

are not members of the profession. I do not believe the board should be composed solely of architects. The Builders' Registration Board is composed of people other than builders, but I will not go into that matter. I think something along these lines should be forthcoming.

Before members in this House go ahead and vote on the Bill, I hope they will make sure that they fully comprehend the ramifications of what I have been saying. Certainly I have taken a long time and perhaps I have not been as eloquent as some members could be.

The point I am trying to make is that the Act and the administration of it by the board leave a lot to be desired, in my opinion, if people are to expect to get any justice. I certainly intend to oppose clause 5 of the Bill, and I will oppose it with every ounce of breath that I have within me, though I will probably be unsuccessful.

I intend to oppose the whole Bill, only on the basis that we should ask the Minister to have an inquiry made into this matter and come back to Parliament with a Bill that leaves no shadow of doubt as to the functions of the board. I oppose the measure.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. V. J. Ferry.

House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 1st October, 1969

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

BILLS (13): ASSENT

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

1. Collie Recreation and Park Lands Act Repeal Bill.
2. Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill.
3. Wheat Marketing Act Continuance Bill.
4. Soil Fertility Research Act Amendment Bill.
5. Water Boards Act Amendment Bill.
6. Land Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
7. Ord River Dam Catchment Area (Straying Cattle) Act Amendment Bill.
8. Western Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment Bill.

9. Wood Chipping Industry Agreement Bill.
10. Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill.
11. Legal Contribution Trust Act Amendment Bill.
12. Fisheries Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
13. Methodist Church (W.A.) Property Trust Incorporation Bill.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Tabling

THE SPEAKER: I submit for tabling the report of the Auditor-General made under the Audit Act, 1904-66, for the year ended the 30th June, 1969.

QUESTIONS (34): ON NOTICE

1. BUS SERVICE

Walliston-South Kalamunda

Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What plans, if any, are being considered for the establishment of a bus service for the Walliston, South Kalamunda area?
- (2) Is it intended to establish a bus depot in the Kalamunda Shire light industry area?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes", when is it anticipated the present bus depot will be vacated?
- (4) Are there any further changes or additions to the existing bus routes and timetables contemplated in the near future?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Consideration is being given to the establishment of feeder services into Kalamunda.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) It was anticipated that this would occur during this year. Non availability of loan funds makes this unlikely.
- (4) No.

2. NOXIOUS WEEDS

Paterson's Curse

Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In what areas of the State has "Paterson's Curse" been declared a primary noxious weed?
- (2) Is his department alarmed over the rapid spread of Paterson's Curse infestations in the Kimberley region?
- (3) Are any weed control officers employed in the area?
- (4) If so, what measures have been taken to encourage eradication of the weed?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The South-West Land Division together with the Shires of Yilgarn, Ravensthorpe, Esperance, and Dundas.
- (2) The department has no knowledge of Paterson's Curse in the Kimberley region. It is a native of areas with a Mediterranean climate and would not be expected to be a problem in the Kimberley area.
- (3) Yes. A weed control officer is stationed at Kununurra.
- (4) Answered by (2).

3. SHOES

Material Content

Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is there legislation making it necessary for shoe manufacturers to stamp on each shoe the material content of the upper part of the shoe?
- (2) Does he know if any research has been carried out by the industry or the Government into the desirability or preference for particular materials from which shoe uppers are manufactured?
- (3) Does he agree that consumers can be misled by the fact that while the sole and insole are stamped as having been manufactured from leather this does not apply to the uppers?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. O'Neill) replied:

- (1) Footwear marking regulations in this State do not prescribe that uppers be marked.
- (2) Research is not being carried out by the Government into these matters, and I am not aware of the extent of research by private industry.
- (3) It is not known whether consumers are misled by the fact that uppers do not have to be marked. The stamping requirements clearly indicate that the description refers to the sole only.

4. RAILWAYS

Rapid Transit System: Armadale Line

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it proposed that the Armadale metropolitan railway terminal will be closed?
- (2) If so, is it proposed that Maddington and/or Kenwick will be the transit terminal on that line?

- (3) Have any preliminary discussions taken place on the above with the Gosnells or the Armadale Shire Council?
- (4) If (3) is "Yes", what were the results of these discussions and were the councils in favour of the proposals?
- (5) Is his department in favour of this proposal?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (6) A study is currently being undertaken to see whether benefits can be conferred on people using public transport in the Armadale corridor by employing a scheme similar to that now operating at Midland. One objective would be to produce faster transportation for people living on the outskirts of the metropolitan area.

The Government has no recommendation before it as to location, type of facility, or the manner in which an integrated bus-rail system might work. When possible solutions have been worked out in detail we will most certainly discuss them with the shires involved, but this may be some months away.

We favour Midland type schemes because they produce better transportation; for example, well loaded express trains will run in from Midland in 16 minutes, under a new schedule to be introduced next week.

5. WATER RATES AND SEWERAGE RATES

City and Country Areas: Comparison

Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What would a ratepayer pay in water rates if occupying a house with an annual value of \$360 and using 100,000 gallons of water yearly—
 - (a) metropolitan area;
 - (b) country towns?
- (2) What would the same ratepayers pay for sewerage?
- (3) If there is any difference what is the reason?
- (4) Why cannot water and sewerage rating be varied according to total annual valuations as do those of local government?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

	Water \$	Water Rates Charges \$	Total \$
(a) Metropolitan area	15.30	5.75	21.05
(b) Country towns	27.00	22.00	49.00

Sewerage 7.

Rates

\$

(2) (a) Metropolitan area	27.00
(b) Albany	46.80
Geraldton	23.40
Northam	27.00
All other sewered towns	54.00

- (3) The Metropolitan Water Board operates as a business undertaking and rates and charges are based on its requirements to cover all its costs.

Country water supplies and country sewerage concerns operate more as an amenity for public benefit and at a substantial annual loss, with the exception of sewerage facilities at Albany, Geraldton, and Northam.

- (4) Water and sewerage rating can be varied according to total annual values. The financial results of the various concerns govern the extent to which this is possible.

6. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Integrated Iron and Steel Works

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) When the first approaches were made to the Government by Conzinc Riotinto for the right to mine iron ore in the Hamersley Range did Mr. Duncan on behalf of the company undertake to establish a fully integrated iron and steel works if given the leases being sought?
- (2) If "No", will he state precisely what Mr. Duncan offered in connection with the establishment of a fully integrated iron and steel works?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) When the first approaches were made to the Government by Riotinto for the right to mine ore in the Hamersley Range, Mr. (now Sir Val) Duncan stated that as they were not steel people it would not be possible for them to give any categorical undertakings at that stage that they would themselves establish such an industry, but they would intend, in due course, to endeavour to persuade one of their steel associates in the world to set up a steel works in Western Australia provided that conditions were propitious.

DUST NUISANCE

Gosnells

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

In view of the growing concern by residents in the Gosnells area to the pollution of air by The Readymix Group (W.A.) quarries, what action is being taken by his department to reduce the dust nuisance?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

There have been no serious complaints regarding these quarries. The matter will, however, be investigated.

8. PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES

Professional Division

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Premier:

- (1) In view of the known widespread dissatisfaction within the professional division over salaries in the State Public Service, can he state when it is intended that salary adjustments will be made to this division as has already occurred in the Special, Administrative, Clerical and General Divisions?
- (2) Is it a fact that the salaries' adjustments for these various divisions have been at varying dates and have no retrospectivity?
- (3) If so, is this not unfair to the various divisions concerned?
- (4) Does he appreciate that if this state of affairs continues it will discourage recruitment, affect morale, encourage resignations, and be injurious to the welfare of the public in general?
- (5) Does the Government intend to introduce amendments to the Public Service Arbitration Act and related Acts with a view to removing these anomalies?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) I call the attention of the honourable member to my reply to a question on this matter by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) and (4) No. Public Service salaries are dealt with on an occupational group basis. Claims on behalf of the respective groups are dealt with as and when they can be justified by increases elsewhere in the salaries of related occupations.
- (5) Requests by the Civil Service Association for some amendments to the legislation are under consideration.

9.

LAND

Karragullen

Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Does his department intend to release blocks at Karragullen for housing and industry?
- (2) If so, what is the extent of the subdivision, the location, and estimated time of release?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) An area of about 12 acres of Crown land, on which the railway station and yards were formerly situated, is currently being designed for subdivision into lots.
- (b) Until the design has been completed to the satisfaction of the shire council and the other authorities involved, a possible time of release cannot be estimated.

10. *This question was postponed.*

11.

EDUCATION

Electric Incinerettes

Dr. HENN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are electric incinerettes now being provided for girls' toilets in new primary schools?
- (2) If not, as girls in Western Australia mature at an earlier age, could consideration be given to installing them?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Investigation has shown that the need for incinerettes is not great enough to justify their installation in all primary schools.

12. NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Risks

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

- (1) Adverting to his reply on the 11th September relevant to the use of nuclear explosions in mining and harbour work, with particular reference to "the Commonwealth Government as a party to the Non Proliferation Treaty", is he aware that Australia is not a signatory to this non proliferation treaty?
- (2) What is the name and the qualifications of the Western Australian representative on the "Inter-Departmental Committee to study the use of Atomic Energy" in Australia?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes. In the answer of the 11th September it was not stated that Australia was a signatory to the non proliferation treaty, but it is understood that the Commonwealth Government takes cognisance of the requirements under that treaty.
- (2) Mr. J. E. Parker, B.C.E. (Melb.), A.M.I.E. (Aust.), formerly Director of Works and now Co-ordinator of Development, Chairman of the State Electricity Commission, and Chairman of the North West Planning and Co-ordinating Authority.

13.

EDUCATION

Exmouth High School

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has there been any delay in the commencement of work on the additions to Exmouth High School; if so, what is the reason for such delay?
- (2) On what date are the additions to be completed?
- (3) Does the contract carry a penalty clause?
- (4) Is he aware that parents at Exmouth are seriously contemplating sending their children away from Exmouth to other schools as it is considered that the additions will not be completed before the new school year in 1970?
- (5) On what date and to whom was the contract let for the additions to this school?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The 19th May, 1970.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.
- (5) The 19th September, 1969. Geraldton Building Company Pty. Ltd.

14.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Prices and Subsidies

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the price of bulk and bagged superphosphate, respectively, at the works in October, 1968?
- (2) What was the Commonwealth subsidy at that time?
- (3) What is the price of bulk and bagged superphosphate, respectively, at the works today?
- (4) What is the Commonwealth subsidy now?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) After subsidy, deduction prices ex works are—

Bulk—\$19 per ton.

Bagged (new jute bags)—\$24.40 per ton.

Less 75c for payment before delivery and less \$1.50 for October delivery.

- (2) \$8 per ton.

- (3) After subsidy deduction prices ex works are—

Bulk—\$15 per ton.

Bagged—\$20.40 per ton.

Less 75c for payment before delivery and less \$1.80 for October delivery.

- (4) \$12 per ton.

15. WATER RESOURCES MEASUREMENT ACT *Commonwealth Grant*

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Government advised the amount of the grant the State is to receive under the Water Resources Measurement Act, 1967?

- (2) If so, what is the amount?

- (3) What amount is to be spent on the Gascoyne River out of this grant?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) In 1967-68—\$259,850.

1968-69—\$273,250.

1969-70—\$311,550.

These amounts cover both surface and underground water.

- (3) Commonwealth grant money spent on the Gascoyne River is for the operation and maintenance of river gauging stations and therefore varies with seasonal conditions. Current investigations are paid for from State funds.

16. EDUCATION

Country High Schools

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) In what towns outside the metropolitan area are—

- (a) junior high schools;
(b) three-year high schools, and
(c) five-year high schools, situated?

- (2) With respect to the five-year high schools what is the enrolment of—

- (a) fourth-year students; and
(b) fifth-year students, in each?

- (3) What is the number of teachers at each of the schools referred to in (1)?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) to (3)—

		Teaching Staff at 1st August, 1969			
		Full-time	Part-time		
Junior High Schools—					
Town :					
Beverley	13	1		
Boddington	10	1		
Boyup Brook	14	3		
Brookton	11	2		
Bruce Rock	9	3		
Bullsbrook, East (Bullsbrook J.H.)	15	1		
Carnamah	11	1		
Corrigin	14	1		
Cunderdin	21	2		
Dalwallinu	12	2		
Darkan	10		
Denmark	23		
Derby	20		
Donnybrook	17	1		
Exmouth	13		
Gnowangerup	19	1		
Kellerberrin	19	1		
Kojonup	17	1		
Kulin	10	2		
Lake Grace	11	1		
Moora	21		
Morawa	20		
Nannup	10		
Narembeen	11	2		
Norseman	16		
Northampton	9	1		
Northcliffe	7		
Penberthon	10	1		
Pingelly	18	1		
Port Hedland	25		
Quairading	13	3		
Southern Cross	8	3		
Toodyay	8	2		
Wagin	19	2		
Warona	12	3		
Williams	8	1		
Wongan Hills	16	1		
Wundowie	15		
Wyalkatchem	16	1		
York	14	2		
3-year High Schools—					
Bridgetown	12	4		
Bunbury (Newton Moore High)	21	5		
Carnarvon	14		
Esperance	23		
Harvey	23		
Margaret River	17	1		
Mount Barker	19	3		
		As at 1st August, 1969			
		Enrolments	Teaching Staff		
		4th Year	5th Year		
		Full-time	Part-time		
5-year High Schools—					
Town :					
Albany	174	79	62	3
Bunbury	116	86	49	3
Busselton	68	47	32	1
Collie	83	33	37	2
Geraldton	125	58	54	1
Kalgoorlie (Eastern Goldfields Senior High School)	51	49	53	1
Katanning	67	22	30	3
Manjimup	103	34	32	2
Merredin	50	36	28
Narrogin	72	38	43	1
Northam	134	70	49	3
Perth	49	20	27

17.

DAM SITES

Gascoyne River

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) In answer to my question on the 2nd October, 1968, he advised that the feasibility study of the

Kennedy Range and Rocky Pool dam sites on the Gascoyne River would be completed in mid-1969. Has this study been completed; if not, when will it be completed?

- (2) If the study has been completed, will he table the report of the study?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) A feasibility study of a dam at the Kennedy Range site has been completed but because it would be extremely costly and there would be difficulties of salinity and supply, it must be studied in conjunction with the current investigations in course in the vicinity of Rocky Pool. These will not be completed until the end of 1971.

- (2) Answered by (1).

18. WATER SUPPLIES

Carnarvon: Tabling of Report

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

Will he table the report of the engineering consultants, Sir Alexander Gibb & Partners, on the possibilities of supplementing the supply of water to the town of Carnarvon and the plantation area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Yes.

The report was tabled.

19. PNEUMOCONIOSIS MEDICAL BOARD

Sitting in Kalgoorlie

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

When is the Pneumoconiosis Medical Board due to sit next at Kalgoorlie?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

The 20th October, 1969.

20. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Reorganisation

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When can the "transformation" of the State Shipping Service which was promised by the Minister for the North-West on the 16th September, 1965, be expected to commence taking shape?
- (2) Apart from the establishment of the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission, what has been accomplished by the passing of the Bill?

- (3) Is it intended to have the modern fleet "with bigger and faster ships with a capacity to carry a greater tonnage" as promised by the Minister for the North-West?

- (4) As it was said on behalf of the Government four years ago, "We cannot allow the present service to continue with its existing disabilities" will he state why the Government has so allowed?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) The Coastal Shipping Commission has done extensive studies on the best method of improving the service and economics of the State Shipping Service and came forward with a recommendation that we purchase Lash type ships. The State Government then prepared and presented a case to the Commonwealth for a loan to purchase these ships and provide necessary port facilities. During my visit to the Eastern States last week I discussed this matter further with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport but it is not anticipated a decision will be made until after the end of November.

The Lash type ship would help overcome unnecessary delay in ports, speed up the service, and in doing so assist in keeping north-west shipping freights to a reasonable level.

The reason we have not purchased these ships earlier is lack of finance.

- (4) Because of our desire to ensure the north-west and Kimberley have a good and continuing shipping service.

* 21. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Accommodation

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

- (1) Is it correct that a considerable number of patients are being prematurely discharged each week from Royal Perth Hospital because of the heavy demand for accommodation?
- (2) Is the position so bad at Royal Perth Hospital that it is bordering on becoming chaotic?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. No patients are discharged until their inpatient treatment has been properly completed. New medical developments and hospital management techniques have reduced the average length of stay by 2.4 days enabling some

2,000 more patients a year to be admitted. At the same time overcrowding in the wards has been significantly reduced. Last year the average daily number of beds occupied has been reduced by 55.

- (2) No. Far from bordering on the chaotic, the condition today is much better than it was a year ago. It is emphasised that all this has been done not by curtailing essential inpatient treatment, but by speeding the throughput of patients by using the hospital resources more efficiently. Despite the considerable increase in the costs of wages and supplies, treatment of each inpatient has been reduced from \$316 to \$305 per case; this is in face of a per diem cost for inpatients which has risen from \$24 to \$29. No patient requiring facilities available only at the Royal Perth Hospital is refused admission.

22. FRUIT

Import Restrictions: Effect on Kimberley

Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Agriculture:

As towns in Kimberley are further from Western Australian orchards than Perth is from the Eastern States orchards and in view of the fact that a prohibition on the entry of certain varieties of fruit into the area deprives residents from taking advantage of a quick and comparatively cheap source of supply in South Australia, will he give consideration to relaxation of the ban, and instead, impose restrictions on the carriage of the offending fruits to the south of the State?

Mr. NALDER replied:

It is considered that departure from the established quarantine policy based on State-wide application is not warranted.

23. CROCODILES

Conservation

Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Has he any knowledge of salt water or fresh water crocodiles being kept in captivity in Western Australia for the purpose of studying their breeding habits; if so, by whom?
- (2) Are any restrictions placed on the size or number of salt water crocodiles which can be taken by professional hunters?

- (3) Is the introduction of legislation for the preservation of the species dependent on the result of the survey which is being conducted by Dr. H. R. Bustard?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) No. Provided the amending legislation now before Parliament becomes law there should be adequate legal authority to facilitate crocodile conservation.

24.

SEWERAGE

East Cannington

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

In view of the concern shown by residents in East Cannington over the outbreak of hepatitis and periodical outbreaks of other communicable diseases (considered to be caused through bad drainage) which are affecting the health of children and adults in this area, will he give an assurance that deep sewerage will be installed forthwith?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The Metropolitan Water Board has no funds available at this juncture to provide sewerage in the East Cannington area and so cannot give an assurance of immediate installation of services.

25.

