know that the Child Welfare Department was giving assistance to 113 unmarried mothers as at the 18th February, 1969. It is a fact, however, that there are a good many more of these unmarried mothers in the community who are not registered in any way and who are not receiving any assistance, but

who are living in some sort of accommodation with either one or two of their children while at the same time attempting to work and look after those children.

We know that in 1968 there were 2,013 ex-nuptial births and that during the same year 189 unmarried mothers received financial assistance from the Child Welfare Department. So that would be more than the number of unmarried mothers receiving assistance at the 18th February, 1969.

The next question I wish to ask is whether we consider our social welfare system in Western Australia to be adequately geared to handle the plight of unmarried mothers. We must accept the fact that we will always have with us unmarried mothers—this is a fact of life—and accordingly we should ensure that our welfare services are adequate to meet what will always be a very real need.

Human beings being what they are, I can see no likelihood of this need not continuing in the future. Let us discuss a typical case and consider for example a young girl of 17 years of age who thinks she is pregnant. What is her first reaction? Does she go to her mother or perhaps to her boy friend; or would she go to her local doctor or clergyman, feeling that she could turn to them for advice?

I think it would be fair to say that at the time she felt she was pregnant the young girl in question would be going through a tremendous emotional crisis and she might not know just where to turn. In these circumstances surely it is necessary for there to be some central bureau in Perth where these young girls can seek advice from qualified social workers; or does the Government think that the services already operating—and I refer to Ngal-a, the Salvation Army, the Home of the Good Shepherd, and the King Edward Memorial Hospital—are sufficient to meet the urgency that exists?

This, I think, would be one of the aspects which could be considered if a Select Committee were appointed. My own thoughts are that a girl would probably make sure that she was pregnant or not by seeking the advice of her doctor. If the doctor gave her the correct advice and confirmed her suspicions she would then perhaps consult one of the agencies I have mentioned.

But are the particular agencies geared to give the right sort of counselling and advice to a girl in such a situation; to pursue the legal processes; and, after establishing the paternity of the child, to obtain a maintenance order together with an order for medical and hospital expenses? Or does the particular girl have to seek her own legal advice or obtain assistance from the Child Welfare Department?

It is difficult to generalise in these cases, because each one must be treated on its merits. I do wonder, however, whether

the agencies I have mentioned are capable of handling all the matters required of them in the case of a young girl who might become pregnant; particularly a young girl who has possibly lost contact with her family or who has no family and, therefore, no-one to whom she can turn.

In most cases it would be preferable for the young girl in question to approach some person who is skilled in giving advice and counsel, rather than for her to seek such advice from an aunt or an uncle. I am informed that the accommodation position for an unmarried mother and her child in the metropolitan area is rather desperate. In most cases it is necessary for the young girl to live in a flat if she is unable to find accommodation at home.

I am also informed that the rates of assistance granted to unmarried mothers while not being terribly generous do, to some extent, meet the necessities at the time. So we are not really asking for an increase in the rates of assistance for these people but rather that we have a good look at all the facilities available to ensure that they are adequate for the purposes to which they are devoted.

From information I have been given it would appear that one of the major problems facing the unmarried mother is the lack of child-minding centres; somewhere where she can place the child during the day so that she might go out to work to earn some extra income to enable her to live a normal life and care for her child.

The other evening I was able to ask some questions of the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare on this matter of child-minding centres. The information I received is quite revealing. We find that in Western Australia there are 31 child-minding centres, 28 of which are operated by private organisations. Only three of the 31 are operated by public committees—one by a committee set up by the Perth City Council, one by the Perth Children's Protection Society, and one by a group of people led by the wife of the member for Fremantle, which is supported financially by the Fremantle City Council.

So in the metropolitan area and, in fact, in Western Australia, there are only three child-minding centres for which there is some direct financial support from either the Government or local authorities. The other 28 are operated by private citizens. My information is that the privately conducted child-minding centres charge around \$12 per week for each child, whereas the other three, which are operated by organisations—if I might class them as such—charge as little as \$5 to \$6 per week, and in some cases they make no charge at all. The three organisations to which I referred depend, to some extent, on the money which they themselves raise. With regard to the 28 private child-minding centres, I do not know how they obtain their finance, other than from

the charges they impose. I do not know whether they receive any financial assistance from the Government.

I am aware there is an Act which controls the child-minding centres in regard to space, the number of children, the type of personnel engaged to conduct the centres, and other matters of a machinery nature. I am told also that it is very difficult to place a child in one of these centres.

It is interesting to note that the three publicly run child-minding centres cater for 130 children, whereas the 28 privately conducted centres cater for 328 children, making a total of 458 children who can be cared for in the metropolitan area. These questions arise: Is it necessary to increase the number of child-minding centres? If so, by how many? Should the local authorities be encouraged to play a greater part in the provision of child-minding centres? If so, how can this be done? These are aspects which I think a parliamentary Select Committee would be able to investigate fully, and report upon to this Parliament, because the provision of adequate child-minding centres is a real and a basic need of unmarried mothers in the community today.

There are other problems which the unmarried mothers have to face, and here I refer to medical expenses and hospital charges. These are not paid by the Child Welfare Department or by any other organisation, and they are not met by the Commonwealth Government. In some cases, where an order has been made against the proven father of a child he is ordered by the court to pay the hospital charges and the medical expenses involved in the actual confinement; but where such an order has not been made then the hospital has to recover the debt incurred from the girl concerned. Some of these hospital accounts run into hundreds of dollars; and it is not inconceivable for a 17-year old girl to have to face a confinement cost of \$300 or \$400, which she is obliged to pay. Obviously a 17-year old unmarried mother has to depend on her family financially.

It has been pointed out to me that as a rule the hospitals do not attempt to recover the charges by legal means. However, they do send out letters of demand. In some cases the unmarried mother might make an endeavour to pay off the account, but in other cases she does not do so. I ask: Is it fair that one unmarried mother should get off scot-free, while another has to be concerned with an account that is hanging over her head? The progress in the community of a girl in the latter category will be inhibited. Just how far this will affect the girl, I do not know.

Again, these are factors which a Select Committee could look at. It could come up with some scheme, such as one which allows the Hospital Benefit Fund to ac-

cept some responsibility for the payment of the financial expenses of unmarried mothers.

The next group of people I wish to consider are the deserted wives. These are the women whose husbands have deserted them, have failed to provide maintenance, and have not recognised their responsibilities under the marriage. In 1966 there were 716 complaints lodged under section 10 of the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act. In 1967 there were 771 complaints, and this is an increase over the 1966 figure. In 1968 there were 1,056 complaints, or an increase of over 250 cases. From the 1st January to the 30th June, 1969, there were 579 complaints lodged, and this represents over half the number for 1968. If these cases keep increasing at the same rate, it is obvious that at the end of this year there will again be an increase in the number, as compared with 1968.