MARRON

Conservation

Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Will he indicate his attitude towards the formation of a voluntary organisation aimed at the preservation of marron in the rivers of the south-west of this State?
- (2) If a public meeting for the formation of such a body were called at Manjimup under the Tourist Bureau auspices, would he make available a research officer for the purposes of guidance on such an occasion?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) My attitude would be one of co-operation.
- (2) Yes.
26. *This question was postponed to Tuesday next.*
27. *This question was postponed.*

28.

RAILWAYS*Collie-Wagin Line*

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Railways:

Is it planned to close the Collie-Wagin railway line?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

No.

29.

COLLIE COAL*Recommendations: Implementation*

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

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to implement any of the recommendations made by the Eastern States mining authorities on the Collie coalfield?

(2) If so, will he advise the proposals?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) and (2) The report is still under consideration by the Government.

30.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION*Collie Office*

Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Electricity:

(1) When did the State Electricity Commission establish an office for the payment of accounts at Collie?

(2) How much has been paid in rent since the office was established?

(3) Who owns the office at present occupied by the S.E.C. at Collie?

(4) What is the weekly rental?

(5) How much has the S.E.C. paid in rent since it first occupied this office?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) The 1st December, 1949.

(2) The earliest records of the rental of the Collie office are not available.

(3) Dorsett Motor Holdings Pty. Limited.

(4) \$11.

(5) \$8,465.10 (from August, 1954, which is the earliest firm record available, to the 30th September, 1969).

31.

WATER SUPPLIES*Serpentine Locality*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Are there two watercourses in the Serpentine locality named "Seldom Creek" and "More Seldom Seen Creek"?

(2) Do these watercourses originate or are they supplemented by springs?

(3) Is it true that one has ceased flowing, and the flow of the other is considerably reduced?

(4) What is the cause?

(5) Could blasting operations in the vicinity in the interests of a large industrial concern be responsible?

(6) If so, what steps can be taken to correct the present situation, and to prevent any recurrence?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) There are two creeks which are very minor tributaries of the Wungong River called "Seldom Seen" and "More Seldom Seen".

(2) They originate east of Byford and approximately five miles north of Jarrahdale.

(3) Both streams were flowing on Tuesday the 30th September.

(4) The rate of flow is affected by prevailing seasonal conditions.

(5) It is unlikely that blasting will affect the flow.

(6) Answered by (5).

32.

LAND*Lancelin*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Have residential lots at Lancelin been made available on a leasehold or freehold basis?

(2) Will he give particulars in both cases, if applicable, including numbers, dates, prices, and conditions?

(3) What is the current system of disposal?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Principally on a freehold basis. Some leases have been granted in special circumstances.

(2) 341 lots have been sold under freehold conditions, and there are seven current leases. These have been granted over a period of 15 years, at varying prices due to the auction system of disposal.

Residential lots have been generally sold by auction on conditions requiring the erection of a residence to comply with local authority by-laws within two years.

(3) There are no lots at present available for sale. System of disposal of lots which may be released in the future will be considered at the appropriate time.

33. WATER SUPPLIES

Wanneroo

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Are there any proposals for the provision of a public water supply for domestic purposes in the township of Wanneroo?
- (2) If so, what is to be the source of the supply?
- (3) When can the service be expected to be in operation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Local bores.
- (3) Early in 1970.

34. NATIVES

Inquest into Death at Laverton

Mr. HARMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

When will an inquest be held to inquire upon the death of an Aboriginal at Laverton on Sunday, the 21st September?

The SPEAKER: I wish to make some observations on the subject of this question. I noticed the question only just before I entered the Chamber. I have grave doubts as to whether it is permissible at all. First of all, it presupposes that an inquest will be held, and I observe that this is a matter in the discretion of the coroner. The quick impression upon my mind is that this would not be a matter for which the Minister is administratively responsible.

However, I understand the Minister has prepared a reply and in the circumstances I will permit the question; but I make it clear that if any similar question arises again consideration will have to be given as to whether it is proper.

Mr. COURT replied:

It is usual for the police to finalise inquiries and submit a report to the coroner before a decision to hold an inquest is made.

The Coroners Act provides that, where committal proceedings are commenced against any person, an inquest must be adjourned until the matter has been finalised.

The police must first complete their inquiries before any further action is taken.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Tenders for Supply of Tank

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Were tenders invited on behalf of the State Electricity Commission for the supply of an 8,000 gallon aluminium tank?
- (2) If "Yes", what was the closing date?
- (3) Was the lowest tender submitted by a Western Australian firm?
- (4) Is it intended to pass over the lowest tender on the grounds that a tank of the size required has not been made in this State and let the contract to a firm in Victoria?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The 15th September, 1969.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Recommendation to purchase has not yet been made.

2.

DROUGHT

Freight Subsidy for Agisted Stock

Mr. GAYFER asked the Premier:

- (1) Is or will a freight subsidy be given on agisted stock for movement interstate?
- (2) If so, what is the rate?
- (3) If not, why is not the freight advantage applicable to services within the State to its border?
- (4) Did the South Australian Government give a freight subsidy for agisted stock outside its State during its drought relief scheme?
- (5) If so, what was the rate?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The subsidy is restricted to stock agisted within the State.
- (4) Yes, but numbers sent interstate were relatively small and mainly to New South Wales. It is understood very few came to Western Australia.
- (5) 50 per cent. of the freight each way was paid by the South Australian Government. Rail freights were used as a basis whether transport was by rail or road.

BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Marketing of Linseed Bill.

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

2. Alumina Refinery (Pinjarra) Agreement Bill.
3. Iron Ore (Dampier Mining Company Limited) Agreement Bill.
4. Iron Ore (Cleveland-Cliffs) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and read a first time.
5. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and transmitted to the Council.
2. Church of England (Diocesan Trustees) Act Amendment Bill.
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.
3. Marketing of Cyprus Barrel Medic Seed Bill.
4. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Lewis (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Council.
5. Timber Industry Regulation Act Amendment Bill.
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Forests), and transmitted to the Council.

OCEAN BEACHES

Creation of Controlling Authority: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 3rd September, on the following motion by Mr. Fletcher:—

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.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.2 p.m.]: I wish to make several comments on what the member for Fremantle had to say in support of his motion, which seeks to create a controlling authority for ocean beaches.

Among other things, he said there was apathy and disregard for ocean beaches, but it was obvious, on reading his speech, that he failed to demonstrate that this is so. I presume he meant there was apathy

and disregard in the sphere of local government and/or Government. I do not believe this is true in either case.

It might be said, with some truth, that certain members of the public have shown disregard for our beaches. I refer to those who act as vandals on the beaches; those who leave litter aplenty behind them; those who leave cans, bottles, and other picnic waste all over the place instead of picking it up and taking it home in their cars, or placing it in the receptacles that are provided on the beaches. If the receptacles are inadequate to handle the large quantities of litter that come from the many thousands of people who flock to our beaches during the summer months, in my opinion it is the responsibility of the people themselves to take their own rubbish away with them. In this respect I will admit there is disregard for our ocean beaches.

However I do not agree that either local government or the Government displays apathy and disregard for our beaches. Greater attention could, perhaps, be given in some quarters and places to this question, but, by and large, what has been done is rather remarkable. I invite the House to appreciate the work that has been carried out on ocean beaches in many parts of the State, work that has been performed by local government and by the Government in an endeavour to conserve and to protect our ocean beaches.

There has been an endeavour by both forms of government, in every possible way, to provide facilities and amenities for the people who use our beaches so much, particularly during the summer months. I instance the beaches in the Scarborough area. Here there has been a partnership between local government and the Government, with the initiative being shown by local government in the provision of amenities and in ensuring that the beaches in that locality are protected and conserved.

I think one can readily say that the same principles apply to City Beach. A different local authority has jurisdiction over Swanbourne Beach and it has done a good deal to provide amenities and facilities, apart from assisting with such ventures as the surf life saving club. At Cottesloe and North Cottesloe a great deal has been done with local government initiative in conjunction with the Government.

At Leighton Beach and the newly-formed Port Beach, a good deal of work has also been done in an endeavour to improve and to protect the beaches. Certain work has been done which has changed the environment—I think for the better—by the Fremantle Port Authority, with the assistance and co-operation of local government. In the same way, good work has also been done at the beaches south

of this region. I refer to the Cockburn Sound area, which has changed considerably since the early 1950s. In recent times it has quickly grown into an important industrial region, fronting a great stretch of water that will be useful not only for industry and great shipping concerns, but also for pleasure activities.

In speaking of this stretch of water, it is interesting to note that quite recently a new Cockburn Sound Advisory Committee has been set up, with appropriate representation, in an endeavour to try to secure from this committee advice on matters of pollution, industrial development, residential development, generally, and how the conservation of beach fronts can be married as far as possible to an industrial complex. This committee was set up very largely—in fact, almost completely—as a result of local demand. Two members of this House brought a deputation to me requesting the appointment of this advisory committee. It was an interesting deputation. By and large, its members were keen to have this committee constituted and they requested my assistance to achieve their objective.

They also asked if the early work they had done in an endeavour to create this authority could be supported by me, because they were having trouble in obtaining adequate governmental representation and were anxious to have on the committee an appropriate representative from the Fremantle Port Authority. I also placed a request before my colleague, the Minister for Industrial Development for a representative from the Department of Industrial Development to act on the committee, and he was quick to accede to my request. So I was able to inform the committee of this additional representative.

I think it would be appropriate if I advised the House the composition of this committee. It is as follows:—

Councillor A. Powell (Chairman)—Shire of Rockingham.

Councillor A. Thomas—Shire of Cockburn.

Councillor J. J. Sowden—City of Fremantle.

Councillor W. E. Prockter—Shire of Kwinana.

Mr. T. L. Williams (Managing Director, BP Refinery)—Chamber of Manufacturers.

Mr. W. R. Courtney—Aquatic Council of W.A.

Mr. Courtney is also the Chairman of the Swan River Conservation Committee and the Leschenault Estuary Committee. Continuing—

Mr. P. Garnett—Engineer, Shire of Rockingham.

Mr. A. Ottey—Senior Health Inspector, Shire of Cockburn.

Mr. H. C. Rudderham—General Manager, Fremantle Port Authority, or his representative.

Mr. G. Cooper—Director of Industrial Development, or his representative.

Mr. S. Giese (Secretary)—Assistant Shire Clerk, Kwinana.

As I have stated, this committee was created to comply with a request of the deputation led by the member for Cockburn and the member for Dale.

I will now proceed to deal with other parts of the Western Australian coastline which have been the subject of local government and Government attention over the years in an attempt to assist, generally, in the prevention of erosion.

Mr. Lapham: Before you start on that, can you tell me why you selected the members you have outlined to be members of that committee? Do they have any particular knowledge of the subject in question?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Obviously they were selected to represent the local governments which have frontages to Cockburn Sound, and this followed the suggestion by the deputation that approached me. On the committee there are representatives of industry associated with Cockburn Sound, so here again the representation is logical. There are also local health inspectors acting on the committee. There is a representative from the Fremantle Port Authority, and the Department of Industrial Development. I have also informed the committee that it can draw on the advice and have the co-operation of officers of the Public Health Department, which assistance has been offered by the Minister for Health.

Mr. Lapham: What is the area of their operations?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The mainland coast of Cockburn Sound. Further south of this region, at Mandurah, a very tricky situation has always been evident.

Mandurah is at the mouth of an estuary and great difficulties exist in relation to a build-up of sand bars and sand spits. An attempt has, however, been made with the co-operation of the local governing body to try to overcome a situation that has developed in that area over many years. The Government is doing all it can in this direction.

It might be remembered that about twelve years ago from December until May a complete sand bar was formed across the river mouth at Mandurah, and there was no possibility of entry or exit to the waters of the Peel Inlet.

The local people became very concerned at about that time, not so much because fishing boats were unable to get in and out, but because the water was becoming stagnant and the fish life was being

affected. I might mention that the fishing boats have never been able to use this water a great deal. The occasion to which I am referring occurred, I think, in about 1957.

Since that time, and after having been pressed by the local governing body and the people in the area, the Government urgently decided to build two groynes to control, as much as possible, the littoral sand drift along the shore. This drift often resulted in a build-up and flow of 150,000 cubic yards of sand. The groynes however, have obviated to an extent the formation of these sand spits and sand bars in one area, though there has been some build-up in other areas.

Mr. Lapham: What has been done would rectify one problem and create another.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Actually it does not even completely satisfy the prime problem. The engineers are, however, now seeking other ways to try to control this problem. It is thought that one remedy might be to have the 150,000 cubic yards of material pumped around the corner in some way at the bottom of the ocean level to try to bypass the tricky situation in this area.

While we are as yet far from achieving our ends, a great deal has been done in this direction, and even though there have been very low tides and a light rainfall this winter there still has been an interplay of waters from the ocean, which means that the fish life has not been deleteriously affected.

Before I travel further south and mention other parts of the State, I think I should return to the Cockburn Sound area. I have already said that this area is being built up, and rightly so, as an industrial region. It is believed that this industrial region could work with co-operation in the interests and the welfare of the people who live in the vicinity. We all know that Warnbro Sound, which is just south of Cockburn Sound, has great prospects; in that it could help cater for the leisure time of people who might visit the area.

It should be remembered that certain industry is best sited on an ocean frontage. Many sections of heavy industry must indeed be sited in this area, and I have at the back of my mind the fact that even the Leader of the Opposition endeavoured at one time to have industry sited in this region. I would be happy to hear the honourable member comment on this aspect at a later stage.

I think the Leader of the Opposition made certain promises to industry at the time he was Minister for Works; he referred to certain areas of land which he said industry could have in this vicinity. However, the honourable member is the person best able to comment on this aspect,

though I think we will find there is a record of this in the literature which is available.

Accordingly it is important that industry be sited in this region at Cockburn Sound and that some sections of beach be set aside for this purpose. I refer now, of course, to ports and port installations which deal largely in bulk exports or imports. It is absolutely essential that we have these facilities. The establishment of power stations is another matter that must be considered in this context unless, of course, we want to place them in areas where there might be difficulties associated with the economics of cooling and other features.

I believe that in certain places along the Western Australian shoreline a balanced view must be taken of development and of the use of some of our ocean frontages. Further south of the region I have mentioned we find there is an area under the control of the Leschenault Estuary Conservation Committee, an advisory committee which has been established for some years. This operates with a somewhat similar representation to that which I said made up the advisory committee controlling Cockburn Sound. The extent of the control of the Leschenault Estuary Conservation Committee is to co-ordinate activity over—

1. the whole of the estuary;
2. the Brunswick River to the Australind Bridge;
3. the Collie River to a point where Clifton Road joins the Collie River on the eastern boundary of Wellington Loc. 49.

It was considered that the Preston River should not be included in the area because of its varying course and the control measures with which the Public Works Department had been intimately associated for some years.

A good deal of work has been carried out by the Government in conjunction with the local governing body at Busselton in an endeavour to preserve the ocean beaches there. Certain groynes have been built and a great deal of time and study has been put in to try to overcome the erosion of beaches in this region. There is a request for a small boat harbour for this area, but again we have no magic wand to wave to secure the necessary loan moneys.

Government assistance has been given at Albany to provide certain amenities for the people of that town and district. At Esperance the Government has been engaged for some time not only in improving the harbour—the development of which is quite a remarkable feature, and I say that incidentally—but in trying to preserve certain aesthetic features along

the frontage of the harbour. This work has been done in conjunction with the local governing body in that area. It has been given every assistance by the Government. In due course the local governing body will very largely take over the maintenance and beautification of the area.

So it will be seen that to say there is apathy and disregard being shown in connection with our ocean beaches is to indicate a virtual blindness to what is taking place in many parts of the State. I do agree that more remains to be done, and more will be done. I believe, however, that a statutory authority for the control of ocean beaches is not the answer; certainly not at this point of time.

Members of Parliament have mentioned this aspect over the years and I think two cases were instanced by the member for Fremantle when motions were actually moved by members in this House in an endeavour to secure some sort of statutory control over ocean beaches. One of these, not as far reaching as the others, was introduced by Mr. North, a former Speaker of this House, when he was a back-bencher. It makes very interesting reading.

Had the Government of the day approved the idea of Mr. Marshall, who at that time was the member for Wembley Beaches, I think, it could have created a statutory authority. Apparently, however, it felt it did not need to do so.

I come back to the point that a good deal of work has been done as a result of co-operation between local governing bodies and the Government. This work has been carried out along our ocean beaches which, admittedly, are the envy of those who come here from other parts of the world. Incidentally, I forgot to mention the work done at South Beach, South Fremantle. The member for Fremantle will know what was done in that area to restore a beach that had been savagely eroded for many years.

The Cockburn Sound Advisory Committee works and functions in its present capacity without statutory authority, and it will be interesting to see just what it does. I believe it will do a good job of work. As a matter of fact, only today I had sent to me through the post a copy of an extract from the minutes of the most recent committee meeting of that body. I feel sure this committee will go on from strength to strength and act in a logical way, because the representation on it is very sound.

If other advice is required—expert or scientific—the Government will certainly provide all the help it can in this direction. Accordingly I see no need for the establishment of a statutory authority at this point of time and I oppose the motion.

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn) [5.28 p.m.]: We have listened to the Minister for the last 15 minutes or so and I must say I am

most disappointed with his attitude. I am disappointed not only with the manner in which he treated the worthy motion of the member for Fremantle, but having heard the reasons he put forward I am disappointed in what appears to me to be a complete lack of interest in this particular subject.

During the few minutes the Minister spoke we were introduced to something in the nature of a geographical travelogue in relation to points of interest up and down our coastline. We have virtually been given no reason whatever why a statutory conservation body should not be set up. In fact, if logic were to prevail in this House and the result of the motion before us were to rest upon what he said, I would say that the Minister has assisted in every degree the case for the motion presented by the member for Fremantle.

His whole travelogue concerning instances up and down the coast has emphasised what the member for Fremantle pointed out; that is, that the Government has a completely piecemeal approach to this problem. In each instance mentioned, the Minister referred to something done at some time or other. No overall co-ordinated approach was made to the situation, but such a co-ordinated approach would be made by the type of authority envisaged by the honourable member in his motion.

The other point which was most disappointing in the Minister's remarks and which confirms the value of the motion, was that all the cases covered referred to conservation committees and action taken here and there after injury was obvious. In all those cases there was a need for some action to be taken prior to the injury being done. There was a need for action in the Cockburn area before that committee was established; there was a need for action in the Leschenault area before the new committee was established, and also in the South Beach area.

Therefore those two points—the piecemeal approach emphasised by the Minister as he jumped up and down the coastline, and the fact that action should have been taken before it was—emphasise why this House should give every consideration to the motion before it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are not making much sense.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will explain those two points. The first concerns whether there is a need for an authority. Obviously many bodies consider there is. The Minister mentioned the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee, which was put into motion by local organisations. The Minister went to some length to emphasise this, but surely the very fact that these people in industry and commerce, and the local authorities got together, emphasises that they felt a vacuum existed in this particular sphere, and that there was a need for them to take action if the Government

was not going to do so. Surely this indicates there was a need, and an urgent one, for such a committee. In establishing the committee those concerned were attempting to fulfil a function which we on this side believe should be carried out by a statutory body.

It is interesting to note that the Minister then moved from the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee to Mandurah where he said action had been taken by the Government. However, again this action was taken after certain damage had been done. It is the opinion of the Mandurah Shire that this motion should be carried because after the motion received publicity in the papers, the member for Fremantle received a letter from the shire congratulating him on his move and emphasising that it supported his particular approach.

So the Minister has commented on the value of the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee and yet it was the local shires and bodies in the area which felt the need to establish the committee, and then the Minister referred to the work at Mandurah done by the Government, and yet the Mandurah Shire has stated that it supports the establishment of a body along the lines suggested by the member for Fremantle in his motion.

The Minister referred to Warnbro Sound, and in this regard it was I who could not follow him.

As I have said, the Minister referred to Cockburn Sound and those on this side of the House agree with the points he made. However, it is interesting to note that so far as the activity in the Kwinana industrial area is concerned before the establishment of the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee, decisions were made by the Government departments, but not in consultation with the local authority.

Western Aluminium was allowed to establish itself right on the shoreline; wheat bins are being erected back from the shore with gantries over the beach to preserve the beach; and now an industry similar to Western Aluminium is to be established in the Pinjarra area. This all indicates that action can be taken at the right time if someone is able to whisper in the ear of the appropriate authority in time.

Apart from the points I have just mentioned, a number of others call for early action. For example, there has been an increase in industrial activity up and down the coast since the last time a similar motion was before the House. As the Minister pointed out, motions such as this have been moved in the past, but the last of them was some years ago, and a tremendously increased activity has taken place since then, particularly in more recent times. This activity would highlight the need for some sort of statutory body at this stage, irrespective of any decision made in the past.

Also to be taken into consideration is the rapid increase in population which has occurred up and down the coast, and the greater numbers of people using our beaches. This indicates the change which has occurred since a similar motion was last rejected by this House; and certainly it points to the fact that there is need for the motion to be considered.

A third point is that people are obviously greatly agitated about the situation. This is evidenced by the number of letters to, and articles in, the newspapers over the last year or two with regard to erosion and pollution.

These three points indicate the change which has occurred since a motion similar to this one was last before, and rejected by, the House; and in my opinion they are sufficient evidence to indicate that this is a worth-while motion which should be accepted.

Together with the increase in industrial activity and the increased number of people using our beaches, in the last few years an ever-increasing amount of money has been spent by local authorities and by the Government on our beaches up and down the coast. At the same time, however, because this money has been spent on a piecemeal approach, a considerable amount of it has been wasted on some of these endeavours.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Where?

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister mentioned Mandurah, which is one instance.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That was not wasted!

Mr. TAYLOR: Some of that money was spent to prevent erosion, but those endeavours have not been successful, and therefore this surely points to the fact that a need does exist for an authority to examine this type of work.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What authority would examine it?

Mr. TAYLOR: Perhaps I could cover the Minister's point if I could proceed further.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Public Works Department already examines the situation. Those in that department are experts and they are the ones who have models in their laboratories.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Minister is correct, and I expect he is, surely this sort of information would be of greater use if it was put into the hands of a body which spent its time consistently looking after the affairs of our coast instead of using the facilities—as is the case at present—only as and when they are required.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is the difference between an advisory committee and a statutory authority in this regard?

Mr. TAYLOR: I have a section I will come to shortly which will cover that very point.

Mr. Graham: The Minister is a little impetuous.

Mr. TAYLOR: The situation at Mandurah is one example of work which was not successful. Another instance is the work done by the Perth City Council at City Beach where, despite groynes, failed to prevent the road being washed away. Trigg Island is yet another place where money has not necessarily been wasted, but it has been used on work which has not been effective. This situation is continuing increasingly. Local authorities are spending more and more money on coastal facilities, but they are doing so perhaps without the backing of an authority or the complete knowledge that such an authority might be able to provide.

At the moment local authorities, small conservation committees, and other authorities are all working towards the same end, but, if a statutory body were established to cover the overall position, far more success would be achieved.

I can emphasise my point by relating the situation concerning the Fremantle Port Authority, which has complete control over its own area. Not long ago it was able to dredge the harbour and pump the spoil to the beach north of the groyne. As far as I can ascertain, this has resulted in no harmful effect. A very good beach has been established. The point I am trying to emphasise is that an independent body was able to do this without, as far as I am aware, consultation with any other group or the department the Minister mentioned. The property concerned belonged to the Fremantle Port Authority and therefore the authority was quite within its rights in establishing a beach on that property. It carried out a similar project south of the port when it established a fishing boat harbour and made a land-backed area along the beach there.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Government built that.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Fremantle Port Authority would, I think, have had the major say, at least concerning the beach north of the groyne.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was the Government's decision to build a small boat harbour just south of the port, and it was responsible for another one at Geraldton, something which a Labor Government never attempted to do!

Mr. TAYLOR: That is completely beside the point. I am indicating that these are two configurations on the coast carried out by independent bodies without, as far as I am aware, any consideration being given to the effect on the rest of the coast.

On the reclaimed beach north of Fremantle, wool stores have been established and a shipbuilding industry has been established on that to the south. Whether or not Government departments were responsible for the establishment of these industries, the overall effect on the whole area was certainly not considered.

At this particular time promises are being made by the Federal Government and the Federal Opposition that some action may be taken in Cockburn Sound in regard to the establishment of a naval base. It would therefore appear that no matter which party wins the next election, some activity in this regard could well take place in Cockburn Sound. This would mean at least a causeway across the southern approaches. If this situation does arise, any construction involved will be undertaken by a department on land which the Government owns. However, I again make the point that I am not convinced that any check whatever would be made by the department concerned on the effect such construction might have on other areas in Cockburn Sound. For instance, if a narrow outlet is established, will it affect Point Peron and Rockingham? What will be the effect? I accept the statement that within the Public Works Department are sections which study these problems.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course!

Mr. TAYLOR: Sections of the University are also involved. However, no authority is solely responsible for examining our coast and the coastal conditions obtaining at all times.

Mr. Williams: There is a research section of the Public Works Department at Subiaco to deal with this.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, but the point I am making is that no local authority, or other body, including the Fremantle Port Authority, is compelled to go to the Public Works Department with its proposals before it makes a physical change to the shoreline. There is no-one to whom such a body must submit its proposals concerning any configuration on the coast.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: All proposals must be submitted to the Public Works Department.

Mr. TAYLOR: Has the Fremantle Port Authority submitted all its propositions to the department?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No; but there is the closest liaison between the two. You must not forget that money has to be found for these various projects.

Mr. TAYLOR: This is accepted; but I would hope that the House would appreciate the point I am making; that is, so many groups are involved in one way and another with our coastline. So many departments and so many shires are responsible for some small sections. These include the Rottnest Island Board, which

is responsible for a certain section of shore; and the Fremantle Port Authority, whether the area concerned is north or south of Perth.

In addition, of course, there are other areas all along our coast, including Bunbury. Any number of groups and authorities have some control of individual sections and are able to take action in their particular spheres without consultation with other interested bodies further away. As far as I am aware, there is no single authority to which these bodies can appeal for advice. Several authorities are available, but not one overall authority which would co-ordinate and accept all the data available.

Mr. Williams: If you consulted the local authorities concerned you would find that they have found the Public Works Department very helpful on this aspect.

Mr. Graham: Why don't you get up a little later on and have your say?

Mr. TAYLOR: The honourable member is correct, but I would point out that the Cockburn Shire and the Kwinana Shire, together with the shires of Cottesloe and Mandurah, have indicated their interest in this motion, and have stated that they would like the Government to appoint some co-ordinated authority to control the situation. Surely this is an indication that people and local authorities are not satisfied with the present situation, and that therefore the motion has every merit!

Incidentally, if I may say so, the motion moved by the member for Fremantle envisages an authority, but not an overriding authority; it does not envisage an authority which will take responsibility from other people.

In this connection, it might be as well to remember that the Swan River Conservation Board although it is responsible for the pollution of the river has never prosecuted anyone, as I understand it, for pollution of the river. It takes a reasonable attitude and obtains its objectives by representations. However, it has a watching brief and is able to keep an overall eye on all bodies—whether Government, semi-Government, or private—in the sphere in which it is interested. This, we believe, would be the type of activity which could be carried out by this particular authority.

Earlier, the Minister made a point upon which I promised to comment; namely, the advantages of a statutory authority as against those other bodies which have been set up, such as the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee and the Leschenault Conservation Committee.

I commend those bodies for their approach to this matter but, unfortunately, they are composed of people who have this function as a secondary interest. They have their normal occupations—whether in

the shire, in business, or in commerce—and they come together only occasionally to examine certain matters.

Two points are obvious from this. Firstly, there is no-one on the conservation committees who is able to give any sort of decision promptly or investigate any matter promptly if occasion demands it. Secondly, they can only ask for advice or pass the matter on to somebody else if something does require attention. They have no teeth at all; that is, they have no statutory powers by which to implement any decision. The committees are simply bodies of people who get together to try to do something worth while. Whilst it is worth while, the committees have a drawback in that they are unable to put on any pressure other than of a voluntary nature.

The third point is that the committees are not responsible to anyone. In a sense, they are responsible to themselves and to the bodies they represent. However, there is no report which would come, say, before Parliament as a whole, or before local governing bodies as a whole, to enable their activities and problems to be examined. Each committee has its own problems and would examine them within its own sphere, but there would not necessarily be any correlation between the findings and activities of conservation committees that were set up in, say, Esperance, Albany, Bunbury, and Cockburn. A statutory body would have this possibility.

Mr. Runciman: To what extent would a statutory authority have finance?

Mr. TAYLOR: The member for Fremantle did not outline this to any degree, but he drew a comparison with the Swan River Conservation Board, which does not have a great deal of finance and has a very small staff. Its value lies in the fact that it is approachable. It is a responsible body which can take action when action is seen to be necessary and which can pass on requests to industry and others who may be concerned.

The Swan River Conservation Board does not represent a large draw on revenue. I believe that a body such as the one envisaged by the member for Fremantle would certainly require some Government money, but this would not necessarily be a drain on the community overall. Indeed if it had access to all the information it could obtain from the Eastern States, overseas, the University, and the Public Works Department, on wave action, wind erosion, and the factors we have mentioned, then, as a central body, it could perhaps save money to local authorities, which would be able to utilise the information it made available.

As I have said, the Swan River Conservation Board does not represent a large draw on revenue, but it performs a worth-while function. I believe this is all

the member for Fremantle envisages in his proposal. The motion before the House does not envisage the overriding of departments, but merely an authority which will look at the overall situation, examine matters that may arise, and suggest possible action.

Mr. Runciman: In an advisory capacity?

Mr. TAYLOR: It would be more than an advisory capacity. As I pointed out, the Swan River Conservation Board has not used its stronger powers, as far as I am aware. The board realises the need for industry and the fact that there must be pollution if there is a port. Realising all these points, the Swan River Conservation Board approaches people, makes representations to them, and ultimately gets its way; not by compulsion but by reason. I believe this to be the case, but I could be corrected by a later speaker. Further, I believe this should be the approach taken by the committee which is envisaged in the motion now before the House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course all the plans of the Swan River Conservation Board which involve capital expenditure come to the Government and, as far as possible, the Government provides the committee with finance for the various projects.

Mr. TAYLOR: Perhaps this is the position. However, as far as the committee is concerned the point I make is that many local authorities are now spending large sums of money on their own coastlines and certain Government utilities are also spending money on their coastlines. I mention, once again, the Rottnest Island Board and the work that will be carried out in Cockburn Sound. This is money which will be spent. I am not thinking in terms of money given to any one body but in terms of co-operation of effort.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Tweedledee, tweedledum.

Mr. Graham: Profound.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The most simple things are often the most profound.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I appear to have covered the points I wished to make on the motion. I commend the member for Fremantle for bringing this matter before the House and for pointing out the need for fairly rapid action in this regard, particularly because of development within the State. Perhaps one of the greatest advantages which could flow from the acceptance of this motion would be the satisfaction felt by shires up and down the coast in having such an authority upon which they could call. Also, I believe, the minds of the community at large are well in sympathy with the motion before the House. I support the motion.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [5.51 p.m.]: I intend to vote against the motion for three reasons. However, I will do so very reluctantly and I therefore take the opportunity to explain why I propose to vote against it.

Before doing so, I would like to congratulate the member for Fremantle on introducing a motion of this kind. I think that any action which has as its purpose the protection of flora and fauna, rivers, bays, beaches, or any other natural beauty spots and features of consequence in Western Australia is something to be commended and, wherever possible, supported. Therefore I congratulate the honourable member for putting the motion forward, but I regret I am not in the position at this stage to support it.

As I have said, I will oppose the motion for three reasons. The first is that there has been virtually no consultation with local authorities on this matter. In those circumstances I think it would be wrong to foist a statutory body upon local authorities and thereby remove beaches from their control. In many cases, of course, local authorities admirably administer beaches within their jurisdiction.

The second reason is that, without any question at all, most of the despoliation of our beaches is bound to occur within the Cockburn Sound area. In view of the fact that the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee has been set up, surely it is logical to give the committee a try to see how it will perform before we think in terms of a statutory body.

The third reason is simply that a statutory body would, without question, involve the Government in heavy expenditure. I do not think it is right to foist this expenditure upon the Government if the Government feels it is not justified in terms of the finances of the State.

The first point I made is that local authorities have not been consulted on this matter and I think it would be wrong to foist a statutory body upon them. Because I was terribly reluctant to vote against a measure of this kind, I took the opportunity to contact some of the local authorities which will be affected.

Firstly, I approached the City of Fremantle. When I say I contacted the local authorities, I wish to make clear that I did not contact the full councils; I simply contacted individuals from, or associated with, the councils. As far as Fremantle is concerned, the people I contacted said they had heard about the motion but were not very enthusiastic. They mentioned that they had a delegate on the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee, which has been set up for the express purpose of making recommendations in respect of the protection of Cockburn Sound and the beaches. In view of this fact they felt

the committee should be given a try before a statutory body of the kind envisaged by the member for Fremantle was contemplated.

I also contacted representatives from the Cockburn Shire, who felt that the shire would be in favour of a statutory body. They also mentioned, however, that it would be logical and reasonable to give the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee a try, as that committee had been set up to prevent despoliation of the sound. The opinion expressed was that the committee should be able to do the job adequately. They stressed, however, that they would be in favour of a statutory body if it was found that the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee was not doing—or was incapable of doing—the job for which it had been set up. I think every member would go along with those sentiments. If that situation arises and the member for Fremantle introduces a similar motion at a later date, I will be the first to support it. In that situation, I imagine the Government, of its own volition, would make the move to establish a statutory body just as the Government of the day established the Swan River Conservation Board. When the need became apparent in that sphere, the Government stepped in and set up the required body.

I also contacted representatives of the Kwinana Shire, who expressed very much the same opinion as those of the Cockburn Shire. They felt they would like a statutory body but, at the same time, they felt, as they had a delegate on the Cockburn committee, that should be adequate. These people, too, considered it would be a good idea to let the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee have the opportunity to show what it could do to prevent despoliation.

Mr. Taylor: Did they indicate which they would prefer?

Mr. GRAYDEN: They did not. In fact, they had no fixed views at all. The attitude expressed was that a statutory body would be a good idea. Of course, the Cockburn Shire and the Kwinana Shire are the two shires which have been rather dramatically affected by industrialisation in Cockburn Sound. It is quite logical they should hold those views. However, they were not at all adamant. In fact, I had to read the motion to them, because they were not aware of its contents.

Mr. Taylor: You mean the individuals?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, the individuals. They said, "We already have an advisory body with a delegate on it. Let us see what it can do." At the same time, I repeat that they felt a statutory body would be a good idea, because it would have infinitely more power. The other committee, of course, is purely an advisory body.

I imagine the Government, any other authority, or anyone at all, would be very loath to do anything contrary to the recommendations of a highly responsible body such as the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee. After all, the committee is composed of delegates from all the shires fronting the sound. The City of Fremantle, the Shire of Kwinana, the Cockburn Shire, and the Rockingham Shire all have representatives on the committee. Further, there is a representative from the Harbour and Light Department, one from the Department of Industrial Development, one from the Chamber of Manufacturers, and one from the Aquatic Council. In those circumstances I imagine that any recommendation made by the committee would certainly not be lightly dismissed by any authority.

I return to the point I was making. I then contacted representatives from Rockingham Shire and, if anything, they represented the thought of a statutory body. They told me they have 22 miles of coastline and they feel they keep the beaches in very good condition. Certainly they do not want any interference in respect of those beaches.

I think the attitude they expressed would be shared by most local authorities in Western Australia that have beaches within their boundaries. I mentioned earlier two local authorities that have been grievously affected—namely, Cockburn and Kwinana—and I think their views are quite likely to be at variance with those of the remainder of the shires in Western Australia that have beaches within their boundaries.

Mr. Taylor: Is not the Cottesloe Council in favour of the proposal?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am sorry; I contacted only those local authorities that have beaches actually fronting Cockburn Sound, because I felt that was where the main despoliation is likely to occur as a consequence, particularly, of industrial development, the construction of the outer harbour, the naval base, and so on. No doubt the local authorities which have metropolitan beaches such as Cottesloe and Scarborough within their boundaries would welcome the appointment of a statutory body principally, I think, because they would be able to place the burden of improving their beaches upon the shoulders of that statutory body.

I think that has always been the situation and I am in sympathy with those local authorities. I would like to see more Government support given to shires in this position because I think it is iniquitous that they should be called upon to improve their beaches which are used by individuals from so many other adjacent shires and elsewhere.

One point made by representatives from the Rockingham Shire was that they did not like the thought of a shipbuilding

industry being established in the vicinity of Point Peron. Whether a recommendation by a statutory body such as that envisaged by the member for Fremantle would have any effect on such a proposition is, of course, another matter.