From 716 complaints lodged in 1966, the number increased to 1,056 in the last year. Of the 716 complaints lodged in 1966, 498 alleged desertion when they were dealt with in the summary relief court; and of the 1,056 complaints lodged in 1968, 762 also alleged desertion.

The other category which should be considered concerns cases where the husband is in gaol. I cannot fathom why the Social Services Department refuses to pay a class "A" widow's pension to the wife of a person who has been committed to prison for a period longer than six months. It does not pay until the period of six months is up. If a person has been sentenced to gaol for 12 months, then it is obvious he will not return to his wife in the first six months of that period. This anomaly has been going on for years, but the Social Services Department has so far refused to pay. I realise it is paying 50 per cent. of the amount that is paid by the State to the wife during the first six months the husband is in gaol. In some way this money is paid to the Treasury.

Let us take a typical case involving a deserted wife, where the act of desertion occurs on a Friday night, which is usually pay night. The husband fails to return home. The wife is left in a state of almost complete destitution. She has waited for her husband to bring home the pay, but he fails to arrive. Where does she turn?

I suppose the first thing she can think of doing is to borrow some money from neighbours or friends, or approach the local clergyman to see whether she can raise some money from him. It is not until the Monday morning that she can approach the Child Welfare Department to arrange for some assistance for herself and her children. This is an interesting exercise. Firstly, this woman has to go to the Child Welfare Department, where she is handed a monetary assistance form.

Sitting suspended from 6.16 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HARMAN: Before the tea suspension I was about to trace the movements of a wife who suddenly finds she is deserted and that her husband has left her in a state of destitution. I am referring to a wife who has a family, and let us assume she has five children.

Her first move on the Monday is to approach the Child Welfare Department where she is given an application form for assistance. This form involves a number of questions regarding personal particulars, cash assets, investments, and such things. The woman must also sign a form saying that she will undertake immediate action to obtain maintenance against the defaulting husband.

So, having paraded her children in the Child Welfare Department—and bear in mind that this woman is certainly emotionally disturbed and is going through a crisis—she then has to go from the Child Welfare Department, which is in Wellington Street, to the Summary Relief Court, which is in St. George's Terrace. There again, with her children, she has to go through another series of discussions and questions in order to lay a complaint under the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act.

From that point she is obliged to go to the Police Department, which is at the other end of Wellington Street, to register her husband as a missing person.

When the wife is completing the application form for assistance, she notices on the back of it a special note, printed in red, which reads—

(a) This form must be carefully completed in full before your application can be considered. If any question is not answered consideration of your application may be delayed. Strokes or other marks cannot be accepted.

There is no argument with that, but paragraph (b) reads—

(b) Please have your Marriage and Children's Birth Certificates, Rent Book, Time Payment Cards, Rate Notices and Receipts, and any other documents dealing with your properties available for perusal when the Welfare Officer calls. Failure to observe this may delay your application.

This means the woman now has to go to the Registrar-General's Office to obtain marriage and birth certificates. One would think that in this situation an extract of birth would be sufficient, but the form states that a birth certificate is necessary, and these are obtained from the Registrar-General's Office at a cost of \$1 per certificate. Assuming that the marriage took place in Western Australia and that the children were all born here, in order to complete the application form, the wife must spend \$6. If the marriage took place in Victoria and the children were born in

that State, then the woman is in a more unfortunate position because she has to send to Victoria for the marriage and birth certificates and the cost of these in Victoria is \$2 for a birth certificate and \$1 for an extract. Therefore, this would double the expense of applying for assistance from the Child Welfare Department.

This is only one of the small sidelights to the application form. It must be borne in mind that fares are also involved, as is also the trouble of taking the family around to the various offices. It must also be remembered that probably this would be the first experience this woman has had of applying for this type of assistance and that naturally she is embarrassed and completely at sea. She therefore has to be guided by someone in each of the offices.

It is my feeling that a Select Committee should have the opportunity to examine whether it might not be better to have one central bureau for deserted wives in order that, when left in a position such as this, they might go to one office in Perth to complete all the arrangements necessary.

I want to say here that this situation is not related only to European white people. It applies also to aborigines, and I hope that a committee will be able to look at the situation as it applies to all the people in Western Australia—not only white people, but also aboriginal people.

The answers I received to questions I asked last year indicate that in the financial year ended June, 1968, the Department of Native Welfare expended 50 per cent. of its relief vote on assistance to deserted wives. That is not an inconsiderable amount of Government expenditure and is one which this committee should examine, as well as the points I have raised in tracing the steps a deserted wife has to take in order to obtain assistance.

I want now to look at the assistance which such a wife obtains. A woman with five children—a six-unit family—would receive \$27.50 per week and out of this, of course, must be taken charges for rent, light, water, I hope Hospital Benefit Fund payments, food, clothing, fuel, school commitments, fares, etc. I submit not very much would be left after such amounts were deducted. From my own experience, and no doubt other members would agree, I would say this amount is meagre when it is considered in relation to the average weekly earnings or the basic wage in this State.

I wonder what criteria the Government uses when it decides these rates. I would hope the committee could look at this situation objectively and ascertain whether the rate paid should be tied to the average weekly earnings in a proportionate amount, so that if the average

weekly earnings go up so will the rates of assistance. Perhaps the committee might decide that the assistance ought to be tied in to some percentage of the basic wage so that with any fluctuations in the basic wage there would be fluctuations in the rate paid to the deserted wife.

Other forms of assistance are granted by the Child Welfare Department. One of these is a clothing allowance of \$26 quarterly. This means that, assuming no maintenance has been forthcoming, the wife with five children would in three months be granted \$26 for the provision of clothing.

I think this amount is meagre and, once again, a committee could well look into and determine some fair scale of assistance in regard to the provision of clothing. The scale of assistance should be more related to the children in the family so that if they are attending high schools or are in primary schools the assistance can be directed to the children who have the most need for the clothing, rather than have a straightout grant of \$26 each quarter for the whole family.

Another point has arisen and I feel that most members in this House would have been associated with the problem. It is found that when a husband deserts a family, or is imprisoned, the family is usually renting a private dwelling. On today's figures, let us assume that the rent is \$15 per week. The family could have been living in a particular environment, and the children could be going to the local school. The mother may be associated in some of the community affairs in the locality in which she lives. She certainly has the company of her neighbours and she may even have relations living close handy. The point I am raising is that no assistance is provided by the State in the way of a rental subsidy.

What does happen, of course, is that the woman approaches the Housing Commission. If the Housing Commission can assist, it provides the woman with a State Housing Commission rental home. However, in most cases, that means the whole family has to leave the particular environment in which it has been living, and go to a selected area. We have heard that the Housing Commission has selected areas such as Collie and Maniana.

Mr. Cash: I do not know whether that is right.

Mr. HARMAN: I hope it is not right.

Mr. Cash: Quite a few deserted wives have gone to other State Housing Commission areas, particularly North Beach.

Mr. HARMAN: A classic case exists in New South Wales where the State Housing Commission built a block of flats for the accommodation, solely, of deserted wives. The result was obvious. It would be quite

demoralising for all those deserted wives to be living in the one environment, and I hope that will not be the position in this State.

There are other aspects associated with this type of housing. We have heard about tradespeople, in areas containing a predominant number of deserted wives, having to give credit. In many cases the tradespeople suffer losses because payments cannot be made, and the debts are never satisfied. This is something which a committee could well look at to see whether it is possible for a rent subsidy to be introduced so that a family can remain in a particular environment.

If it is a case of the husband being in gaol for, say, 12 months he could return to his previous environment and his rehabilitation would be much faster than if his wife was living in a town such as Collie. We have already heard that opportunities for employment in Collie are not good, and in some cases, they are negligible. This is an aspect to which the committee could well give attention.

Suggestions have been made over the past few years that some form of counselling for deserted wives and deserting husbands, by a qualified counsellor, may have the effect of bringing about a reconciliation. Quite frankly, I do not know whether this would be a success. However, I am guided by a case which occurred in America and which was recorded in a publication called, *Counselling Services to Parents and Children Involved in Divorce Proceedings*. The particular report demonstrated a project to determine the need for assertive case-work techniques and for counselling persons who had filed for divorce. Persons who had filed for divorce were sent information concerning the counselling service, and were offered its service.

About 18 per cent. of those people responded to the invitations to take advantage of the service, which resulted in 195 cases receiving counselling during the two years the project was in operation. The three main areas of counselling were children, reconciliation, and adjustment to either divorce or reconciliation. It was felt that some wives file for divorce without wanting it—to shock husbands into good behaviour—and that such a divorce could be prevented through case-work services.

It might be practicable to have a qualified social worker attached to the central bureau to which I referred, but I do not know whether it could be made mandatory—I do not think it could be—for both parties to be given some sort of counselling service. Of course, the deserting husband would have to be located. A reconciliation might occur but, in any case, the woman could be given advice as to how she might cope with some of the problems she will face as a deserted wife.

I am sure that in our community there are people with wide experience in these matters. A parliamentary Select Committee could receive advice from those people and then decide whether my suggestion is practicable or not.

I also wonder what forms of legal assistance are available to deserted wives, particularly in the Summary Relief Court. Are those women able to seek counsel on the basis of the advice being paid for by the Government, or by the Legal Aid Society? These are points on which I am not too sure. I know that financial assistance certainly is not available in cases of divorce, although discussions are being held by the Attorneys-General to see whether assistance can be provided through the Legal Aid Society. These are matters which could be investigated and, no doubt, recommendations could be made to this Parliament.

During the period after the husband has left, and arrangements are being made for maintenance, there is the problem of medical expenses.

Perhaps there may even be hospital accounts. How on earth can a woman with five children who is receiving \$27.50 per week afford to pay medical and hospital expenses, assuming she is not covered by the Hospital Benefit Fund? Even assuming that she is covered by the fund, this means a regular payment each week out of the \$27.50. Certainly a person receives payments back from the Hospital Benefit Fund, but it is still necessary to pay an additional amount. These are debts which would be accruing to the woman and her family.

I am sure there must be some way of solving this problem. Again, I wonder whether this could be resolved through some participation by the Hospital Benefit Fund, which I mentioned when I was referring to unmarried mothers. Certainly this is an area of inquiry which a Select Committee could pursue.

Next, I would like to refer to the question of maintenance. I wonder how successful it really is. We are told there are some 3,000 accounts being kept by the Summary Relief Court which, in the last financial year, received nearly \$1,000,000. I wonder how many more dollars were not received because the defaulting person could not be traced or because he refused to pay when he was traced and subsequently spent some time in prison.

My experience has been that even when an order has been made in the Summary Relief Court, it never really covers the full expenses incurred by a wife who has five children to care for, because the court has to bear in mind that the husband has to maintain himself, too. Consequently, some part of his income is set aside for his maintenance and the other part is set aside for the wife and five children.

When the magistrate has made the order, it is incumbent upon the defaulting husband to make his payments regularly. If he does not make his payments, no further action can be taken by the Summary Relief Court at the present time. Then, it is necessary for the woman to come into Perth to the Summary Relief Court in order to sign a warrant of commitment, which is then served by the police on the defaulting husband, assuming that he can be located. If he is located and the warrant is served upon him, he then has the chance to delay payment by asking for a variation of the order.

Again, this takes probably several days to arrange. The husband can approach the court and say, "I have been out of work for two or three weeks. Could you make an order for a lesser amount and an order for me to pay the arrears at so much per week?" Off he goes again. If he does not worry about paying under that order, the woman is still left without a penny. Consequently, it is necessary for her to come back again and sign another warrant. This process could go on forever, I suppose. Certainly it is difficult to get money from an irresponsible defaulting husband.

I wonder whether it would be better if the clerk of the Summary Relief Court was empowered to issue warrants himself once it was established that the husband had not paid any maintenance. There may be some difficulties legally with this suggestion. It could be that the husband had sent money direct to the wife and the wife had failed to notify the court of the amount. This could be a problem and probably is the reason for the requirement that the wife should come to the court to sign the warrant of commitment. Again, however, this is a matter which could be closely investigated.

In some cases, there is the cost of service which is added to the warrant and, again, I presume this would have to be paid by the wife. I wonder how rigorous the enforcement of these warrants is, because I know of cases where warrants have stayed in police stations for some time. In one case the husband was out on the trans-line and because the person issuing the warrant could not, or would not, pay for the police officer to go out to Rawlinna to serve the warrant, the police refused to go at their own expense. Consequently, the warrant stayed in the Kalgoorlie Police Station for many months.

I wonder how many cases of this nature there are in other parts of Western Australia. We should bear in mind that many defaulting husbands find it expedient to go north. I am told that when any cameras are focused in the area for the purpose of taking photographs of iron ore projects, and the rest of it, many men run for cover, because the experience has been that when one of these people has

been noticed on a film, the Summary Relief Court has sent a warrant to that location the very next day.

Mr. Bickerton: It is just as well the Minister for the North-West is not a maintenance dodger.

Mr. Court: There was a time when those who were building roads and other works in certain remote areas were fugitives from wives and fugitives from the police, so I am told.