I repeat: The Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee is a purely advisory body, but if later on it is found that as an advisory body it does not have sufficient power, and cannot get anything done, then I hope something will be done to create a statutory body.

One of the points I wanted to make concerned the question of no consultation and I have just dealt with that aspect. A further point was that we should give the conservation committee that has been set up an opportunity to see what it can do; and I do not think anyone would dispute that proposition. This committee is composed of highly reputable individuals including representatives from all the shires affected and, in fact, all interests concerned with Cockburn Sound. There is a representative of the manufacturers, another from the Department of Industrial Development, and also one from the Aquatic Council and the Swan River Conservation Board. Those people are in addition to the shire representatives, and I would imagine that the majority vote would be in favour of protecting Cockburn Sound in every instance.

Members opposite might point to the fact that the representative from the Chamber of Manufacturers would probably be against anything which would affect industrial expansion in that area. But he is only one voice on a large committee, and I doubt very much whether such a representative would try to do anything prejudicial to that area, because he is vitally concerned that there is no pollution of the sound, if only to prevent criticism from being heaped upon the activities of the members of his own association.

I do not share the views that have been expressed by the Minister for Works that there has been no apathy or disregard in respect of Cockburn Sound. I do not think that is so and in this regard I agree with the member for Fremantle. I would think that in the past there has been apathy and disregard. No doubt the Minister is quite correct in regard to what is happening at the moment. At present I do not think anyone is going ahead with anything which will despoil Cockburn Sound or ruin the beaches.

At the moment everyone is conscious of the need to protect the sound and its beaches, but that was not the position until comparatively recently. Take the case of the BP refinery. That was established right on the shores of Cockburn Sound, but there was nothing in the world

which should have prevented it from being set back, say, a quarter of a mile, or even half a mile from the beach.

Some time ago I attended a social function at which there was a top ranking executive of BP who had just arrived from England. He said that he could not understand why the Government of Western Australia had permitted the refinery to be built on the water's edge. He told me it would not have affected the workings of the refinery had it been set back from the beach several hundred yards, or even half a mile.

Mr. Taylor: Is it the same with the alumina company?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know the problems of that company. They may be completely different.

Mr. Taylor: It is going to Pinjarra now.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is the situation with the oil refinery. The Christmas before last I took the opportunity to go to Victoria to have a look at some of these problems in that State. One of the places, I visited was Flinders where there is a BP refinery. It has been set back 400 yards from the waterfront, and the only tangible evidence that there is an oil refinery in that area is when one notices a few pipes—probably 16 or 18, extending over an area of about a chain—passing under the road. In addition, there is a small jetty and that is all. The refinery itself is set well back from the waterfront.

I understand that BP has already considered—possibly not seriously—the setting back of the refinery in this State, even at this stage. That is a rather silly situation when we consider that the refinery was permitted to be built right on the waterfront and yet, within a few years, the company is thinking in terms of shifting further back from the water in order to allow public access to the beach.

That is only one instance, but it indicates, at least as far as I am concerned, the apathy and disregard displayed in regard to Cockburn Sound. There is no doubt one could point to many more instances in Western Australia. Even in the last few days letters have appeared in *The West Australian* from people complaining about the City of Perth dumping rubbish or rubble—it is really rubble and not rubbish—over the cliffs between Trigg Island and Watermans Bay. This is spoiling the beautiful cliffs between those two localities, and it is typical of what goes on. It is an instance of what is happening now, but the refinery incident, of course, occurred some considerable time ago.

I could well understand that in its anxiety to attract industry at that time the Government of the day felt it should make land available exactly where the company wanted it. However, there is certainly no reason, either now or in the future, for our continuing to make these

mistakes. I think the same applies to B.H.P. and its steelworks. This industry is being established right on the waterfront. But look at the position at Whyalla, where there is an enormous steelworks. At times we have been told that no-one could swim within half a mile of a steelworks; yet at Whyalla, well within half a mile of this huge establishment, there is a splendid beach with all sorts of amenities. I do not know whether these amenities have been provided by the company, the local authority, or some other body, but that is the situation.

So even at a place like Whyalla where, as I said, there is a huge steelworks, excellent beach amenities have been provided in close proximity to the industry established there, and those amenities are enjoyed by all who wish to use them. This, of course, should be the pattern as far as Cockburn Sound is concerned.

I realise that we must have industrialisation if we want to provide jobs for our young people. No-one would dispute that and we all applaud the Minister for Industrial Development and the Government for being responsible for attracting industry to this State. However, I think it is the height of absurdity and shortsightedness to overlook the aesthetics and the necessity to preserve things as a heritage for the people of Western Australia when siting industrial establishments.

Not only Warnbro Sound, to which the Minister for Works referred, but also Cockburn Sound, must remain the playground of the population of Perth not merely for the next 50 years, but forever. In those circumstances it is vital we should do everything possible to protect these areas and for this reason I cannot understand why the Government is even thinking of establishing a shipbuilding industry at Point Peron. If that were the only suitable site it would be a different proposition. However, if there is any other suitable site I would certainly hope that that industry will not be permitted to operate at Point Peron. Because of the despoliation of our beaches that has taken place in the past I think we should do everything possible to protect the position in the future.

I have already made reference to the local authority at Rockingham, and to Rockingham itself. My mother has a home there and I take my children to visit her regularly. Every time we go to the beach we make a point of picking up all the broken glass and bottles we see. We fill our boots and our towels whenever we go to the beach because of the danger to young children. If one scratches around in the sand one will find jagged pieces of glass all over the place, particularly in the sandhills.

I cannot understand why the local authorities do not make greater efforts, periodically, to clean up our beaches, particularly in regard to broken glass. I am

not talking so much of rubbish but broken glass. This is something that should be cleaned up regularly. Yet, within a short distance of the jetty at Rockingham, there is broken glass all over the place. It remains for months on end in the sandhills and beachgoers generally do not bother to pick it up. But this broken glass is a hazard, particularly if it is underneath the surface of the sand. A person may pick up several pieces of broken glass without realising that there is a lot more of it under the surface, and it is a great danger to young children, particularly, as well as adults.

Finally, let me say that if we find the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee is not doing the job it has been set up to do, or that its efforts and recommendations are being disregarded, then I would say unhesitatingly that something more should be done and I would express the hope that the Government would act along the lines suggested by the member for Fremantle. I am certain the Government would do that. However, the member for Fremantle is to be commended for bringing the motion forward.

I regret that I have to oppose it and I do so, I repeat, firstly, because no consultations have been held with the local authorities, the great majority of whom would be opposed to the proposition. Also, the two authorities most vitally concerned with Cockburn Sound have no clear views on the matter. Secondly, I oppose the motion on the ground that the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee has been set up as a responsible body and we should give its members the opportunity to operate as such. The third reason I put forward is that as the local authorities are actually coping with the beach problem and, for the most part, are adequately maintaining their beaches, at this stage, I do not think it desirable that the additional expenditure which would be involved by agreeing to the motion should be placed upon the Government.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [7.30 p.m.]: The attitude of the Government to this motion is most disappointing, and this emphasises the need and the desirability for the motion. It proposes the setting up of an authority for the purpose of protecting the beaches in the interests of the people. No more laudable object could be imagined.

The Minister has not attempted to argue against the motion on the basis of the cost of the authority, or of any difficulties which would arise; his whole argument can be summed up in that he said the authority is not needed. The arguments which he used to come to that conclusion would apply with equal force—if they have any force at all—against the Swan River Conservation Board, which was set up by a

Labor Government for the same purpose with regard to the Swan River as the proposed authority in the motion should be set up in regard to beaches.

This is a question of what comes first: the interests of the people or profits for industry. If we go from Whitfords Beach to Warnbro Sound along the coast we find 45 miles of coastline, and of those 45 miles only a very limited length is available for small boat havens or as safe beaches for children. We have to anticipate that in the fulness of time there will be a large population in Western Australia, and a very large proportion of that population will reside in the metropolitan area. These people will be looking for areas of recreation, and the most popular areas of recreation are the ocean beaches, which are already used up to an alarming extent.

I venture to say that if there had been such an authority as is envisaged in the motion when the BP refinery was established where it is, it would not have been given the length of shoreline that it now has; but because there was no such authority there was nobody to put up an argument against it.

Mr. Speaker, you probably know that almost all Governments dislike restraints; they like to be able to do what they wish; they hate the idea of an ombudsman who might inquire into what they are doing; and they hate the idea of a beach authority which might interfere with what they are doing or what they propose to do. They like to be free to please themselves absolutely; but unfortunately, for one reason or another, Governments fall down, from time to time, in adopting the proper procedure. There was an example recently when the Minister for Works got into trouble with the Shire of Mandurah, because he decided to permit houseboats there; but he did not consult the shire about the matter. His explanation was that he forgot to let the shire know.

So we can see what happens if Ministers are forgetful. They can make decisions with which local authorities do not agree, and which may be against the interests of the people. There is a further example: the Minister for Lands has approved of the cancellation of a recreation reserve in the Fremantle area without reference to the council in which it has been vested.

Mr. Bovell: Are you sure of that?

Mr. TONKIN: That was what the council told me.

Mr. Bovell: You want to make sure of your facts.

Mr. TONKIN: I will limit it to the extent of saying that I have a letter in my office in which the council avers just that.

Mr. Bovell: You sent it on to me.

Mr. TONKIN: That is right.

Mr. Bovell: I wrote back that I would look into the matter. You want to make sure that this area is vested in the council. You should be sure of your ground.

Mr. TONKIN: I want to hear from the Minister, so that I can pass back to the local authority the information as to whether or not that is the position.

Mr. Bovell: I will write to you and answer your letter.

Mr. Court: That is fair enough.

Mr. TONKIN: I think the Minister's interjection is most unfair, because he put the matter in such a way as to indicate that I am not telling the truth.

Mr. Bovell: I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the way it appears to me.

Mr. Bovell: You want to be sure of the facts. Because I am not sure of them, I will not commit myself.

Mr. TONKIN: When the Minister interjects and says that I ought to be sure of my facts, that is an indication that either I do not know what I am talking about or I am not telling the truth. The Minister has had a chance to see the letter which I received from the local authority, and I gave him the opportunity to say whether the situation as set out in that letter, that the recreation area in question has been cancelled, is correct or not.

Mr. Bovell: I said that because I have discussed this matter with the department and I have been given some information. I have asked for the file, and until I see it I will not commit myself. I ask you whether you are sure of your facts.

Mr. TONKIN: Under those circumstances the Minister should have kept his mouth shut.

Mr. Bovell: So should you.

Mr. Graham: He was invited by the Speaker to speak to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: Whatever the facts are with regard to this matter, so far as the authority of the council is concerned, I have been informed that a recreation area has been cancelled without reference to it.

Mr. Craig: Is this on a beach?

Mr. Bovell: I have also received a letter in this regard from the member for Fremantle. Did you say this area is vested in the authority which wrote you the letter?

Mr. TONKIN: The two illustrations I have given show that Ministers from time to time do what they could not do—

Mr. Bovell: I certainly attend to my correspondence.

Mr. TONKIN: —if there was an authority watching what was going on. The proposal contained in the motion is that a watchdog should be set up for the

express purpose of preserving for the people the maximum amount of the remaining beaches in this State.

I tried hard to find some logic in the argument of the member for South Perth. I admit quite readily the difficulty which he faces, but nevertheless he argued both ways at the one time. He referred to the fact that BP had been given too much of the beach—a fact with which I agree. I am sure that he must be of the opinion that if there had been an authority in existence at the time that would not have happened.

Mr. Grayden: There is now.

Mr. TONKIN: Surely that is an argument for setting up an authority to prevent a repetition of that sort of thing.

Mr. Grayden: There is one.

Mr. TONKIN: That is all that the motion is asking the Government to do.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Before you sit down will you tell us—

Mr. Graham: He has just got up.

Mr. TONKIN: It has to be admitted that there is already a paucity of safe small boat harbours along the coast. There are many owners of small boats who are looking for these havens; and if the existing pattern is continued we can expect in the following years a far greater demand than exists at present for small boat havens along the coast from Whitfords Beach to Warnbro Sound. For that reason we should take all necessary steps to ensure that as small an amount of the beach as possible should be utilised for industry. I do not argue that no industries should be allowed to be sited on a beach, because some industries could not operate if they did not have access to ocean beaches.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: When you were in Government you tried to get some area of beach for an industry.

Mr. TONKIN: That is right. I was endeavouring to get a petrochemical company sited alongside BP. To do that I guaranteed the company a stretch of ocean beach, but it would not be anything like the length of beach which BP was given.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How much would you have given?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know that we had gone into the question of the length of beach. This would have been a matter to be considered in the light of the company's requirements.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is right.

Mr. TONKIN: When there is no watchdog there is always the tendency on the part of Governments which are anxious to attract industry to be regardless of the interests of the people. You, Mr. Speaker, will recall that not so long ago the Government was bent on resuming quite a

large portion of the Swan River, but because there was the Swan River Conservation Board and a pretty loud vocal opinion expressed at the time, the Government was obliged to agree to a limitation of the amount of the river which could be filled in without reference to Parliament. Governments do not like these restraints; they like to be free to do what they wish, and to tell the people as little as possible about what they propose to do.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not this Government!

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, this Government. How much has this Government told us about the sinking of the railway line and the Western Australia Development Corporation's proposals?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We have told you as much as we could so far.

Mr. TONKIN: There was not a line. So, Mr. Speaker, it should be perfectly clear that there ought to be a statutory authority with some teeth to look after the interests of the people so far as their recreation areas are concerned; and vital recreation areas for the people of this State are to be found on the beaches.

Members opposite, apparently, are not very worried about this. They are prepared to leave it to the Government, and the Government has said there is no need for any watchdog; there is no need for any authority. Well, as I have already stated, if that is so the same argument would apply to the Swan River Conservation Board.

If it had not been for that board one local authority would already be tipping sewage effluent into the river. It was only the opposition of the board—not the opposition of the Government or the shire, but the opposition of the Swan River Conservation Board—which prevented that from happening.

That is why we want a beach authority; to prevent the Government permitting industry to come in on the beaches and take up too large an area. The Minister, in illustration of his case, enumerated a number of things which he called the good works of the Government and the local authorities. He mentioned the good work of the Fremantle Port Authority with regard to Port Beach. Well, of course, the Fremantle Port Authority has already begun to use up part of Port Beach and is depriving the people who use it of that part of the beach. Is that to be listed in the good works of the port authority?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If the Leader of the Opposition had listened to my speech—and I feel sure he did—

Mr. TONKIN: I listened to the Minister's speech all right; every word of it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I said one had to have a balanced view about development, and the Leader of the Opposition said much the same thing five or 10 minutes ago.

Mr. TONKIN: What I am saying is that my long experience, both in Government and in Opposition, causes me to conclude it is desirable, in the interests of the people, that there should be a watchdog. That is why I have been so strong in my advocacy for an ombudsman, and why I introduced the Bill for the introduction of the Swan River Conservation Board, and that is also why I am advocating a beach authority.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Why didn't you support Mr. Marshall's submission?

Mr. TONKIN: I was a very young man when that first came forward, and surely the Minister will not argue that one should not profit from experience and change one's views in the light of that experience. If I were going in the opposite direction there would be some point in the Minister's interjection.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I just want to clarify these things.

Mr. TONKIN: You do not clarify much with that.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It just shows you have changed about.

Mr. TONKIN: All the Minister has done is show, to my advantage, that my mind is flexible.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is so flexible you would change your mind again if you got into Government.

Mr. TONKIN: Would I? I will debunk that one because I will give the House an assurance that after the next election, if this Government does not take this opportunity to set up an authority, then we will.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And no more land will be developed at Cockburn if you get in? Would you say that?

Mr. TONKIN: No, I would not say that.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Some responsibility then, I see.

Mr. TONKIN: What I am saying is that we would set up an authority with some teeth which would be able to point out to the Government—if the Government was not able to see for itself—where the interests of the people lie. And that is what is most desirable with regard to this matter.

The member for South Perth seems to be concerned because some local authorities would be adverse to losing control of the beaches under their jurisdiction. Well, they have lost control of the river frontage under their jurisdiction through the Swan River Conservation Board. What is the difference?

Take, for example, the City of Melville, which has a very long river frontage. The City of Melville has never objected to the existence of the Swan River Conservation Board and that board has had no adverse effect on the river frontage in the district. So why would any local authority have the right to object to what an authority might do with regard to an ocean beach?

Mr. Grayden: Would it be desirable for an authority in Perth to control the Kimberley? It is a different thing altogether.

Mr. TONKIN: It would be the same as an authority in Perth controlling the administration in Kimberley; the Government in Perth.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: A local authority would have a far better idea of controlling beaches in the Kimberley than anybody in Perth.

Mr. TONKIN: But we should accept the situation with regard to river frontages.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The local authority should have quite a say.

Mr. TONKIN: And, of course, local authorities would have a say if an authority were set up. They would have an opportunity to be represented on it and liaise with it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Well, they have that opportunity under the conservation committee.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister's argument is debunked because I understand in the latest *Local Government Journal* the Local Government Association is in favour of the proposition.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Well, I would have to see that.

Mr. TONKIN: So there is not likely to be much opposition from that quarter.

Mr. Graham: So much for the member for South Perth.

Mr. Grayden: Representatives of local authorities to whom I have spoken have been against it.

Mr. TONKIN: On the main shore of Cockburn Sound, from Woodman Point to Point Peron, there is about 13 miles of coastline and already six miles of that coastline has been reserved for industry and, of necessity, closed to the public. That leaves a fraction more than half of the beach, so we cannot contemplate, with equanimity, the possibility of more of this coastline, in large lumps, being given to industry with a corresponding reduction in the land available to the people.

We have reached the stage when somebody has to be placed there to keep a careful check on what is happening in the interests of the people and nobody else. If this proposition was to benefit people

in some foreign country, or some profit-making organisation, one might understand the opposition, but the basis of this motion is to safeguard the heritage of the people at very little cost to the State. So I am at a loss to understand the Government opposition to the proposition.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But I have told you, and the member for South Perth has told you, we have just set up the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee, which can act in its present advisory capacity. Let us see how it works.

Mr. TONKIN: Will this Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee have any authority or jurisdiction over Whitfords Beach?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No.

Mr. TONKIN: Or over any part of the beach outside of Cockburn Sound?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, what is the good of it? Are they the only beaches to be safeguarded?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is the only critical section.

Mr. Jamieson: Not necessarily.