Mr. HARMAN: On this question I wonder whether the present maintenance system favours the wife and children or the defaulting husband. I leave it at that point.

I wish to refer to another group of persons; namely, social service widows who have three or more children. These people are entitled to a payment of \$1 per week from the Child Welfare Department for each child, although the maximum payment is only \$3 per week even if there are more than three children.

I wonder why the rate has been struck at \$3 per week for three children or more. What is the criterion for this payment? What reasoning is used for the rate of \$3 per week? I think this is a question which could be included in a general inquiry.

Widowers with children are another group to which I wish to refer. These men find themselves in a very difficult situation, too. Obviously, they have to go out to work. Some might have three or four children who are below school age, and others might have children at school. These men have to go to the trouble to find somewhere for the children to stay during the day so that they can go to work. They leave the children in the morning and pick them up at night. Perhaps a partial solution can be found for this problem; nevertheless, it is one into which a committee could well inquire.

A housekeeping service is in operation in Western Australia. How effective is this? How many applicants can be satisfied with housekeeping services? Is there any need to inject the scheme with Government finances? Is there any need to encourage this scheme? These are points which we, as a Parliament, should be looking at. There are always the problems of school books and fees confronting these people. I know the Education Department has a scheme of assistance and that the Minister for Education has the prerogative to grant assistance.

However, I do not know what is the machinery to obtain this sort of assistance and I do not know whether there is any limit to it. I do not know how often it is used; it certainly is not well publicised, because there are cases where I have advised the people concerned that they should approach the Education

Department for the payment of fees, school books, etc. Prior to my giving them this advice, those people had no idea that assistance was available. So this is another aspect which could be looked at.

We have a number of private welfare agencies—that is, they are private in the sense that they are not run by the Government; a number of them are operated by our churches and some are operated by organisations such as Legacy. I wonder what degree of co-ordination exists between these organisations and our own Government welfare agencies? I know these organisations carry on an excellent job in the community, but I wonder how much better they would be if they were encouraged by the Government; if, for example, the Government agreed to pay the salary of qualified social workers in those organisations?

I do not know the calibre of the training that the staff of those organisations receive, but in one case I know of there is a qualified social worker employed and I believe the Government contributes towards that person's salary. What opportunities for research are available to these private organisations? Are they able to receive regular advice, or regular counselling, from Government representatives—advice and counselling which would be to their benefit, and which would flow on to the people who attend the private organisations rather than approach a Government department?

We should look, too, at the way the Government functions. There are six Ministers involved in this particular problem: the Minister for Child Welfare—obviously—the Minister for Native Welfare, the Minister for Housing, the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Health, and the Minister for Police. I know they are all very busy with their own portfolios, and I wonder how much co-ordination exists between the Ministers regarding this particular aspect.

Again, we carry this down further to the departments: the Child Welfare Department, the Crown Law Department, the Department of Native Welfare, the Prisons Department, the Medical Department, the Police Department, Probation and Parole, and so on. How much co-ordination exists between these departments? How much consultation is carried on between these departments in respect of one-parent families? I do not know, but I would hope that, should a Select Committee be agreed to, these departments would present their case to the inquiry and be available for questioning and to give advice and assistance so that the Select Committee would be able to make a determination on any particular issue.

Mr. Cash: Perhaps you would agree with me that we could have a Minister for Community Welfare?

Mr. HARMAN: That is something which might well come out of an inquiry, and I hope that the member for Mirrabooka will see fit to support the motion, because it might be an idea to have a Minister looking at these things.

It might be desirable to have a permanent welfare commission consisting of, say, three or four persons who would be permanently employed to look at the trend in welfare, the trend in facilities, and the increases in one direction or the decreases in another. As a permanent structure, that commission could constantly advise the Government of what is required to assist not only one-parent families, but also all the other people in this State who are in need.

I trust that members will give this motion every consideration, and I know that they will. As I said previously, I hope the motion will not be treated along party lines but, rather, that the overriding aspect will be that we as a Parliament should have the opportunity to investigate a situation which involves possibly 10,000 people in this State: and that we should be able, through a Select Committee, to make suitable recommendations to this Parliament.

Finally, Sir, might I say that the other day I listened to the Premier upon his return from overseas making references to other parts of the world. He said that although we have problems in this State, we should get together and solve them. I would hope that the Premier will demonstrate this by agreeing to the appointment of a Select Committee so that, together, the members of this Parliament can look at the problems besetting one-parent families, and, I hope, come forward with suitable recommendations which will go a long way towards alleviating the present situation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands).

OCEAN BEACHES

Creation of Controlling Authority: Motion

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [8.8 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early action to introduce legislation to create an authority—with local authority co-operation—to plan, protect, and maintain ocean beaches in the metropolitan area and areas to be proclaimed.

In so doing I regret the no doubt necessary absence of several senior Ministers from the Government benches on, no doubt, Government business. However, I hope they will subsequently read my motion and supporting argument. I trust they will analyse what I shall say and give it

favourable consideration so that support will be subsequently forthcoming.

Mr. Cash: There are also prominent members of the Opposition front bench absent from the House.

Mr. FLETCHER: Thank you very much. I anticipated such a reply from the other side of the House. I had no doubt it would come; but I would point out that if Government members are occupied elsewhere, the same prevails in respect of Opposition members. We have similar responsibilities.

Mr. Bovell: They are probably conferring together in the interests of the State.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is so.

Mr. Court: A matter of great public interest.

Mr. Bickerton: I hope we are sitting here in the interests of the State.

Mr. Court: We are the keen types here tonight.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is strange that even on a non-controversial matter such as this, I seem to precipitate interjections. However, the fewer interjections I get the more precipitately will I dispose of this motion and the argument in support thereof.

Mr. Court: I think you got your message across. What you are trying to convey is that the sooner you finish the sooner we can go home.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, but even if that be the desire of members here, my desire for the motion to be passed becomes more sincere, because I believe, if agreed to, it will be to the benefit of the State. Therefore, if I delay the departure of any members from the House this evening, let me assure them that I, at least, believe the motion is worth while, because the intention is to afford some protection to ocean beaches in the same way as protection is afforded to the Swan River and its beaches by the Swan River Conservation Act. In seeking to gain protection for ocean beaches, possibly I will be able to demonstrate the apathy and disregard that is shown in respect of one of the State's greatest assets.

I appeal to members to act now to ensure the preservation of our beaches, because, as representatives of the people, we owe this to the State of Western Australia. For any member to oppose the motion, to move to defer it, or otherwise endeavour to frustrate my attempt to have it passed, would be to leave our great heritage to the vagaries of erosion or contamination by the sea; or to the encroachment of the fence lines of industry onto our ocean beaches and waterfronts.