Mr. TONKIN: The sooner we realise how serious this matter is, and that it has to be dealt with in a comprehensive way, the better it will be for the State. The Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee is only fiddling with the problem. What is required is a properly constituted authority with some teeth that will be able to say to the Minister or to the Government, "No; what you are proposing to do is against the interests of the people generally and you should not do it." If the Government will not see reason then the authority should go a bit further and say, "You cannot do it until you take the matter to Parliament." There would be somebody in control of the Executive to make it observe the conditions that are so very necessary in the interests of the people, and nobody else.

Mr. Grayden: In the interests of the people, could not the local authority do the same?

Mr. TONKIN: The member for South Perth had every opportunity to speak his mind, and it did not amount to a great deal. So I do not think he is entitled to interrupt me.

Mr. Grayden: I still think a local authority would know what it is doing if it had its own beaches. If a body was established in Perth it might be called the Kimberleys, and could be called all over the State.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Fremantle is to be commended; firstly, for bringing the motion here so that we can ascertain the Government's views on this

question; and, secondly, for the tremendous amount of energy he put into preparing the case to submit to the House in connection with the proposition.

I would say that the amount of research he carried out was unusual on the part of a private member. A Minister has available to him research officers by the dozen who can seek the information and make it available to the Minister by way of a prepared speech. The member for South Fremantle had to delve for himself, far and wide, which he did with effect. If the members who did not hear his speech will take the trouble to read it they will find a very strong argument indeed in favour of the motion which the honourable member has moved.

All we have heard from the Government in reply is that such an authority is not needed because the Government and the local authorities have done so much good work. Well, so much good work has been done that we have seven miles left out of 13 miles of the coastline to which I referred a few minutes ago. That is the good work that has been done! So, it is high time that we put a stop to this and imposed a check.

Mr. Grayden: That is why the conservation committee has been set up.

Mr. TONKIN: And that is what this authority is to be set up to do. It would not be expensive; and in any event the money involved would be well worth while. If the argument is analysed it will be found that there is very little against the proposition. The real reason why the Government opposes it is that it does not want the committee. There is no other reason. It just does not want an authority to tell the Government to hold on because the authority does not favour what the Government proposes to do. The Government does not want that and that is the real reason behind its opposition. How many things would have been done in this State if we had accepted the argument that they were not needed—"You do not need this; and you do not need that"? As a matter of fact, such an authority is needed; that is the point, and in my opinion the member for Fremantle amply demonstrated the need for it.

Even without that, our own experience should be sufficient when we consider how much beach is left, what encroachment has taken place in recent years, and what further encroachment is contemplated. The member for South Perth, quite understandably, is concerned lest a shipbuilding industry be established at Point Peron. I want to tell the honourable member that I have in my office a map which shows an area of Point Peron reserved for Dillinghams for a shipbuilding industry.

So it is a very real fear, and if the member for South Perth is concerned that such an industry might be established there,

surely he ought to support this proposition in order to see that an authority is set up which could make the Government go very carefully into the question and weigh up the interests of the people against the interests of industry.

Finally, I say that the question before us is not whether we are going to set up an authority; it is a question of beaches *versus* industry. That is the question. Now, the Government will look after industry, but who is going to look after the beaches? We are suggesting that the Government set up an authority to do just that.

I hope the Government will have second thoughts about this. It is not a matter which should be treated as a party question; it does not involve the fall of a Government. It is an expression of opinion to the Government, and members on both sides should be free to express their opinions on this question without being bound by party discipline, because it transcends the interests of Governments—it involves the interests of the people.

Whilst we have ample beaches for the present population, the day will surely come when we will find ourselves short of recreation areas on the beaches of Western Australia. In order to ensure that the maximum length of shoreline is kept available to the people, we need somebody to look after the interests of the people and not leave it to the Executive, which more often than not is swayed by the needs of industry and the possible advantage which will accrue from the establishment of industry. So I hope the motion will be carried.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Murray) [8.5 p.m.]: My argument does not concern beaches *versus* industry. However, I do think the motion moved by the member for Fremantle has a great deal of merit. I am well aware, as are all Australians, of the importance of beaches. It seems to me that our beaches and waterways are part of our national life and anything that prevents us from enjoying them is not looked upon favourably by any of us.

I have a certain amount of sympathy for the member for Fremantle because for some time I have been anxious to have set up a Murray River conservation board or committee, due to my admiration of the Swan River Conservation Board. Within my electorate is contained possibly one of the greatest inland waterways in Western Australia—certainly it is the waterway with the greatest potential. There is an area of water as large as Cockburn Sound within the Peel Inlet, and there is almost 60 square miles of water. I believe this should be jealously guarded.

We can learn greatly from the mistakes of the past, and for some time I have been endeavouring, with the co-operation of the Murray Shire Council, the Mandurah Shire Council, and other interested people, to

obtain permission from the Government to set up a conservation board somewhat along the lines of the Swan River Conservation Board. We are working on this now.

Therefore, when I saw this motion on the notice paper, I felt I would like to be able to go along with the member for Fremantle as far as ocean beaches are concerned. I can well understand the Mandurah Shire Council writing to the honourable member and saying that it supported him. The council sent me a copy of that letter, but it did not give me any direction as to what it would like me to do on the matter.

Over the years the Mandurah Shire Council has had a considerable amount of trouble with beach erosion. A few years ago the Minister for Works came down to Mandurah to have a look at some very severe erosion which had occurred several miles south of Mandurah at a place called Avalon. A good many people will not know just exactly where that is; it is a little place below Falcon. The member for Belmont would probably know that it used to be called Miami.

Mr. Jamieson: Tell them it is Falcon now, and see what happens.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Considerable erosion occurred in the area in that year. Beaches were washed away and there was something like a 30-foot drop from the road to the beach, and this was something that had never occurred there before. The Minister for Works and officers of the Public Works Department were brought to the area to give advice on the matter. However, peculiarly enough—and this is one of the problems regarding erosion along our coast—there has been no further erosion in the area since that time, about seven years ago.

Possibly members will have seen and heard on television and read in the Press the problems concerning the erosion near Silver Sands, about a half a mile north of Mandurah in an area bounded by Merle and Barry Streets. A number of houses almost tottered on the brink due to the severe erosion this year. Some of the people who live there—I might add that most of these people use these places for weekend cottages only; there being no permanent residents in the affected area—believe that the new groynes were partly responsible for this erosion.

Upon looking back at the records we found that years ago there was a broad roadway in front of those houses and gradually over the years the erosion increased, and it was possibly a little worse in some years and some places than in others. The engineers believe, and I think it is the general opinion of most people in the town, that the groynes had nothing to do with the erosion.

However, I would like to commend the Mandurah Shire Council for the work it did to stem the erosion for the rest of the year. That council went to a great deal of trouble and expense to form a groyne along the beachfront, and this has been successful. The council is concerned that it may possibly have to do more work each year, and it may have to put down what is known as a tubby groyne or a short groyne at right angles to the beach. This could involve the council in a great deal of expense. Bearing this in mind, after seeing a reference to the motion of the honourable member in the Press, the council naturally sympathised with him and felt that, perhaps, a body of this nature might be able to give it some assistance. However, I think the council really needs financial assistance, and not so much advice regarding this matter.

Some reference was made to the Mandurah ocean bar, and it was said that the groynes which had been built were a waste of money. I do not agree with this at all. I think if we had not had the groynes the bar would have been closed this year like it was seven or eight years ago for six months. If any project has had more research into it than the Mandurah bar, I would like to know of it, because for some 60 years—or even more—engineers have given consideration to methods of keeping the bar open.

I think C. Y. O'Connor himself was one of the first engineers to give a great deal of thought to this matter. At the time it was felt that the hazard involved was too great and so nothing was done. Over the years Public Works Department engineers, overseas engineers, and universities have taken an interest in the Mandurah bar and endeavoured to advise means whereby it could be kept permanently open.

Some years ago when the bar closed the Minister for Works of the day (The Hon. G. P. Wild) told the people of Mandurah that the bar would be kept open and that a permanent groyne would be built. This was done and the bar has been open since that time. At this time of the year the tides are exceptionally low for practically the whole of the day, but fishing boats can make the crossing during the night. Numbers of fishing boats were able to move in and out over the weekend; but the crossing involves a certain amount of hazard and it is due only to the expert seamanship of the fishermen that they are able to make the crossing safely.

Some pleasure craft might fall into serious trouble while attempting to make the crossing, and this worries me a little. But for the watchful eyes of the many people in the area who have effected rescues, we could have had a severe disaster.

The bar has been kept under close watch by the officers of the Public Works Department. I do not think they could possibly

have done any more than they have. I have kept in close touch with those officers and they watch the situation all the time. I understand that it is now intended to keep the bar open by means of fairly frequent dredging, and I think possibly this will be the answer from now on.

Some years ago a model of the Mandurah bar was installed at the Floreat Park Research Station, and the engineers in charge were the men who had worked on the planning for the Ord River diversion dam. Using the model, the engineers simulated the wave action and the movement of the sand, and were able to pinpoint the best situation for the placement of the groyne.

However, the Director of Engineering felt there was always a certain element of risk. It is a form of engineering which no engineer really cares to tackle, because it is fraught with the uncertainties brought about by the forces of nature. Naturally they were not completely happy with it, but they believe a reasonable solution will be provided with the extension of the groyne and with some dredging. Unfortunately sand has built up more rapidly than was anticipated and the situation has been considerably aggravated this year because of the dry conditions. There appears to be much less water in the river than is usual at this time of the year.

Many of the inland creeks have not flowed at all. The Murray River rises in the Dumbleyung region, which this year has been declared a drought area. Due to the dry season, little water has drained into the river. If we had had a flood year or heavy rain, I believe that the existing situation would never have occurred. The Public Works Department has given the Mandurah Shire a great deal of co-operation. The engineers of the Public Works Department have never failed at any time to visit Mandurah to consider the problem faced by the shire and to assist it, which of course has meant that the department has spent a great deal of money in carrying out its work.

I cannot see that the statutory body which is sought to be appointed by the member for Fremantle could do as much as is now being done by the Public Works Department. Such a body would not have the necessary finance. It could only advise. It would not have available to it the expert knowledge which the officers of the Public Works Department have gained through many years of experience. In addition, those officers are able to draw upon the knowledge of engineers in other States.

Only recently a leading New South Wales engineer was brought to Mandurah by one of the Public Works Department's engineers to consider the problem. He gave a lot of thought to it and had a great deal of discussion with our local engineers.

The Public Works Department has not been slow in seeking the advice of overseas engineers in regard to this matter, which is an extremely difficult problem to solve.

I believe the continued co-operation that exists between the shire and the Public Works Department in this matter is possibly sufficient to overcome the problem. However, as I said earlier, there is a great deal of merit in the motion, and one could almost agree with it. If it is agreed to and it did not do any good it certainly could not do any harm. Nevertheless, I do not believe I can really support it.

MR. LAPHAM (Karrinyup) [8.22 p.m.]: I sincerely regret the Minister is adamant in not agreeing to the formation of an authority, with local authority co-operation, to plan, protect, and maintain ocean beaches, as is suggested in the motion. I consider it is a most laudable attempt by the mover to bring into operation something which was mooted almost 40 years ago. I can recall writing to newspapers at that time suggesting the appointment of an authority to look after our beaches in those years.

As the debate has progressed, speakers have seemed to adopt the attitude that there are beaches only between Cockburn Sound and a spot a little south of that region. I can assure members that the finest beaches along our coastline are situated north of Port Beach. Travelling south from Mullaloo there is Sorrento, Watermans, Marmion, and Scarborough Beaches, all of which are excellent, but they vary in many ways. Some are the sandy type and others have quite a good deal of rock outcrop. One area of beach at Marmion is ideally suited for the harbourage of small craft. The Marmion Angling Club has erected premises on the beach itself and quite a number of small craft are harboured underneath the clubhouse. The operations of this club are only small, but with the growth in our population it is now faced with a problem, because many people want to take advantage of this harbourage and the club has great difficulty in accommodating everyone.

In a short space of time the situation will become impossible unless something is done to extend the facilities the club has provided, or some other suggestion is made to overcome the problem.

At Watermans there is also the Marine Laboratory. That laboratory was not constructed on that spot merely because it happened to be readily available. The laboratory was situated there because the sea water in that particular locality is of a purity that does not exist south of the region. That was the prime reason for the laboratory being constructed there. A great deal of money was expended on the construction of the laboratory and

the amount necessary for its continued operation is also considerable. It is conducting splendid research work and ultimately, as a result it could advantage the community to the extent of millions of dollars.

However, if pollution occurs in or around this area because of oil being emptied into the sea, or by some other means, all the money that has been spent on the establishment of the laboratory could be completely wasted. At times I look at this structure and think to myself, "It is not right that this expensive building has just been placed in position and a great deal of money is still being spent so that the laboratory can continue its work, when we are just hoping and trusting that nothing will happen to prevent its research continuing and so completely destroy the purpose for which it was constructed." This could happen. At this moment we have no authority to plan anything, which is a most haphazard arrangement, and it is the same haphazard arrangement that existed in the days when I and some of the Ministers on the other side of the House were boys. In fact, I used to see some of the Ministers on our beaches in those days.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How long ago was that?

Mr. LAPHAM: That was almost 40 years ago.

Mr. Bovell: No!

Mr. LAPHAM: Well, make it 30 years. I can remember that in those years we faced the same problems we are facing today. Local authorities did not show any co-operation because they had no knowledge of how to deal with the problems that occurred in regard to our beaches. They would collect rates from a section of ratepayers in a small locality surrounding the beaches and that money would be used to solve any problem that might develop on the beachfront. I used to do a great deal of swimming at City Beach, long before surf clubs were operating on our beaches. At that time a fair amount of erosion occurred during the winter months along the beach in front of the tearooms situated in the Wembley Beach area. To overcome this the Perth City Council decided to construct a groyne.

A great deal of argument followed as to what effect the groyne would have on the beach, but nevertheless the Perth City Council went ahead with its plans and constructed the groyne, which cost a large sum of money. The groyne has never been satisfactory. In fact, it has completely destroyed a beach. On one side of the groyne one can swim practically the full length of the structure, but on the other side the sand extends almost to the end of the groyne. It has the effect of splitting a good beach area. It was not a very successful operation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: This is what happens with groyne.

Mr. LAPHAM: I know that, and I am trying to indicate to the Minister that the local authority, with its limited knowledge, went ahead and did what it considered necessary, despite the fact that little knowledge was available as to what effect its action would have. Nevertheless, the groyne was constructed.

There is no authority which any shire or municipality can approach for advice or information. There is not even a body within the Public Works Department which can be approached for any advice on a beach problem. There is no authority whatsoever in existence, not even at the University. A person named Geoffrey Mogridge deals with this question to some extent, and he is anxious to see an authority appointed because, like most people, he considers that once such an authority is operating it will be its duty to carry out research, collate all the information available, and co-ordinate the activities of all local authorities so that ultimately there could be created one complete authority which anyone could approach for advice when they wished to spend money on any of our beaches. For example, the Wanneroo Shire has spent quite a deal of money.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You would still have to go to engineers for advice.

Mr. LAPHAM: That is quite so, but if there were an authority it could call upon engineers for advice if it were seeking to solve any problem associated with our beaches. We have talked about the conservation and the protection of our beaches for 40 years, but no action has been taken during that time. The only move that has been made is that industry has come to our State of recent years and taken some of our beaches away from us and, in consequence, concern has been expressed by many people.

I can recall that, many years ago, an attempt was made by one local authority to place trees on beaches to provide shade. On good grounds it was argued that our beaches are spoilt to some extent, because no shade is provided for the people who patronise them. One shire spent a great deal of money trying to find suitable trees that would grow successfully on the beach, but to no avail.

Beaches in other countries of the world and in the Eastern States have shade provided, but there is definitely no concerted attempt made to provide shade on our beaches. This is one aspect on which the proposed authority could seek advice. It may have to obtain the assistance of experts at the University and to spend a great deal of money, but ultimately we would find that the activities of such an authority would benefit the people of the State. Further, I feel sure that the

work performed by such an authority, including the provision of shade on beaches, would assist in attracting tourists to Western Australia, and therefore it is a suggestion that is well worth consideration.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is difficult to get shade from trees on our beaches because they face the western sun.

Mr. LAPHAM: I suppose other beaches also face the western sun; those in Western Australia would not be the only ones. Has there ever been any attempt to do anything to provide shade apart from the action taken by the Perth Shire Council?

When he was commenting on what the member for Fremantle had said in moving his motion the Minister referred to the question of apathy and the fact that there was a disregard for this question. He did so because the honourable member happened to use those words and the Minister felt it was a glorious opportunity for him to tear the member for Fremantle apart on the use of those two words.

There is apathy and disregard; there always has been in regard to our beaches. It is only when a problem arises that the Government steps in perhaps to give some advice to a local authority or, at times, to assist it financially in an attempt to help it overcome a new problem. But in the intervening period there is complete apathy and disregard for the problems associated with our beaches. This has always been the case and the Minister knows this to be so.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I do not think you are right.

Mr. LAPHAM: The Minister took us right down the Western Australian coast, including Albany and Esperance, without indicating what the Government had done. He did not tell us of any specific action that had been taken by the Government; he merely generalised and said that the Government had assisted local authorities. I know the Government has assisted local authorities, but I would like the Minister to be more specific and tell us what the Government has done concerning problems associated with our beaches.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Those who have eyes to see, let them see.

Mr. LAPHAM: I have eyes to see all right, but I can see very little that has been done by the Government for our beaches. In fact I would go so far as to say that our beaches are in the same state today as they were 40 years ago.

Mr. Taylor: Except that they have industries on them.

Mr. LAPHAM: I do not often go down Cockburn way but I do know it is cluttered up with industry. There is no such activity, however, on our northern beaches.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are not serious?

Mr. LAPHAM: I am serious. There are, of course, roadways that have been constructed, but there has been no planning on the waterfront of our beaches and no direction has been given as to where homes should be built. Homes have been erected in areas where they should never have been built. This is another aspect that could be dealt with by the authority referred to in the motion.

Much has been said about the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee. But this committee was set up in the first place to satisfy a deputation. The personnel of the committee was apparently selected from representatives of interests in the area concerned. If the personnel of the committee was selected to represent only those interested in the area, surely the Minister would not expect me to accept the fact that it should use its authority in an area apart from Cockburn.

The mover of the motion suggests that the personnel be not taken only from the business people associated with one area, but that the personnel should be selected from the whole of the State; that it should comprise knowledgeable people who are interested in this sort of thing. I suggest that the selection of the committee should also embrace the University because then we would be able to get some research done on the question of sediment, winds, sand and erosion.