This subject has been dealt with by the Press, and was referred to by the member for Cockburn this evening when he stated that 250 homes at Kwinana seemed to be

doomed. His remarks were most appropriate to the reference I have made to the encroachment of the fence lines of industry onto ocean beaches. I am gratified to learn that, according to the Press, the member for Dale is also concerned, because he is reported as having said, in part—

It is my belief that because of the general noise and odor factor in the area, residential living should be phased out.

The same article also contained the following:—

Residents were in a dilemma. They could not move, they could not sell, or let—and now it was forecast that it would be intolerable to stay there.

They are indeed in an unfortunate position and, as I have said, I am greatly concerned that the fence lines of industries are coming right down to the waterline and encroaching on beach localities. At this point of time let me say that these displaced people—

The SPEAKER: Order! This has nothing to do with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER: Very well, Mr. Speaker. However, I am concerned that industries are encroaching on ocean beaches. I think you will bear with me in that respect, Mr. Speaker; namely, that I am concerned about the preservation of ocean beaches, and I point out that they extend some distance back from the waterline, as I will subsequently mention when I speak in respect of other legislation. When speaking this evening, the Minister did hold out some prospect of granting assistance for their preservation.

I am sure the House will admit that what the Swan River Conservation Board has done for the Swan River can be done for our ocean beaches. The Swan River Conservation Board has undoubtedly cleaned up the river and has, by constantly policing the activities of industry, prevented its contamination. The board has beautified the river and has freed it from the malodorous algae, with the result that fish and prawns can again be caught in it. In the past I have pointed out that for some years fish and prawns were absent from the river because of the contamination of its waters by industry.

We do not want to see our ocean beaches placed in a similar condition of being contaminated by industry. Families can now sail upon or swim in the river with enjoyment because they realise that much of the algae that was previously present has been removed from the river, of which we can be proud. Therefore, I repeat that what has been done for the river can also be done for our ocean beaches, and support for my motion will establish an authority for such a purpose. I appeal

to the House not to wait until the situation has become irretrievable. I believe other States of the Commonwealth have not waited to take steps to preserve their ocean beaches, nor have many countries overseas.

In view of the success of the Swan River Conservation Board, I did have in mind to bring under its jurisdiction the care of ocean beaches by widening the representation on it. As a private member, it seemed that my object could be achieved in this way without imposing a charge on the Crown. With this end in view I interviewed our capable and very conscientious Parliamentary Draftsman (Mr. Alan McGonagle) at the Titles Office, and, despite the pressure of other work, he spent a considerable time in an endeavour to marry the care of ocean beaches to the Swan River Conservation Board. In fact, a Bill was drafted which was to be known as the Swan River and Ocean Beaches Conservation Act, 1958-69. For this purpose, the principal Swan River Conservation Act was ideal. It was my suggestion that section 3 of that Act, as amended, would have brought ocean beaches within its provisions, because, as amended, it would have provided for the appointment of a rivers, waters, and ocean beaches advisory committee.

A new proposed subsection to section 4, which relates to the jurisdiction of the Swan River Conservation Board, would have broadened that section to include ocean beaches lying within 31 degrees 29 minutes south latitude, and 32 degrees 27 minutes south latitude, which are, according to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, the northern and southern boundaries of the metropolitan area, extending from the northern boundary of the Wanneroo Shire to the southern boundary of the Rockingham Shire. It is this area of ocean beaches, in particular, that I want to take care of. The authority I wish to see constituted would take care of that area and would maintain ocean beaches in the metropolitan area and other areas to be proclaimed beyond the location I have just delineated. For that purpose section 7 of the Swan River Conservation Act seemed to be ideal, because it was proposed to repeal that section and re-enact it to include Fremantle Port Authority and additional local government representation.

I would suggest that one could hardly request that a body be constituted for the care of ocean beaches that came within the boundaries and jurisdiction of local authorities, without permitting those local authorities to be represented on the body; so, as local authority representation already existed on the Swan River Conservation Board, I was of the opinion that that board could bring ocean beaches within its jurisdiction. However, both the parliamentary drafting officer and myself were

of the opinion that the local authorities concerned would not be satisfied with the four members who represent the Local Government Association on the Swan River Conservation Board. Such representation seemed inadequate, particularly where it would apply to ocean beaches outside the boundaries of local authorities affected.

As a result, other amendments were drafted, using the Swan River Conservation Act as a model. However, the opinion was expressed that had I attempted to amend that Act, some member opposite would have taken up the point of asking how Yanchep, Safety Bay, or any ocean beach area to be proclaimed came under the jurisdiction of the Swan River Conservation Board. That point would have been taken against me and there would have been no prospect of debate from that side of the House and, in effect, I would have been stultified, to the disappointment of myself, my colleagues, and those we represent, in my very desirable efforts to care for the ocean beaches.

I would point out that the Labor Party's last policy speech included an undertaking to establish a statutory authority to care for and protect ocean beaches. This is generally known to the electors and, I hope, it is also known to members opposite. Accordingly, I am honouring here and now an obligation given by the Labor Party to the community at large during the last election, and also at the previous election, if I remember correctly.

However, we were not elected; we were beaten by a very narrow margin of some 300 votes, if my memory serves me right. But let me say it is now the Government's chance to put aside political partisanship and join with the Opposition in its laudable desire to care for our ocean beaches. The Government has an opportunity to join with us, if it so wishes, to help care for the ocean beaches.

I have given considerable emphasis to the splendid role and composition of the Swan River Conservation Board. It is an ideal model upon which an authority can be established to do for our beaches what has been done, as I explained earlier, for our river.

If my motion were carried new legislation would be required, a message would be necessary and, of course, it would entail a charge on the Crown. Because of this, I have moved a motion requesting the introduction of legislation which I ask the Government to implement and for which I can guarantee support from this side of the House.

The argument might be submitted that local governments can care for the beaches. They can and do, to a limited extent and at great expense to a handful of ratepayers, provide facilities for enjoyment and recreation of ratepayers

from other areas including the country areas. Accordingly, there is no reason why the country representatives should not support my motion because they come from country areas throughout the State to enjoy the facilities that are provided at our ocean beaches.

Why should a handful of ratepayers in the various areas provide facilities for everybody else to enjoy? On that basis alone surely every member in this House should support my motion; surely not one member here can find an argument to vote against it!

Section 193 of the Local Government Act grants the right to make by-laws with respect to bathing and surfing with or without surf boards; it states where people shall surf in respect of the safety, decency, convenience, and comfort of surfers, and non-surfers. I suspect this would also refer to those who do not surf but who merely enjoy the beach. It even goes so far as to cater for the dedicated bird-watchers and by that I do not mean seagulls, either. Section 199A grants local authorities the power to make by-laws respecting beach area cabins, camps, chalets, etc., for holiday purposes.