As I see the position the motion seeks to discard the old method of haphazardly continuing as we are at the moment; it seeks to discard the non-directional trend that has existed for a long time and to replace this with some co-ordination; with knowledge gained from research and adequate development, so that forward planning can benefit the whole of the community, irrespective of where the beach is located in Western Australia.

I have already indicated that in the area I represent there are numbers of beaches which embrace the activities of various bodies such as life saving clubs, surfboard riders' associations, and a number of clubs where boats are used for fishing purposes. These boats use the anchorages provided by the clubs. Apart from this a number of spear fishermen operate along the coast, and we also have established a marine laboratory.

All these activities do at times present problems to the local shire councils. For instance the Surfboard Riders' Association does to some extent present a problem, but while I feel its activities should be curbed in some areas they should not be entirely curtailed, as seems to be desired by the Perth City Council. While these people are not permitted to use the beach area at City Beach, the Perth Shire Council does give them authority to use specific areas of the waterfront controlled by that shire.

This is another aspect which I feel could be considered by the authority sought under this motion. It could decide the areas in which the surfboard riders could operate; it could decide where the spear fishermen could operate; and it could generally control all the activities associated with beaches.

With the growth in population, numbers of problems are arising in connection with the activities on our beaches. For example, with the growth in population in Western Australia one would expect that the surf life saving clubs would have no difficulty whatever in finding members to patrol the beaches thus allowing for their safe use by the people who visit them.

This, however, is not the case. With the growth in population there seems to be a greater scarcity of young people who are prepared to join surf life saving associations. This may be due to the fact that entertainment is provided in other spheres of life and also that surf life saving perhaps calls for a degree of physical fitness and responsibility that is not always needed in other forms of entertainment.

While it is difficult to find new members for life saving clubs, the beaches have a constant influx of people, far greater than that which existed previously. Accordingly the operations of the life saving clubs have covered more of the beachfront, yet their membership has not increased to enable them to control a greater length of beach.

As a consequence the members of those clubs work a lot harder than should normally be the case and problems are rapidly developing. The problem of finance is one that must be considered inasmuch as it is far more expensive to operate a life saving club today than it was a few years ago. Because of the extended areas over which life saving clubs operate and the increased number of people who visit the beaches, it is necessary for the clubs to have four-wheel drive vehicles, walkie-talkie sets, and other expensive equipment to help control the activities of those who indulge in this Australian pastime.

With the influx of migrants, many of whom are completely new to this form of Australian life, there is a degree of risk which was not previously apparent; there is a greater need for the members of life saving clubs to patrol the beaches to ensure there are no fatalities. We have been fortunate over the years in not having a great number of fatalities, but it is very necessary to watch this aspect.

I feel that this is another matter that will ultimately have to be faced by an authority set up to consider the question of beaches. We are not considering the question of grains of sand or the droplets that make up a wave; we are considering the usage of our beaches, which will intensify with our increased growth of population. If the activity on our beaches is

intensified and we cannot get volunteers to assist in patrolling these beaches to ensure their safety we could find ourselves in extreme difficulty.

In returning to the motion before us, I would point out that the member for Fremantle seeks the appointment of an authority to control our beaches, and I think it is advisable that this matter be given serious consideration. The honourable member has not asked for anything of an extreme nature; he has merely asked for an authority. He has not laid down what ambit the authority should have but, in effect, he has asked for an authority to look at the question of the beaches, including the matters of sediment, and erosion by wind and waves.

Who pays for all the activity on our beaches? We all know that this activity is quite expensive, particularly if we consider that the local authority must pay its beach inspectors and that it must also provide for the cleaning of the beaches, which is a difficult and expensive operation. Parking areas must be provided as must lighting, water, change rooms and toilets. There must also be supervision, which is not a small item, and to cover these aspects the local authorities provide financial assistance to the surf life saving clubs.

Because of this a large amount of ratepayers' money is spent. The amount is governed by the area of beach involved. In the electorate I represent the Perth Shire is responsible for a considerable length of beach and it has not a large number of people from whom to obtain the revenue to pay for all of the activity necessary on the beach.

I do believe it is unfair that the residents in any particular shire should be the only ones responsible, through the rates levied on their properties, to pay for the many amenities provided at a beach; particularly as those who enjoy these facilities come from all over the metropolitan area, the country, and even from other States.

Candidly I am of the opinion that ultimately the stage will be reached when the State must provide the necessary funds for the maintenance of our beaches instead of leaving this responsibility solely to those who happen to reside in the shire in which the waterfront is located.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.47 p.m.]: There is a well-known adage, familiar no doubt to all members of this House, that here in Australia, "If it moves, you shoot it up; if it does not move, you chop it down." Adapted to the procedure in this Parliament that could perhaps be altered to read something like this: "If an Opposition member introduces a Bill or a motion the Government feels obliged to shoot it down and chop it up."

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I recently accepted a number of your amendments.

Mr. GRAHAM: With the greatest of reluctance.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not at all.

Mr. Cash: That is unkind.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do not let us go into the details of that, because I anticipate that in the next few days there will be a further instalment indicating how quickly the Minister opposes something from this side but—as has been the case recently, albeit to the embarrassment of two of his supporters, when he had to admit he was wrong and the spokesman of the Opposition was right—on second thoughts, had to admit he was wrong.

Apropos of this, because a proposition sprang from the Opposition benches, immediately and automatically the Government feels it is its duty and its responsibility to oppose what has been suggested, irrespective of whether or not argument or merit is to be found in the proposition. I hazard the guess that in the course of time this Parliament will agree there should be a statutory authority to deal with the matter under discussion.

In so many instances it has been found necessary by all Governments, irrespective of their political colour, for an authority to have a broad perspective. The present backward and petty thinking on the part of the Government that the village squire and his henchmen are able properly to look after and safeguard precious assets of the State is out of place in the thinking of a Government in the year 1969.

We have a national parks authority. I wonder why. If this Government were consistent it would disband that authority and a Bill would be introduced by the Minister for Lands for that purpose, and each of our national parks would be returned to the local authority in whose territory it reposed.

We have a State Library. What about getting rid of that and returning to the concept of the local group being 100 per cent. responsible in every way?

Experience in this country and elsewhere has shown the necessity for some broadly-based authority in order to have a real plan and some form of co-ordination. Let us face it: something has been said by those on the other side of the House, particularly with regard to the rights of local authorities. Our beaches are a national asset. They are not by any means a local amenity. More and more as the people are becoming increasingly mobile, so the patronage of the local resident population is becoming one of still lesser degree. In other words, the beaches are catering preponderantly for people from other areas, either within the State

or from other parts of the world. Therefore it is completely and utterly unreal to suggest our waterfront should be attended to by a local authority merely because an accident of plan drawing gave that local authority X miles of coastline.

Under the present set-up it is possible that in one area development and activity could take place, bearing no relationship whatever to development on adjoining beaches. Indeed works and activities undertaken in one area could have a deleterious effect upon an adjoining beach.

Local authorities have many duties and responsibilities, and, incidentally, the financing of a church is not one of them. However, they do have many responsibilities; and certain beach areas to which the public are attracted, or to which they could be attracted, are virtually neglected because the local authorities, in the very nature of things, are called upon to provide all sorts of essentials, particularly in the thickly-populated communities.

As a consequence, it is possible to go to a place like Burns Beach, a little north of the city, and find that no amenities whatsoever are available except a ladies' toilet and a gents' toilet; at least that was the situation on my last visit. No other facility whatever is available for the public and, of course, the Wanneroo Shire Council, in whose area this beach lies, is busily engaged on 101 other projects of high priority.

If a State-wide authority were established, then, in the very nature of things, more abundant financial resources would be available to it and this finance would be used where the need was greatest, or where the prospects of benefit were the best. At present the situation is determined almost exclusively by the domestic requirements of a community. The local authority concerned, of course, can have no regard for the broader aspect.

Mr. Cash: The Tourist Development Authority does quite a lot in this regard.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, upon a specific request being made. However, this is not only a question of finance, although that is extremely important. With regard to the finance, apart from the assistance from the Tourist Development Authority, the local authorities are bearing the entire burden. What is needed is a proper and comprehensive concept. Surely with regard to the beaches which serve principally the population of the metropolitan area, this plan I envisage should be implemented. I do not want members to think I am becoming particularly parochial, but they will notice that the motion specifies the metropolitan area and then refers to other areas which may subsequently be prescribed and over which this authority shall have some dominion.

I suppose it would be logical that initially such an authority would commence its work in the metropolitan area and move

gradually outwards, but of course taking in some of the more populous beaches in other parts of the State at the same time, including Bunbury, Geraldton, Albany, and so on. Surely some interest should be displayed in our beaches here. One can imagine, for instance, a concept under which some beaches would be left in their natural, raw condition, where certain facilities would be provided for the populace. On the other hand there would be the type of beach developed to give it more of a carnival atmosphere, with all sorts of side-show entertainments, groynes, jetties, and other such facilities for the public generally.

In other words, I envisage two entirely different concepts, but as things are at present each local authority proceeds on its own sweet way, irrespective of what the overall position might be or should be.

Therefore, there is a great deal to be done in the matter of finance because, without being specific, it is suggested that this authority, in co-operation with local authorities, should plan, protect, and maintain ocean beaches; and I suppose that "to protect and maintain" implies that funds would be required in order to carry out certain undertakings. If, as is the case at present, the great burden falls upon the local authority in whose territory, by some mischance, some ocean waterfront lies, then the people who happen to be living in that particular local authority will bear the greatest burden. Surely this is a burden which should be spread over the entire community, because the entire community makes use of these natural resources, and the facilities and other amenities which are man-provided, in exactly the same way as it does with national parks.

Because of the onslaught of nature, there is a great deal of protective work to be done at our beaches. In addition, as we are all aware, people in their many thousands patronise these facilities and for this reason greater attention is needed, and a greater degree of urgency is required, than in the case of expansive national parks.

Mention has already been made—and therefore it is not my intention to go into the matter—of the virtual despoliation of the beaches from Fremantle down to Rockingham and around Garden Island.

It is appreciated that there is a necessity for industry—for heavy industry—and for it to have some access to the ocean. I have never been able to understand why the oil refinery has more than a couple of chains of ocean frontage; namely, a small piece of land on which would be located pipes and other communications which would run out to a jetty. Pipes which carry oil are laid for many hundreds of miles in and around Arabia

and countries in that locality. In these circumstances, surely it would have been possible for oil to be pumped half a mile or a mile to the refinery had it been set back from the beach.

Of course, what applies in that case would apply to very many other industries in the area; they should be given access to, and not domination of, the entire waterfront.

The industrial complex of the metropolitan area with the new railway yards complex, Welshpool, and O'Connor, seems to be planned and situated between Midland and Kwinana. In other words, it is south of the river. Somewhat naturally this is where one would expect the great majority of people to live; that is, within reasonable proximity to their places of employment. Nevertheless, we see the day rapidly approaching when there will be virtually none—or, at most, very little—of our naturally beautiful beaches with their white sands available to this tremendous percentage of the population of Western Australia.

The damage has largely been done, but shame on the heads of the Governments responsible for allowing this sort of thing to occur. Steps should be taken, and Parliament should clothe an authority with power in order to ensure that an irresponsible Government—or a Government grasping for some kudos for the easy establishment of an industry—should not, in the process, damn for all time something which is an asset of the people and which is not the property of 10 or 12 men who happen to be the Ministry for the time being. This has happened.

Industrial areas are also planned north of the city. Surely we should learn by our mistakes and set up some sort of body—some watchdog; some guardian of the public interest—to see that there is not a repetition north of Fremantle.

When other speakers were discussing Cockburn Sound the issue was not only that of pollution of the water. There were other factors such as a complete denial of access to our natural heritage on account of the mislocation of so many industries. I repeat: These industries should have access to the beaches but they should not be squatting on beaches which should be preserved for the people.

Many in Western Australia have been shocked to learn from recent experience that it is possible for somebody to peg a mineral claim round the State War Memorial, to perform similar operations along the banks of the Swan River, and so on. In other words, mining seems to have a priority over everything else.

In the Parliament, we go through solemn processes of dedicating State forests and declaring Class "A" reserves. However,

somebody comes along and puts in some pegs and, if a mining warden and the Minister feel so disposed, irrespective of what Parliament has said on these matters, work can proceed and bulldozers go in and wreck the whole place.

Of course, this sort of thing can happen to our shores, our waterfront, our beaches. We know the interest which exists in mineral sands. We have good reason to believe that underground oil and gas resources extend beyond the land in the direction of Rottnest and other places offshore.

Surely there should be some authority set up by Parliament which would be composed of dedicated persons whose concern would be the interests of the ordinary people—the community of Western Australia—and who would not be carried away on account of political considerations or the undue influence of some mighty influential overseas corporation.

Who amongst us would not be human enough to feel proud if he were to sign his name to a document involving some overseas company in some hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent in establishing an industry? However, playing up to one's pride and vanity could be at the sacrifice of something that belongs to the public; something that is precious, irreplaceable, and for which there is an evergrowing demand, not only because of the additional freedom, leisure time, and affluence which is supposed to be ours, but also on account of our rapidly increasing population and the necessity for still more places of healthy recreation to be enjoyed by our people—out in the sun and fresh air—instead of gathering, perhaps, in casinos, and other places that might be less desirable.

Let us face it: during the time I have taken an interest in public affairs the amount of time available to the average person to follow his own pursuits is an ever-increasing percentage of the working year. Hours of work are being reduced; the number of days in the week on which work is required to be done is diminishing; annual leave is being increased; and long-service leave is available at much more frequent intervals.

Therefore, it is necessary for us to preserve and to plan to make sure that our young people—indeed, all of our people—shall have available to them facilities for doing something better than huddling in houses, flats, or other confined areas. If we allow our beaches to be despoiled, or if we do not make adequate provision in order to provide interest and variation to cater for the different tastes of the community, then we will have been recreant to the trust which is ours. Let us face it: if we speak proudly of our rapid increase in population and the mighty industrial expansion of our State, hand in hand with that goes the necessity

and the responsibility to protect and provide facilities and amenities for the population whom we, in the Parliament, are supposed to serve.

There is the matter, too, of preserving some natural characteristics. I do not know whether I speak with any authority on this subject, and I am sorry the Minister for Police is not present, because he might have been able to confirm or contradict what I am about to say.

Mr. Cash: Take a chance.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand that, at a beach resort north of the city, some physical characteristics, which were called verandah rocks and which were formations caused by centuries of ocean tides and waves, were destroyed by a bulldozer in order to have available, close at hand, large boulders of limestone for the purpose of constructing a groyne in the hope that this would affect certain ocean currents and provide a beach from which boats could be easily launched by those who seek to go out in the ocean for several miles in order to undertake fishing on grounds which are known to them, if they are not known to very many other people. If that be so—namely, as it was recounted to me—I think it is a shocking thing.

I think photographs of these rocks were featured in the *National Geographic Magazine* which is internationally famous. The rocks appeared in that magazine because of their uniqueness and resemblance to architectural works of bygone periods.

There are complaints, which I have not investigated, which have come from the direction of North Beach and Waterman Bay; namely, that certain of the limestone cliffs are being despoiled by bulldozers and graders for the purpose of levelling off in order to make an additional car park. I repeat: I do not know the merits of this case; but surely some body other than a local authority should be having a look at the overall situation. A local authority may have the best intentions in the world towards providing some sort of amenity—albeit a car park—to cater for certain people but, in the process, it may be destroying something which was placed there by nature, which apparently had beauty, and the loss of which would be mourned by very many people.

Of course it is trite to say that all members are aware that very many of our beaches have a complete lack, or a shortage, of proper amenities and facilities in the way of change rooms, toilets, and general facilities which enable people of all age groups and in all walks of life to enjoy themselves in recreational conditions. If the situation warranted it, how many local authorities would be able to afford to build a shark-proof enclosure? Apparently, in bygone days, it was possible to provide a jetty at almost all of our beach resorts. There was a promenade

and usually a bandstand at the end of it, or something of that nature. I am aware that tastes and behaviour patterns of people have varied to some extent. However, it was one of the pleasures to walk out there and be virtually surrounded by comparatively heavy seas; there was romance and beauty for so many people.

Now, local authorities are unable to proceed along these lines because so many urgent calls are being made upon them in many different directions. A competent authority which was able to draw on the resources of the entire State and which would take each place in turn, would be able to do something on a much larger scale than can even be thought about at the present moment.

We are aware of this in many different directions. We see a local authority—for instance, one in the metropolitan area—which is unable to provide a proper football ground. However, because the Perth City Council is so much larger and has so much more in the way of resources it was able, as we are well aware, to construct three league club headquarters with tremendous pavilions, change rooms and the rest of it. A small local authority could not undertake that.

In the same way, a State-wide authority dealing with the question of beaches could provide a facility costing many tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars in a certain place because, in its overall operations, that would be comparatively insignificant; whereas if undertaken by a single local authority it would prove to be a major burden and an interruption to the works programme.

Tribute has been paid to our volunteer life savers and to the tremendous job which they do. In the past all of them have not had the facilities to which they were entitled in order to enable them to carry out this noble, self-sacrificing work which they have spontaneously undertaken, without any thought of reward or payment; and they have to undergo rigorous training, and are required from time to time to expose themselves to the risk of death, either by drowning, by misadventure on reefs or from shark attacks, or something of the nature.

Mention has been made of the fact that there are very few shade facilities on our beaches. I am aware of the difficulties in that connection. Our beaches face west; but that is not a liability in itself. We experience very strong winds which bear salt and sand, and accordingly make it very difficult for more than a few plants, shrubs, or trees to survive when they are grown on the waterfront; but they can be grown successfully. We find vegetation in very many places where the conditions are somewhat akin to those existing on the west coast of this State; but we find too little of it here.

Unless one is a rather hardy type and is prepared to run the risk of being as red as a crayfish—I understand that in these days it is referred to as a lobster—it is impossible for one to go to the beaches in the heat of the day. I have never been troubled in this direction, but very many people with fair skins are susceptible to sunburn and there is no escape for them. A number of people huddled within the circumference of the shade thrown by a beach umbrella are not given much protection. Furthermore, there are many people in our midst who came from cool climates on the other side of the equator, but they are part and parcel of our community today. They miss out going to the beaches, or they go to the beaches at great inconvenience in having to suffer all sorts of torture and torment.

At proper vantage points—irrespective of the local authority in which the beach lies—provision should be made for boat-launching ramps, for facilities for fishermen, and for safe areas for children so that they are not exposed to the thump, the ebb, and the flow of the water to be found on our major beaches.