In short, there is such limited authority granted that I could not marry my Bill to the Local Government Act to prevent an additional charge on the Crown. Accordingly, members will see why I cannot introduce a private member's Bill to achieve my purpose. All I can do is to move a motion requesting the Government to bring down legislation for this purpose.

I next explored the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, because the Fremantle Harbour Trust has been of considerable help in respect of ocean beaches. I sought help from that Act to see whether I could find a desirable amendment that would not place a charge on the Crown, but the drafting officer and myself were again both frustrated in this respect.

The area under the jurisdiction of the Fremantle Port Authority is limited to the inner harbour and outer harbour between the mainland and a line drawn from Bathurst Light on Rottnest, along the eastern shoreline of that island to Carnac and Garden Island, and on to Point John on Point Peron near Rockingham, and back along the coast to a location somewhere near City Beach. There are members here who represent that area and no doubt they will, as a consequence, support my motion. This point is in fact at latitude 31 degrees, 56 minutes, 22 seconds south. It then proceeds out to sea to Duck Rock and Bathurst Light at Rottnest.

Let me say at the outset how grateful I am to the Fremantle Port Authority for the improvements and facilities provided at both Port Beach and Leighton Beach.

I express this appreciation not only on my own behalf but on behalf of those I have the honour to represent.

These are splendid beaches and if this standard can be reached in those locations there is no reason why it cannot be reached elsewhere, particularly if we receive the help and co-operation of everybody in this House.

Any beach authority would need Port Authority representation on it. I deliberately made known the area of jurisdiction of the Fremantle Port Authority to demonstrate the need for representation of that Port Authority on any statutory authority that might be created. Such an authority if established would also need additional local government representation.

Section 22 of the Fremantle Port Authority Act vests in the commissioners all lands vested in the Crown within the boundaries of the harbour. Section 24 states, in effect, that the commissioners shall have the exclusive control of the harbour, while section 25 gives the necessary right to carry out the works.

If works are to be carried out on our ocean beaches we would need the co-operation of the Fremantle Port Authority and its representation on any board that might be established to deal with this question. Section 27 of the Fremantle Port Authority Act says that the Governor may on the recommendation of the commissioner grant leases of any vested land, while section 27A says that land required for the purposes of the Act can be acquired compulsorily.

The Minister for Industrial Development would be well aware of the fact—and so, as a consequence of the headlines in this evening's paper, would many of the people who are disadvantaged—that 250 Kwinana homes are likely to be doomed.

The SPEAKER: I have already told the honourable member that that has nothing to do with the motion. Very little of what the honourable member has said has anything to do with the motion. I have been very tolerant, but I will not be tolerant for much longer.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am at some disadvantage.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not establish a positive motion that early action should be taken to introduce legislation to create an authority by telling the House all the reasons why he cannot amend the Acts on the Statute book. They are quite irrelevant to the subject before the Chamber, and I will be glad if the honourable member will get back to the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will do my best, Mr. Speaker, to comply with your ruling. I will do that by illustrating what has gone on in other States. I think you will agree that

in so doing I am on safe ground. I did attempt to point out to the House why a motion was necessary, and in what respects I would be frustrated in introducing a private member's Bill.

I have written to the United States of America, to other countries of the world, and to other States in Australia in respect of this matter. If the Government wishes to be progressive it should support my motion, which attempts to accord our beaches the protection that is accorded to beaches elsewhere in Australia and overseas.

Firstly, in the case of Queensland I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition, Parliament House, Brisbane. In reply he acknowledged receipt of my letter, and forwarded a copy of the Beach Protection Act of 1968 of that State. He said that he had not personally taken part in the debate on that Bill, and therefore he requested the Chairman of Committees to write to me direct giving me further details of the debate and the points put forward by the Australian Labor Party, which is the Opposition in that State.

I shall read a few brief excerpts from a letter which I have received from Queensland—

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Houston, has asked me to write to you concerning the legislation introduced in the last session of Parliament relating to the setting up of a beach protection authority in Queensland.

Briefly, because of the erosion problems that developed, particularly in the south east quarter of our coast, the Government found it necessary to set up an authority to devise and plan ways in which to combat this erosion.

The legislation provides for the setting up of a beach protection authority which mainly comprises the representatives of the various Government Departments and is administered by the Premier of the State. In addition to the authority, an advisory board is provided for, comprising in addition to Government nominees, for a seaside local authority representative, a university representative, sand mining interests and a representative from such other organisations which in the opinion of the Minister could contribute to the work of the board.

I believe I could best assist you in the matter by sending you extracts from Hansard of the debate that took place regarding the matter together with the speech made by me as leading the debate for the Opposition.

If there is any other way in which I could assist you do not hesitate to again contact me.

Yours faithfully,
D. J. Sherrington,
Member for Salisbury.

He also sent me a copy of the legislation. I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, will find that what I am doing is in order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already informed the House that the responsibility of members is to make speeches and not read them. It is the task of a member to use his own language in telling the House what is in an Act. I will not permit you to read an Act, nor will I permit you to read out letters.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will not read the Act in its entirety.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not read more than two lines from the Act, otherwise I will sit him down.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Queensland legislation contains in the title the words, "To provide for the protection of beaches against, and for the Restoration of Beaches from, Erosion or Encroachment by the Sea, and for those Purposes to Establish an Authority and an Advisory Board and to Confer and Impose upon them certain Functions and Powers." This is the sort of thing I would like to see emulated in Western Australia. The short title is, "The Beach Protection Act of 1968." Section 7 governs the setting up of an advisory board, and its composition is set out. Section 15 makes provision for the appointment of a committee of the board. Section 17 contains the power to borrow from the Treasury or by sale of debentures, or by both methods.

Any similar legislation brought down by the Government in Western Australia could emulate the Queensland legislation in those respects. Under sections 18, 19, and 20 it is necessary for a resolution to be passed for borrowings to be made; and this provision could also be emulated in this State. Loans as authorised investments are covered by section 22. Section 29 relates to the establishment of a beach protection fund, and to the ways and means of doing so. I have referred briefly to those provisions of the Queensland legislation to show what could be done in Western Australia.

In accordance with your ruling on a previous occasion, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is no objection to the reading of brief excerpts from *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order! The *Hansard* I was referring to is the *Hansard* of this Parliament recording the debates. I would draw the attention of the honourable member to the motion before the Chair, which he seems to have misunderstood completely. The motion is—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early action to introduce legislation to create an authority—with local authority co-operation—to plan, protect, and

maintain ocean beaches in the metropolitan area and areas to be proclaimed.

The purpose of the honourable member's speech is to establish the need for legislation to create an authority to plan, protect, and maintain our ocean beaches. He does not establish that by telling us about the borrowing powers of some authority in Queensland; that has nothing to do with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER: Very well, Mr. Speaker, this certainly does not make it easy for me. It rather circumscribes me when I attempt to point out what has been done elsewhere by quoting examples of what exists in other areas of the world. I could mention that if members are interested in seeing how to achieve what the motion seeks, they will find on pages 2516 to 2519 of the 1968 Queensland *Hansard* the methods suggested. However, both the Government and the Opposition in Queensland saw the need for the legislation; and I ask all members of this House to emulate what has been passed by an anti-Labor Government in Queensland; this could be done by an anti-Labor Government in Western Australia.

I have also received correspondence on this matter from Victoria informing me of the desirable legislation that is in force in that State—and I hope it will be emulated in Western Australia. My purpose in moving this motion is to make provision for an authority to care for our ocean beaches. I would point out that in Port Phillip Bay and the areas beyond, the ocean beaches are cared for under an Act known as the Port Phillip Authority Act. This makes provision in respect of the co-ordination and development of Port Phillip and certain other areas, and for other purposes. I have carefully annotated in that Act the ways and means of according protection; and the same provisions should apply in this State. I would draw the attention of members to the legislation which exists in Victoria, from which they can judge the need for comparable legislation here.

They will find this legislation a revelation to them, and very desirable for this State. I will admit that my attempt is not the first made in this House in an endeavour to ensure that our ocean beaches are cared for. Although I will not read the appropriate passages, *Hansard* reveals that Mr. North, then member for Cottesloe, attempted something similar in 1925, by introducing a Bill entitled, "The Cottesloe Municipal Beach Trust Bill". This was defeated on the grounds that it involved a charge on the Crown.

In 1958 the then member for Wembley Beaches introduced a motion requesting legislation to care for ocean beaches, but he, too, failed. I mention this fact because I will be reminded by members opposite that a Labor Government was in office in

1958. I admit this, and if I concede that the defeat of the motion at that time was a mistake, will the Government match my frankness with an undertaking to accept my motion and thus rectify that 1958 mistake?

I would point out to the House that I cannot be blamed for what happened before I came here. However, I have done my best to retrieve the situation, and I am making another attempt now with my motion. I am aware that in 1958 members opposite, including the Minister for Works, the previous member for Claremont, and even the Premier himself, were not unenthusiastic about the motion. I hope they will be equally enthusiastic about the one I have introduced this evening.

A number of changes have occurred since 1958, including changes in industrial and other circumstances. In fact a new situation exists, and if a motion was justified in 1958, it is even more justified now, 11 years later.

I believe in my motion because there has been an increase in industry, population, housing, shipping, possible pollution from offshore oil drilling, oil and refuse dumping at sea, and encroachment of industrial and residential fence lines onto the water's edge, as I mentioned earlier.

I wish to quote a few lines from a real world authority, although I cannot vouch for the authenticity of his remarks. I am referring to Thor Heyerdahl who, members will know, was the man who attempted to sail the raft *Ra* across the Atlantic. The heading of the article I wish to quote is, "Ra Man Says Ocean is Polluted." If the ocean is polluted then that pollution can wash ashore and it is necessary for some authority to ensure that it does not.

Thor Heyerdahl is the explorer who fashioned a raft from papyrus and sailed from the coast of Africa. He asserts he sailed for five days through heavily polluted sea some 2,000 miles offshore. In those circumstances I believe it is conceivable that this type of pollution could wash on to our coastline. He said that the water was "thick with big lumps of oil or tar or whatever. The day in the middle of the Atlantic the water looked like a sewer." That in itself demonstrates the amount of pollution which takes place and the amount of rubbish floating around at sea. It also demonstrates the need for an authority along the lines indicated in my motion.

Mr. Bickerton: It certainly demonstrates the need for legislation to be brought down, as the motion states.

Mr. FLETCHER: I thank the member for Pilbara for his interjection. It is the first help I have had this evening in my laudable attempt.

Mr. Court: You need it!

Mr. Bickerton: From reading that motion it is quite obvious that what the member for Fremantle says is correct.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You'll get on!

Mr. Court: I am interested in the chap and his raft. Did he leave it out at sea to add to the pollution?

Mr. FLETCHER: I did not suggest that the raft *Ra* had anything to do with the pollution. I stated that Mr. Heyerdahl reported that for five days, 2,000 miles out at sea, he sailed through filth and pollution which was presumably dumped from ships and other sources. My concern is to ensure that this type of pollution does not reach our shoreline, and that if it does an appropriate authority, in accordance with my motion, will be in existence to take care of the situation.

Getting closer to home, we are aware of concern about yellow beaches at Bunbury and the possible health hazard, and the alleged effect of this yellow industrial pollution on fish. Therefore not only would the member for Dale, but also I hope the member for Bunbury, support my motion on the grounds of the pollution at Cockburn and Bunbury.

We are also aware of the coloured effluent bubbling to the surface from an undersea pipe in Cockburn Sound. I am sure this is well and truly within the ambit of my motion concerning the need for legislation to protect our beaches. I draw the attention of the House to page 776 of *The Statutes of Western Australia*, volume 1 of 1964, dealing with the Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Agreement Act where, under the heading of "Effluent", we find the following:—

27. (1) Subject to the provisions of this clause CSBP may discharge into Cockburn Sound into water not less than eight (8) fathoms deep at low water mark up to three hundred and fifty (350) tons in any one day of gypsum being effluent from the operations of CSBP hereunder.

I anticipate an interjection from the Minister for Industrial Development indicating this is quite harmless and that it is part of the agreement. I have heard the member for Pilbara take exception to the fact that when legislation containing an agreement is introduced we must accept it. The agreement is usually the first or second schedule. I am not arguing about the fact that this agreement has been passed. However, the 350 tons of effluent is going through the pipes into Cockburn Sound.

Mr. Court: You are not suggesting an authority, having studied the scientific evidence, would say that the company could not discharge this effluent and that therefore we could not have the industry? Surely not!

Mr. FLETCHER: The House has accepted it whether we like it or not, but I want to know who is to say that an employee might not dump, among the effluent, dangerous chemicals and other properties for disposal? After all the pipe would be a convenient repository for rubbish or other chemicals which might be dangerous to human health and which would certainly be dangerous to fish.

Mr. Court: You are missing my point. A responsible authority would do exactly what the Government has done in this case. It would have the matter scientifically examined, and if it was found that the effluent would cause no harm to humans or fish, it would say the effluent could be discharged.

Mr. Bickerton: An authority would keep a constant eye on the matter, whereas the Government would do it only from time to time. That is the difference.