I have already mentioned the establishment of groynes, jetties, and things of that nature. I have made mention of the necessity to provide on certain of our beaches a 100 per cent. carnival atmosphere which very many of our people enjoy. On the other hand, there are those who like the rugged beauty and nature of the beaches as they are. Surely within close proximity to Perth we could have samples of both types of beaches to cater for those with varying tastes.

Instead of development—I am not speaking of industrial development, but residential development—proceeding in a haphazard manner, approved generally by local authorities because the more dwellings there are the more rates they receive, some attention should be given to regulating how far residential accommodation should be permitted from the ocean front. Perhaps in certain areas the natural state of affairs should be left as it is, even though the natural state of affairs happens to be rough sandhills, scrub, and isolated trees. At least that is something which is typical of this portion of the Western Australian coast. Why should not some of it remain?

Perhaps instead of allowing so many of the permanent residences to be built right up to Marine Parade—if I might use that locality as an all-embracing term—some of it could be reserved specifically for visitors—people from other towns, from country centres, and from other parts of the Commonwealth and the world. If you, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Williams), and I, and the next person all build cottages dotted along the waterfront what opportunity is there for other people to enjoy the beaches,

other than from a car standing in a scorching car park somewhere along the coast?

One could not expect a single local authority to take all these factors into account, and for that reason it appears to me to be increasingly obvious that there is a necessity for the establishment of a properly constituted body, as has been acknowledged by this Parliament in respect of many other activities on a State-wide basis.

It apparently appealed to the member for South Perth as being a little ridiculous for an authority which is located in Perth to be the one to determine, and perhaps to undertake, works in the Kimberleys or similar areas, where they happen to touch the ocean front. We have the Minister for Education and his officers in Perth dealing with education matters at the four points of the compass in Western Australia, and with natives 1,000 or more miles away. There is no great difficulty in that regard. It is very shallow thinking that endeavours to dismiss this worth-while proposition; it is petty thinking and petty argument.

Even in minor matters we have had State authorities. I remind members that when we were faced with the Argentine ant it was not considered sufficient to allow each local authority to set about the work of eradication of this minor nuisance. The Government of the day and the Parliament agreed that there should be an overall authority, and that this was the practical and the proper way in which to tackle the problem. The same applies to the matter which is before us, because overall the job done on beach development has not been a particularly good one.

When I say that I am not in a negative fashion decrying the activities of local authorities, because to go back to the point I made there are very many calls on them for urgent and necessary work—work which is very close to the people living in their districts. In effect the work that has been done on beach development has taken second or tenth place, as the case may be, by way of any tremendous or worth-while expenditure on these facilities, which in the very nature of things cater overwhelmingly for people who are not residents or ratepayers of the district. All the arguments and commonsense dictate that support should be given to this motion submitted by the member for Fremantle, as an instruction to the Government to go into the matter for the purpose of evolving a workable piece of legislation for our later consideration.

I close on the note on which I opened; namely, that there is nothing wrong with this motion, and what it seeks to achieve. The thing that is wrong with it, in the eyes of the Government, is that it emanated from a member of the Opposition, and

irrespective of how worth while the project may be the important consideration is that no member of the Opposition should receive any credit whatsoever, if this Government can avoid it; therefore the proposition must be defeated by the Government. Unless I am a very bad judge, this evening at least two members on the opposite side of the House who are supporting the Government are, in fact, in favour of this motion, and they felt obliged to address themselves to it. To me it is obvious that they have been put through the drill in the party room and have been told they are to vote solidly with the Government in order to poke the finger in the eye of the member for Fremantle, because he has the temerity to submit something of his own volition.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [9.25 p.m.]: This particular debate has degenerated not into a discussion around the original points that were in the mind of the mover of the motion—at least, that is how I see the position—but rather as a hate session by certain members of the Opposition against industry.

Mr. Graham: Your old tactics.

Mr. COURT: If the cap fits, the honourable member can wear it.

Mr. Graham: You should start thinking about the people of Western Australia for a change.

Mr. COURT: This Government has been thinking about the people of Western Australia. What I take exception to is the false view expressed by Opposition speakers that the Government is completely indifferent to this question of beaches. If members will look at the beach situation as it exists in Western Australia they will see that it has developed according to a well determined plan.

The Opposition has to make up its mind whether or not we are to have industries established. As the Leader of the Opposition admitted, certain industries must be located on the waterfront. If we look at the pattern of development it will be seen that we have endeavoured to do this in a sensible way, by trying to concentrate these waterfront industries in logical places, instead of having them popping up at odd places along the coast. This is the work of Government, of town planning, and of regional planning. I submit this type of thinking and of basic planning cannot be the work or the responsibility within the capabilities of an authority such as that suggested by the member for Fremantle. It is something much bigger than that.

If we are to have the employment and the career opportunities for our people, then we must accept the fact that certain industries of a major and a heavy nature have to be located at or near the waterfront.

Mr. Fletcher: I know that. I can see that.

Mr. COURT: I said earlier that I did not think this particular trend in the debate was intended by the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Graham: Every speaker on this side has acknowledged what you have just said.

Mr. COURT: I am talking about the points that have been raised by some of the colleagues of the member for Fremantle, and I think they have raised them with complete irresponsibility. The Opposition has a responsibility in this matter because at various times in the last 20 years it has been in Government; and I suppose the Opposition lives in hope that it will be the Government again.

The Opposition has the responsibility of determining, from time to time, whether or not certain industrial complexes are to be developed. I would suggest here and now that if members on the front bench of the Opposition were in Government they would be as anxiously seeking the establishment of industries as we are, and if those industries had to be located on beachfronts I think they would do as we have done; that is, try to concentrate them at logical places. We would not like to see a string of industries established from Whitfords Beach to Warnbro Sound. This Government has tried to keep the industries which must be established on the waterfront in an area where they can be controlled.

Members opposite seem to have lost sight of the fact that the industries which have been so maligned tonight are under a statutory authority. One of the most powerful is the Fremantle Port Authority. There is no secrecy about the plan which this authority has announced, with the blessing of the Government, and I think with the blessing of most people in the area concerned because they were happy to hear the plan announced. There was no secrecy about the development of the outer harbour and Cockburn Sound, which to my way of thinking is part of the Fremantle Harbour complex.

It is very interesting to note that if one goes to the south of France and sees the great developments that are taking place at Fos Harbour alongside the Port of Marseilles—which is now developed to its fullest capacity—one will notice that just around the corner, almost in an identical position to that of Kwinana in relation to Fremantle, a great industrial and port complex has been developed.

The people there have had the experience of centuries of maritime activity, and they have had the experience of long-term industrial development. What do they do? They have set the area aside as a port

and an industrial area and said they accept that amenities and industry are not compatible. They have said that it is a harbour area and an industrial area, and 20,000 acres have been set aside for industrial purposes.

I believe this is good thinking and good planning and we hope to have the same thing ourselves. Then there would not be this conflict between amenity use and industry use. I submit this is not a job for an authority such as is suggested by the member for Fremantle, although I believe he put forward the suggestion in good faith. This is work for a Government responsible to Parliament and responsible to the people. It is the sort of work done by the overall regional planning authority—not even the town planning authority. In the final analysis the plans, such as the Metropolitan Region Plan are subject to the supervision of Parliament.

The question of the provision of a few trees, or toilets, or the preservation of natural features on a particular amenity beach is, of course, much more a matter of local character. I am of the opinion that this Government, particularly, has taken a responsible attitude towards this question of industry. We have gone after industry; of course we have. We will go after more industry because this provides the real economic security for the people of this State, and provides greater career opportunities in more diversified industries.

We have always endeavoured to locate the industries within the defined areas of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and other places like Bunbury. I can give one instance of the sense of responsibility of this Government. When the Alcoa agreement was negotiated—the first one—we knew there was a red mud problem. It would have been easy to say that we could put it in the sea, but not an ounce of the red mud has gone into the sea.

At great cost the red mud has been handled in basins and the basins have now to be increased still further. We have planned for the next 50 years if need be to handle the Kwinana red mud requirements. This is one of the reasons why we have told Alcoa that it can only go up to 1,250,000 tons of alumina production at the Kwinana works. We can handle the red mud to that point without any problem. However, we told the company it would have to go further south for its next expansion, even though—it might surprise honourable members to learn this—it will cost an extra \$40,000,000 to put the first two units at Pinjarra rather than build them alongside the present installations. That is the responsible attitude of this Government.

That arrangement has not been easy to negotiate, but it has been negotiated to avoid the problem of the pollution of the

land on the one hand, and the sea on the other. So I reject completely the suggestion that this Government is only interested in big business and only interested in industry, and is irresponsible and not interested in the amenity beaches.

There is no beach development by industry at the present time in this State that is outside the original concept of the concentration of industry. Whether some got a few feet too much or a few too little for their frontage is another matter, but again it is a matter of detail and not of principle.

I draw the attention of members to the fact that when we put the C.S.B.P. agreement through this Parliament we negotiated with BP to surrender a very substantial area at the southern end of its site so that it could be incorporated in another industry. We gained this land by supplying additional land inland and so obtained the beach front land. However we could not release it for amenity purposes; it had to be incorporated into the industrial complex because it happened to be in an industrial area right on the waterfront. Nevertheless, we fortunately managed to get some of the land from BP on the basis of a sensible commercial negotiation that further demonstrates the responsibility of this Government.

One would get the impression that if we appoint this authority our problems are over: the trees will grow; there will be no interference with natural features; and there will be plenty of amenities available at all the beaches. If it were as easy as that I think the Government would jump onto the idea and say "Hurrah for the member for Fremantle." But an authority of this kind cannot handle all the natural problems associated with beaches. The problems are tied up with regional planning and town planning; with matters of pollution and wind erosion; and with the question of access. The problems are tied up with the question of how close industry should be to the beach. Every one is an engineering problem and every one is exercising the minds of Government Ministers.

The modern trend is to say that an area of beach is clearly defined for industrial purposes on the master plan and is set aside for industrial purposes where industry has to be on a water front. The Fremantle Harbour itself is an industry and that could not be anywhere but on the ocean. If that were denied, it would show how foolish is the suggestion that one cannot have industry in the Kwinana area.

I come back to my point: the logical thing to do is to say this will be an industrial area. We are not seeking to encroach on beaches other than those which have been declared. The Fremantle Port Authority has been quite outspoken and quite frank in expressing its plans for the development of the Cockburn Harbour area. Railways and roads have been defined to give ready access to the port. We have

to accept that certain beaches have to be used for industrial purposes and I would be the last one to want these big industries on beach fronts scattered from one end of the metropolitan area to the other.

The whole economics of the industries are related to their location with regard to railway systems, water supplies, power stations, and the like. This, we have done. I reject the motion for the reason that it would not achieve the purpose which the honourable member states it would achieve. In conclusion, might I refer to one factor which seems to be coming out of this debate. There seems to be a division between the overall question of beach use for amenity as against industrial purposes and the question of local development.

The member for Murray really touched on this point more succinctly than he thought when he referred to his own advocacy of a Murray River authority along lines similar to the Swan River Conservation Board. He was thinking in terms of a responsible authority directed at a highly specialised river system with its lakes and other waterways. The Swan River Conservation Board has been able to concentrate its efforts in this particular direction, and not bother itself with what will occur on the Ord River in the Kimberley and the Kalbar River in the south.

The Swan River Conservation Board has been very successful and no doubt one day someone will take hold of a river like the Murray River and adopt the same attitude. It is a matter of local management as distinct from the overall concept which the member for Fremantle is endeavouring to try to get in an all-embracing authority to control beaches. The member for Fremantle seeks to give such an authority a responsibility which would be quite impracticable to carry out. I oppose the motion.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [9.40 p.m.]: I will once again read the motion which has caused so much controversy.

Mr. Jamieson: I think it would have been better if the last speaker had read it.

MR. FLETCHER: The motion reads as follows:—

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.

Mr. Jamieson: Did the Minister read that? It is a pity he did not read the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fremantle will proceed.

Mr. Court: I refreshed my memory before I got up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jamieson: No, you did not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

MR. FLETCHER: Perhaps I was a little naive in moving such a motion but I had hoped that, subject to the carrying of the motion, I might have put something worth while through this House rather than merely having contributed so much to *Hansard*, which will go to no other place than the shelves of Parliament House.

I hoped to receive more support for my motion. It was not a political exercise, as has been implied; the motion was moved in good faith. However, I need not elaborate on that.

Unfortunately, in reply one goes in on a sticky wicket. Irrespective of the outcome, I will still carry my bat on this particular motion. As others have said on this side of the House, irrespective of the outcome tonight, the motion will ultimately be carried just the same as the Swan River Conservation Board was established for a similar desirable purpose.

I will deal briefly with the comments made by the Minister for Industrial Development because he was the last speaker. I expected the Minister to support industry, and I do not oppose industry in the areas mentioned by the Minister. I know that is inevitable, and it is inevitable that there will be additional industrial development in those areas. I believe that is all the more reason for the establishment of an authority.

The Minister mentioned the northern part of the coast. My motion mentions beaches in the metropolitan area, and in areas to be proclaimed. While your deputy was in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, reference was made to mineral sands. I made reference to this matter the other night. If there is some activity regarding mineral sands along the southern coast—to which the lady correspondent in the Press referred—then I would say if there was any disturbance of the beach in that locality to the detriment of the public, that area could be proclaimed.

To the best of my knowledge, there has been no reference to the northern part of the coast and, to my knowledge, there is no industrial activity on our metropolitan beaches north of Fremantle. In your absence, Mr. Speaker, some members even referred to Kimberley, and one member on the opposite side of the House referred to Dumbleyung, and another to Esperance.

Mr. Court: But you said in areas to be proclaimed.

MR. FLETCHER: That is so much nonsense and is in no way related to my motion.

Mr. Bovell: We are glad to hear that.

Mr. FLETCHER: I know what made the Minister for Industrial Development get to his feet. It was the splendid contribution made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who, in his inimical style, finds it difficult not to become provocative. In your absence, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition gave a splendid description of what can be achieved by local government co-operation with various authorities without spending hundreds of thousands of dollars.

This is the sort of thing I envisaged in the motion which I moved. However, the issue of industry has been dragged into the debate and I am convinced that as industry increases, particularly in the metropolitan area, such an authority as I consider necessary will ultimately come into existence.

The Minister has said that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority plans anything that has to do with ocean beaches. I wonder if the Minister is listening to me now. However, the M.R.P.A. does not take samples of water from the harbour to ascertain if any contamination exists. This was mentioned by the member for Karrinyup. In your temporary absence from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, that honourable member stated that the C.S.I.R.O. and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna had established a marine laboratory in his locality, and he explained the reason for its being constructed on that particular site; the reason being that the water at that particular spot was of greater purity than at other locations along our coastline. The water there is free of any contamination that would be detrimental to the marine life on which the laboratory is conducting its research and experiments. If there was no need to go that far north along our coastline to construct this marine laboratory, why was it not established in Cockburn Sound?

I have noted and accepted the statement that 350 tons of gypsum is emptied into that harbour daily by means of a pipe. Does any member consider that marine life would flourish in that locality after the waters had been contaminated with such material?

Mr. Jamieson: We will have a gypsum island there before long.

Mr. FLETCHER: As I pointed out in my introductory speech, that locality is regarded as a nursery for marine life, and there is no doubt that deposits of gypsum in the waters at that spot would certainly be detrimental.

Mr. Young: Where was this 350 tons of gypsum deposited?

Mr. FLETCHER: It is emptied into the sea through a pipe about half a mile out in Cockburn Sound and it then bubbles to the surface. I liken the situation to that which occurred off the Bunbury beach at

one time when the water was discoloured by some yellow effluent material. I am not sure what it was. It is this type of operation which I think an authority should police.

Mr. Court: That particular discharge you are talking about has been scientifically evaluated and accepted.

Mr. FLETCHER: I suppose the Minister would say that if this were referred to the M.R.P.A. it would decide it was not detrimental to fish.

Mr. Williams: It is not detrimental to the fish. One can catch plenty down there.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not know whether it is or not. I made the point the other evening that other materials could be tipped into the ocean and we could have a situation which was experienced on the River Rhine. On one occasion millions of fish were found to be floating on the surface of the waters of the Rhine as a result of the deposit of some unknown material into the river, which material eventually found its way out to sea.

I return to the point that the Minister has said that the M.R.P.A. pays close attention to housing development or any other type of development. Nevertheless, the M.R.P.A. does not take samples of water from the harbour. I would point out that the Swan River Conservation Board does take samples of water from the river. It takes samples of water in the vicinity of the C.S.B.P. works at North Fremantle to ensure that the acidity in the water at that location does not rise above a certain level. The board would probably also take samples of water upstream to check if any pollution is occurring in those reaches, but this is the sort of activity that could be carried out by the beach authority suggested in my motion.

The Minister also stated that the Fremantle Port Authority could supervise our beaches. That authority does supervise any spillage of oil from ships, and takes action to prosecute the skipper of the offending ship. However, the Fremantle Port Authority has very limited time and scope to supervise all the activities that should be supervised in the situation which now exists on our beaches and which is continuing to develop.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that during your temporary absence from the Chamber, the Minister for Works treated my motion in a cavalier manner. Quite frankly his speech did not afford me much opportunity to make a reply. The lack of substance in his reply rather disappointed me. He gave the impression that my motion, in some way, reflected on the activities of the Government or on local government. I hope the Minister is listening to what I am saying. However, it will go on record that I was not condemning

local government or the Government itself by implication or in any other way in the motion I have moved.

I was not even condemnatory of the Fremantle Port Authority, because if my speech is perused it will reveal that I have referred to the co-operation that is shown by the Fremantle Port Authority and that I appreciate the facilities that have been provided by it at Port Beach and Leighton Beach. I am only hoping that an authority, as suggested in my motion, would make it possible for such work to be performed at other beaches along our coastline.

When I referred to apathy and disregard in my introductory speech, I was not in any way reflecting on any authority—including the Government. I was merely stating that apathy and disregard were shown by members of the public. Other members, like myself, made reference to the fact that local authorities provide facilities which all those who visit our beaches can enjoy, including people from the country.

I made the point the other evening that, so far as Fremantle is concerned, members would be astounded to learn of the limited number of ratepayers in that area who are responsible for providing the money to make available facilities on our beaches for people who come from places as far distant as Wyndham, Esperance, Kalgoorlie, and other outlying parts.

Country and other members could assist me by supporting the motion to ensure that an authority is constituted which will continue to make provision for adequate facilities on our beaches for the benefit of all people throughout the State. The Minister for Works, in the course of his speech, mentioned Scarborough, Cottesloe, North Cottesloe, and other beaches, I have read a letter written by a lady in which she expressed objection to what she considered was a necessary obstruction race to reach a beach, which beach is in the Minister's own electorate.

The voluntary committee, in regard to which the Minister made great play, came into existence only as a result of a deputation that was met by him. This committee has been in existence for about two months only. Prior to its being constituted the committee sent a letter to several Government departments, including the Fremantle Port Authority, the Department of Industrial Development, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board, and the Public Health Department, asking them if they would care to nominate a representative to act on the committee.

The Minister is of the opinion that this voluntary committee would be a satisfactory substitute for the authority I desire created in accordance with the terms of my motion. I would further point out

that the voluntary committee did not receive any reply to the letters sent out to the various Government departments. Not one department indicated whether it was interested. It was only after the Minister had met a deputation from the committee that any department agreed to appoint a representative to the committee.

I do not know whether the Minister applied pressure or how it happened, but let me inform the Minister that I was aware of what was going on in the area, because I received a copy of the minutes setting out the activities of the committee. As a matter of fact I received copies of minutes of the deputation of the local authorities concerned, but I set my sights higher than my own particular locality because I wanted to help areas throughout the State. My motion seeks to achieve that very desirable purpose and I did hope for more support from the other side of the House.

All my motion asks for is initiative from the Government. We on this side of the House cannot impose this authority on the Government. All we ask for is co-operation from a sufficient percentage of members on that side of the House to ensure that the motion is carried. This is not a directive but merely a suggestion to the Government that the type of body mentioned should be created.

I cannot see why everything that emanates from this side of the House should be wrong while everything that emanates from that side is right. The Minister said that a statutory authority was not necessary at this point of time. He harked back to 1958 which was before you, Mr. Speaker, and I were members of this House, when the then member for Wembley Beaches introduced a similar motion.

I made reference to this aspect in my remarks. The Minister wanted to know why we on this side of the House, as the Government of the day, did not carry the motion at that time. I said I would give an undertaking not to embarrass members opposite over the stand they took if they did not remind us of the situation that occurred in 1958.

All I can say is that the Minister for Works, the Minister for Industrial Development, and the past member for Claremont were not unenthusiastic about the motion at that time; the Ministers adopted a different line then from what they are taking now.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I did not. I said there should be the same thing then as I have said now—that the Government and local government should work together.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is what my motion advocates; it advocates the creation of an authority with local government co-operation. I undertook not to hark back to that period. I could remind members

of what was said at that time, but I am only supposed to reply to the debate that took place earlier this evening.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Let us see how the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee goes.

Mr. FLETCHER: As I have already pointed out, the other States support this type of legislation. This fact can be found in my previous comments in *Hansard*; that in Queensland and Victoria there exists legislation of the type I have described. The copies of *Hansard* show that the Country Party, the Liberal Party, and the Labor Party in the conservative State of Queensland joined together for the almost identical purpose envisaged in my motion.

I will not weary the House with the comment that was made on that occasion, but in one place the conservative Premier thanks the Leader of the Opposition for his co-operation in this respect, and the members congratulate each other on the good job done in creating the authority they did.

There is nothing new about this. I have the legislation before me in respect of Queensland and Victoria. Even tiny Tasmania takes care of its sand dunes, and this will make interesting reading for members opposite. However, I will not deal with that aspect now even though sand dunes were mentioned at great length this evening.

The Minister made reference to the work that was done by the Government to assist the Fremantle City Council in connection with the South Fremantle beach. I admit that assistance was given, but prior to the building of a groyne south of South Beach the beach there was really beautiful. This, however, was destroyed by haphazard development which had the effect of erosion which caused South Beach to disappear. It was also the cause of the pine trees and the foreshore disappearing.

Would not an authority of the type I have advocated have seen this possibility; would it not have prevented the waste of thousands of dollars as a result of the wrong movements that were made? On the 28th August I asked the Treasurer the following questions:—

- (1) Does the University or any other authority indulge in research into ocean beach erosion?
- (2) Is any Treasury or other grant made for such a purpose?
- (3) If so, to what extent?

I received the following reply:—

- (1) Some work is being undertaken at present on ocean beach erosion by the University and the Public Works Department.
- (2) No, but expenditure by the Public Works Department is met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

In effect, a very limited amount of research is done in this respect. An authority as envisaged in the motion could have seen this coming.

Mr. Grayden: Why does not the conservation committee have jurisdiction over all parts of the State, including the Kimberleys?

Mr. FLETCHER: I was making the point that thousands of dollars have been wasted as a consequence of trying to restore a situation that developed through bad management, for want of a better term.

I rebut the argument of the Minister; because I remember a groyne that was built close to the South Fremantle power station, and this caused the beach immediately north to encroach on the Robb Jetty area, so that one could walk out to half the length of that jetty on dry land, whereas previously one would have been in 8 feet of water. These are the types of situations which my motion endeavours to prevent from occurring, not only in the metropolitan area but in other areas to be proclaimed.

In passing I might mention that the Minister, in reply to my submissions, did not make any reference to areas to be proclaimed. It caused me concern that he treated my motion in such a cavalier manner. He satisfied himself that an authority has been created which will look after the needs in Cockburn Sound. I have a broader horizon than that, and so has my motion.

Mr. Grayden: Wyndham is 2,000 miles away.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will deal with the member for South Perth when I come to his contribution to the debate. Prevention would be better than any subsequent cure, and if the authority which I am advocating had been established that would have been achieved.

The letter which was referred to by the member for Cockburn came from a certain local authority. It contains only one paragraph. It is from the Shire of Mandurah. The letter states—

I have been requested to convey to you this Council's endorsement of your recent efforts towards the introduction of legislation aimed at the appointment of a statutory authority through which corrective measures to combat the problem of erosion and pollution to foreshore reserves and beaches of this State, may be investigated.

Shire Clerk.

I have received commendation from that local authority. I have also received commendation at greater length from other local authorities for having moved the motion. The

member for Murray has admitted that the Shire of Mandurah also forwarded a copy of the letter to him. He said that he would like to support my motion; I have no doubt that his shire would also like him to support it. I am sure that the wish was the father to the thought, when the Shire of Mandurah sent the correspondence to the member for Murray, in the hope that he would support my motion; otherwise why would it have sent it to him? However, that is his problem.

Mr. Grayden: The Swan River Conservation Board controls all rivers in the State?

Mr. FLETCHER: It is doing a very good job.

Mr. Graham: I think the member for South Perth is 1,000 miles away!

Mr. FLETCHER: If the member for South Perth is trying to say that my motion is worthless in this respect, I would point this out to him: if mining activities, of mineral sands for example, are to take place at a centre 1,000 miles from here or at Esperance, or other coastal points, and they prove to be detrimental to the beaches, I am sure he will agree that the local authority concerned would like the assistance of an authority, such as the one I have proposed, to ensure the retention and the maintenance of the beaches. I have no doubt that certain local authorities as far away as Wyndham or the Kimberleys would welcome the assistance I have mentioned.

The member for South Perth raised certain matters, and indicated that he would like to support my motion. Let me inform him that I would like his support.

Mr. Grayden: If there is any need for it.

Mr. FLETCHER: There is. I have demonstrated that some local authorities have intimated that their finances and their general purposes committees have given consideration to my motion, but that they will not commit themselves until such time as the full councils have endorsed the recommendations. Does that satisfy the member for South Perth and others who think that I am making this move on my own initiative? Local authorities meet only once a month, and this motion has been on the notice paper for a very limited time. As a consequence a large number of local authorities have not had time to hold meetings to confirm the recommendations which have been made by the various committees.

In answer to the member for South Perth as to the attitude of local government in general to this matter, I would refer him to the *Local Government Journal* of August, 1969. The editorial is headed, "The Price of Pollution." The honourable member implied that this

motion did not have the blessing of local authorities, yet the question of pollution merited editorial comment.

Mr. Grayden: I understand this question has been discussed by the local authorities.

Mr. FLETCHER: I wish the member for South Perth would not delay the House by his interjections. Although I am fighting a lost cause, he should allow me to proceed. I want to carry my bat along quietly. In the editorial of the journal to which I have made reference, the following appears:—

240 million gallons of waste are flushed into it every day from the nation's capital.

This is the Potomac River. The editorial points out that the Missouri River is filled with animal grease balls as large as oranges from the Omaha meat packers. That is the sort of thing my motion seeks to prevent.

Relative to that I draw the attention of members to the issue which arose over the discharge of livers, intestines, and offal of animals into Cockburn Sound from a private abattoir. This was not from the very well managed Government abattoir. This filth drifted out into the sound from a private abattoir. The matter received headlines in the Press. One headline was, "Statement by abattoir challenged." The incident was repeated many times, until it became almost a public scandal in the Fremantle area before it was stopped. Another report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 27th May, 1969, under the heading, "Still More Pollution."

The editorial of the *Local Government Journal* to which I have referred states that, as a consequence of the pollution, no marine life at all, not even sludge worms, is to be found. So not even sludge worms exist in an area of industrial pollution.

Mr. Grayden: Where is that?

Mr. FLETCHER: Overseas. I should read the whole of that editorial to make it more coherent, but I shall not do so. The Missouri River rises in a certain area; the water flows to the sea, and it carries pollution along its course. I want to make sure that a similar situation does not occur in this State.

On page 12 of the same journal appears something that is consistent with my motion. It is under the heading, "Coping with Erosion on Sea Fronts." Does that satisfy the member for South Perth that the motion is not a capricious one, put forward without the endorsement of local authorities? Under that heading the following appears:—

With new areas of coastline having been thrown open for development, and cases of erosion having caused concern, the following article by R. W. Condon and D. A. Barr, published in the *Journal of the Soil Conservation Service of New South Wales* last year,

will give some advice to local authorities in coping with a very real and dangerous problem.

The article then continues under the headings of "Preservation of Existing Frontal Dune" and "Reconstruction and Stabilisation of Eroded Frontal Dune." It gives paragraph after paragraph of advice to local authorities on pages 12 and 14. However, I have read enough of it to illustrate my point.

Mr. Dunn: Does it recommend anywhere the establishment of a board?

Mr. Grayden: No, it does not!

Mr. FLETCHER: No; but I do, in order to provide the very protection the people in local authorities want. My motion refers to co-operation with local authorities. These are the people I am trying to satisfy even if those on the other side of the House, through the activities of the Government, are not.

I do not pretend to be an expert. However, in an article headed, "The battle of the beaches" in *The West Australian* of the 17th September, reference is made to the fact that Mr. Geoffrey Mogridge, lecturer in civil engineering at the University, has been doing research on sediment movement; and it is stated in the article that he favours an overall beach authority. So I find that I am in rather distinguished company.

Another authority is referred to in the same article, in which it is stated that University experts on erosion favour the establishment of a beach authority. Also in the same article is the statement by Mr. Mogridge that a lack of co-ordination has been the cause of some of the erosion problems at resort centres south of Perth. Therefore I have found a lot of expert opinions in excess of the one expressed by the member for Fremantle, who advocates the same thing. However, I regret to say my motion is being rejected by those on the other side of the House.

I would like the member for South Perth to note that the Fremantle City Council is more enthusiastic than he implied, as also are the Cockburn and other shires which have communicated with me on the matter. As anyone who has been connected with local government would know, it is possible for a committee to recommend endorsement of a proposal, but it would be endorsed only by the full council. Not until it has received this full endorsement would it become the policy of the particular council concerned. I could quote correspondence which would be rather premature until such time as I receive further correspondence which I will subsequently, but not, unfortunately, until the death of this particular motion.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I know one Fremantle city councillor who would support you wholeheartedly!

Mr. FLETCHER: Lack of time will prevent my receiving the correspondence I know will ultimately flow to me.

Mr. Grayden: It may be the other way.

Mr. FLETCHER: It will not be the other way. I happen to know a sufficient number of councillors with whom I have spoken, to know it will not be the other way. As a matter of fact, I have one councillor in my own family, and as a consequence I am better informed on the subject than is the unfortunate interjector.

Mr. Williams: Why is he unfortunate?

Mr. Graham: He is just built that way.

Several members interjected.

Mr. FLETCHER: I wish members would be quiet. As I said earlier this evening, and also when introducing the motion—and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made the point—a number of local authorities have disproportionate areas of coastline when compared with the number of ratepayers from whom the money must be obtained in order to maintain them. My motion attempts to help local authorities in that position because it is beyond their economic capacity to adequately maintain the beaches with which they have been endowed. Through my motion I wanted an authority established to assist local authorities in this position.

I must point out that country members who come down to the metropolitan area for holidays, make use of these beaches, but they do not contribute rates to the particular authority which must maintain those beaches.

Mr. Gayfer: What about Dumbleyung Lake? The local authority concerned must maintain that.

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Avon just referred to the Dumbleyung Lake and, if there is such a place, the local authority concerned would maintain the facilities on it, facilities enjoyed also by non-ratepayers. However, those facilities have always been the responsibility of that local authority. I have no doubt that other local authorities would like assistance to be received as would the local authority at Dumbleyung—wherever that is!

If I remember correctly, the Minister stated that a statutory authority could not take care of all sorts of industrial activity in, for example, the Rockingham area. Reference was also made to the likelihood of a shipbuilding industry being established there. My motion has nothing at all to do with that. I would submit that section 27 of the Fremantle Port Authority Act already provides machinery for the very thing which causes the member for South Perth to be concerned regarding the shipbuilding establishment. The port authority already has the right to grant such a lease for such a purpose.

The member for South Perth made reference to glass and rubbish on beaches. This was also referred to by a Press correspondent who said she was concerned about the filth and contamination which were to be found on our beaches in the metropolitan area. Reference was also made to the scum, orange peel, and other refuse to be found on the beaches.

Since this has been raised, let me just briefly inform members that I wrote overseas and received in reply all sorts of material. I could not introduce it when I moved my motion, but it is pertinent now in view of the comments already made. In correspondence I received from America, reference was made to eight beaches, which were outlined. It was stated that these beaches are visited by 84,000,000 people each summer.

The pertinent part, which I think is particularly significant in view of the contribution made by another member, refers to Honolulu beaches. I have been informed that there are no private beaches in the Waikiki area. This, of course, perhaps implies that there are private beaches in America.

Mr. Williams: There are a lot in America.

Mr. FLETCHER: The correspondence I received shows how the authorities cope with the very problem which causes concern to the member for South Perth and the lady who contributed a letter to the Press.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER: Is that all, Mr. Speaker? The following information was received by me:—

At 5.00 a.m. the City of Honolulu Public Works Department tractor cleans, scrapes the beach surface, rakes and vacuums the sand area to free it of filter cigarette butts and and debris (forgotten wet towels covered by sand, a novel, a ball or careless discarded picnic material).

There are severe penalties for "litter bugs".

There are ample and attractive bins to collect debris and the bins are emptied DAILY or several times over weekends.

There are constant reminders on TV, radio and in GRADE and HIGH Schools about anti-litter.

Gasoline stations GIVE AWAY FREE litter bags for automobiles.

In Western Australia, I might add, these are sold for 45c each!

I thank members from this side of the House for their contributions to the debate, and I thank the member for South Perth for his contribution and for the fact

that he would like to support me. I also thank the member for Murray because he stated that he would like to support me also.

Even at this late stage I ask members to have second thoughts and to join me in what I advocate. I desire the Government to acknowledge the need for the authority I have requested. We have promised this type of legislation on the last two occasions when we made election policy speeches, and I ask that we be given an opportunity to implement our desires.

I accept the fact that, as a consequence of the opposition from the other side of the House, I cannot change the situation. I very much regret the response which my motion has evoked from that side; I had hoped it would be received more enthusiastically.

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

Ayes—18

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Graham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Harman	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Davies

(Teller)

Noes—22

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir David Brand	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. Kitney	Mr. Young
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hall	Mr. Burt
Mr. Toms	Mr. Rushton
Mr. May	Dr. Henn
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Bateman	Mr. Stewart

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

EXMOUTH GULF SOLAR SALT INDUSTRY AGREEMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

THE PERPETUAL EXECUTORS TRUSTEES AND AGENCY COMPANY (W.A.) LIMITED ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [10.31 p.m.]: The Perpetual Executors Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.) Limited was incorporated

in this State on the 2nd August, 1922, and its good standing as a local business entity is, I believe, favourably known.

The effect of the adoption of this Bill will be to take the scheme of deposit and investment operated by the Perpetual Company through the medium of its "common trust fund" out of the ambit of division 5 of part IV of the company's Act. This means that the company will be enabled to operate its common trust fund under the authority of its private Act and on a scale that will provide substantial accretions of capital for property and other development from small and large investments made with the company.

The Government sees no objection to the passage of the Bill and accordingly supports it.

Question put and passed

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

**THE WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE
EXECUTOR AND AGENCY COMPANY
LIMITED ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 2)**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [10.34 p.m.]: The West Australian Trustee Executor and Agency Company Limited, one of the State's oldest and most respected companies, was incorporated on the 8th November, 1892.

The effect of the adoption of this Bill will be to take the scheme of deposit and investment operated by the West Australian Trustee Company through the medium of its "common trust fund" out of the ambit of division 5 of part IV of the company's Act. This means that the company will be enabled to operate its common trust fund under the authority of its private Act and on a scale that will provide substantial accretions of capital for property and other development from small and large investments made with the company.

The Government sees no objection to the passage of the Bill and accordingly supports it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 2nd October, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

ELECTRICITY

1.

Accounts of Strata Title Holders

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it a fact that tenement owners at Elanora Flats, Ventnor Street, Scarborough, are not issued with separate accounts by the State Electricity Commission even though separate titles to property are held under the Strata Titles Act?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that owners of the above properties employ a secretary to issue individual accounts?
- (3) Does the Minister consider the action of the State Electricity Commission in issuing a combined account is justified when a separate title to property is held under the Strata Titles Act?
- (4) If not, will he take steps to ensure that individual accounts are rendered in future?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) See (3).

2.

WOOL SALES

Payment of Proceeds

The Hon. G. W. BERRY (for The Hon. I. G. Medcalf) asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the prompt date for payment of wool sale proceeds at Albany Sale No. 1 which took place on the 3rd and 4th September has had to be extended from the 22nd September to the 6th October due to the non-availability of shipping, thereby depriving growers who sold their wool at that sale of the proceeds on the due date?
- (2) Is he aware that the prompt date for payment of proceeds at Albany Sale No. 2 being held on the 1st and 2nd October, is likely to have to be also extended for the same reason?
- (3) Will representations be made by the Government to the Overseas Shipping Representatives' Association to endeavour to have a more