Mr. Court: The Government is just as constantly watchful as would be an authority.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would like to refer members to an article headed, "Sequel to Rhine Poisoning." I have no doubt that every member in this House has read this article in which it is stated that millions of fish were found floating upside down in the Rhine as a result of poison which entered the river and floated down it to the sea. Those dead fish were found in various countries, including Holland, as a result of the contamination occurring in the way I have mentioned.

The Minister is not there to ensure, nor is the management there 24 hours a day to ensure that nothing other than 350 tons of gypsum goes through the pipe. All the ingredients I have mentioned could go through that pipe and there could be a repetition of the situation which was reported in an article in *The West Australian* of the 3rd July, 1969. The article was headed, "Sequel to Rhine Poisoning" and it was written by Sue Masterman and Anton Keone, at the Hague.

If such a situation could occur in that country, it could happen here and that is all the more reason for an authority being established for the protection of our beaches. Another article appeared in the Press on the 23rd August, 1969, and was headed, "Mystery of Dead Birds."

Mr. Court: I cannot see that what occurred in the Rhine could be a parallel to what might occur in Cockburn Sound.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Minister cannot see the parallel? I am trying to explain that in the case of the Rhine there is a very rigid authority.

Mr. Court: I am trying to explain that authorities are not completely without their problems.

Mr. FLETCHER: Well, the Minister will admit that authorities do afford more protection than is possible where no authority exists. If what I have mentioned could happen where there is an authority, it is all the more reason for an authority to be established here to protect our waters.

I was about to refer to the article published in *The West Australian* on the 23rd August, 1969, under the heading, "Mystery of Dead Birds." The birds had apparently lost the waterproofing oils in their feathers and had died in rivers and reservoirs. People were asking where the contamination came from. Apparently something in the water destroyed the waterproofing. Some people would ask, "What does it matter?" However, anybody interested in flora and fauna on our coast will support me in my request for the creation of an authority to ensure the protection I have suggested.

Some amateur fishermen have caught fish in Cockburn Sound and they have had a definite kerosene flavour. Cockburn Sound is a nursery for surface type fish. If the Minister for Works were present he would recall that I, as a member of Parliament, took a deputation of fishermen to his office to protest against trawl nets being used in Cockburn Sound. Those fishermen were concerned with protecting the immature fish, and the natural feeding grounds of the fish. How much more likely is the destruction of that fish nursery by effluent from industry?

I have already mentioned the headlines "Sequel to Rhine Poisoning" and the "Mystery of Dead Birds." During my maiden speech in this House 11 years ago I referred to a possible causeway from Point Peron to Garden Island. Current negotiations make the construction of this causeway more likely and if it is built I would suggest that it would have to be of a type to permit the ingress and egress of tides. This would allow for harbour flushing. The causeway should not be a continuous groyne, or breakwater, from the mainland to the island.

This is the sort of construction that would need the supervision of an authority to ensure that the open sea was not locked off from the area of Cockburn Sound so preventing industrial waste from being flushed out to sea; otherwise the locality to which I have referred would become contaminated.

If there were not adequate supervision the construction of a groyne could destroy the area of Palm Beach and Rockingham. The formation of a committee, in accordance with my motion, would see that this did not happen. In effect, the committee would become a watchdog.

If any members have reservations about my motion I ask them to visit Rockingham, Coogee, or Palm Beach during a summer weekend. They will see the young, the old, and the older, playing with water—for want of a better expression. They are in the water and they are on the water in various types of craft in surroundings found in few other—if any—parts of the world.

Support of my motion will guarantee the preservation of this marine playground. If Cockburn Sound, and the beaches in the area, were contaminated a great many people would be saddened. My motion becomes more and more necessary every day because of the development of industry, the building of homes, and shipping in and out of the area I have mentioned.

My motion states, as does the Queensland and the Victorian legislation, that the authority will operate in areas to be proclaimed. I envisage legislation to create an authority for the protection of beaches not only in our own particular locality, but also at Bunbury, Busselton, and even at Albany.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you extend that as far as Esperance, too?

Mr. FLETCHER: That could be an area to be proclaimed. Norseman Gold Mines (No Liability) is extending its activities to beach sand production, and may centralise in Bunbury with a work force of 50 or 60 men. Mineral claims have been pegged at Waroona and Busselton, and the company is indulging in a feasibility study, and is installing a flushing plant.

The SPEAKER: Order; that is enough!

Mr. FLETCHER: Another article which appeared recently demonstrates that thousands of tons of rutile, zircon, and other minerals can be taken from beach sands. I will not weary the House with the tonnages but to obtain the various minerals it is necessary to move not thousands of tons, but millions of tons of beach sand. My motion is for the purpose of ensuring that if industrial firms exploit the mineral sands on our coast, and shift millions of tons of sand to obtain those minerals, the beaches will be restored as near as possible to their original form.

I said earlier that legislation existed elsewhere, and legislation is just as necessary here. We can learn from the legislation which does exist, and can apply it to this State. We have no legislation to impose conditions on companies regarding the rehabilitation of any beaches from which mineral sands have been taken.

Care and protection of our beaches will become more necessary with an expanding industry and an expanding popu-

lation. I do regret your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that I am not to read correspondence between myself and people in America, because there are a few statistics, referred to in the correspondence, in which the House might be interested.

I would refer members to the position which obtains in Tasmania where provision is made in respect of sand dunes; or to South Australia or New South Wales where care is exercised. Also, I have received correspondence, for example, from the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association in answer to my correspondence. I would have liked to enlighten members of this House with excerpts from that correspondence in support of my motion. Indeed, I am sure they would have been delighted to hear some of the particulars of areas where the authorities cater not for thousands of people as we do in Western Australia but for millions of people who visit their beaches. Further, I have correspondence from the American Conservation Association Incorporated addressed to myself which gives particulars of the way beaches are cared for in that country. If I am asked for this correspondence by any member opposite, I will be only too pleased to make it available.

However, I hope I have presented a sufficiently good case, without the aid of this correspondence, to demonstrate the need for beach conservation. I have a letter from one of my constituents who expresses concern, on behalf of many youth organisations, over what is happening in Cockburn Sound. However, in view of your ruling, Sir, I cannot make his comments known to the House. He has addressed his concern to me and has asked me to do what I can to prevail upon the Government not to destroy our ocean beaches. I have replied to him, but I will not read my reply, either.

Since I cannot make these facts, including the way in which beaches are cared for in Honolulu and elsewhere, known to the House in order to illustrate the need for legislation in Western Australia, I merely hope that I have presented a good case to this House.

If we accept that ocean beaches are an important factor to the health and social life of many thousands of Western Australians who congregate on them, then we will emulate other States and overseas countries by establishing a statutory authority in conformity with my motion which appears on today's notice paper.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development).

House adjourned at 9.4 p.m.