

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 23rd November, 1978

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.00 p.m., and read prayers.

### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: STAR SWAMP AREA

#### *Flora and Fauna Reserve: Motion*

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [2.04 p.m.]: Before we commence the Orders of the Day, may I have your permission, Mr President, to place on the Table of the House for the duration of the debate on Order of the Day No. 1, this relief map of Star Swamp? Leave granted.

### QUESTIONS

#### *Deferment to Later Stage of Sitting*

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [2.05 p.m.]: I know that the questions have been deferred to a later stage of the sitting, Sir, but many of us who have commitments in country areas are concerned to know when it is likely that the session will finish. I wonder whether, with your permission, the Leader of the House could make a statement.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member would have to ask a question without notice, and the practice I have adopted with respect to the postponement of the questions is that I have postponed also the asking of questions without notice. Members will be aware that we amended our Standing Orders so that questions without notice could be asked after questions on notice. This means that an honourable member may ask a question without notice relating to a question on notice on the same day.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I apologise, Sir, for not understanding the rules of debate.

### CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION: SECOND PART

#### *Sitting Days and Hours: Ministerial Statement*

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [2.07 p.m.]: Mr President, I seek leave of the House to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There seems to be some concern with regard to the possible sitting of the House tomorrow. It is my belief we

can finish the session this evening. If I assess the attitude of members correctly, I think most members think that given a degree of goodwill it is possible to conclude the session in this sitting, and I am proceeding on that basis.

I could make a better assessment of the situation sometime between 12 midnight and 2.00 a.m. tomorrow morning, and I will do so at that stage. At the present time it appears that given a degree of goodwill we can accomplish that target and that members may be able to go about their normal avocations tomorrow.

### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: STAR SWAMP AREA

#### *Flora and Fauna Reserve: Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 22nd November, on the following motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton—

That the Members of the Legislative Council support the efforts of citizens of the Trigg, Marmion and Waterman localities to have set aside a reserve of 100 hectares in the area bounded by Beach Road-Marmion Avenue-North Beach Road and Hope Street, as a permanent natural bush and passive recreation/nature study area or such lesser area as will ensure that Star Swamp and its surrounding bushland will be protected from degradation and recognising—

- (a) that the Star Swamp bush area is one of the few remaining locations of natural vegetation typical of the Swan coastal plain left in the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) its value for recreational and educational purposes;
- (c) the classification of Star Swamp by the National Trust of W.A. for environmental and historical reasons;
- (d) that Star Swamp is one of the few metropolitan wetlands free of salmonella infection;
- (e) the area is being increasingly used as a refuge for plants, birds and animals which are being displaced from the surrounding housing developments;
- (f) the area contains an array of plant communities;
- (g) that none of the land in question is privately owned;

urges the Government to reserve the area as requested and facilitate any land transfers and/or exchanges necessary to achieve these purposes.

*To which the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House) had moved the following amendment—*

Delete all words where appearing after the word "Council" in line 2 and substitute the following—

commends the efforts of the Government for setting aside approximately 21 hectares in the vicinity of Star Swamp and requests that further investigations be undertaken to determine whether a further extension of the reserve is possible through the amalgamation of the adjacent area of regional open space which is vested in the City of Stirling.

**THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON** (East Metropolitan) 12.09 p.m.: I wish to oppose the amendment moved by the Leader of the House and to support the motion moved by the Hon. Roy Cloughton. I would not mind if a bit of the amendment of the Leader of the House was tacked on to the motion, because I think the Government should be commended for the way it has gone about this matter. It has been reasonable up to date. I am hoping that in fact the Government will not stop at the 21 hectares or whatever the Stirling City Council may do, but will continue to consider the question.

It is, of course, sometimes foolish for a layman to enter into a field where experts belong, but I went out and looked at Star Swamp this morning and walked around it. I was very impressed by it, and by being there I understood what people are concerned about. Before that I had read much of the literature put out by a number of people. When I saw where in fact housing is proposed to be started alongside Star Swamp, it seemed to me that the arguments put by the people who are trying to support the retention of Star Swamp and the whole of the 100-hectare area seem to have some foundation.

Before I moved into my electorate I used to live close to Lake Claremont which, I was told, was once a very beautiful lake and which was worth seeing. By the time I saw the lake, it was a muddy waterhole with dead stumps sticking up through the water. Certainly, although it had some pleasantness in that the area was grassed, it had lost the character it previously had, and it was no longer in any sense a natural wetland. It was no longer in any sense the place it had been.

It appears that Star Swamp is a most attractive area in a most attractive setting. One of the things that will happen, according to the people who are arguing for the retention as natural bushland of a far greater area than the 21 hectares, is that once development occurs the development will be so close to the water table of the swamp that runoff from bitumen roads and lawns will be such that it will raise the water table and turn Star Swamp into another Lake Claremont. From looking at it, I think that is what well could happen. So we might destroy something that is irreplaceable.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I haven't been to Lake Claremont lately, but hasn't there been a degree of public response, and a public exercise in respect of clearing the petrified trees?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: There may have been; I have not seen it for some time. All I know is that it is not what it was, and it can never be what it was.

Certainly in respect of Star Swamp if the water table rises the paperbarks will be destroyed, and the area will cease to be what it is. What it is is there for Mr Oliver to look at.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I have walked through it many times.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I had not walked through it before I did so today, and it seemed to me it would be most unfortunate if the area were lost. One of the things I found very attractive about Perth when I first came to live here at the end of 1966 was the areas of bushland in the middle of urban areas. This is a most attractive feature. One of the things of which people in this State are very proud is the foresight of Sir John Forrest when he reserved Kings Park as an area of bushland. I think the present Minister (Mrs Craig) has a chance to show similar foresight by reserving the whole area surrounding Star Swamp now as a sesqui-centennial park to maintain one of the last remaining pieces of wetland in the metropolitan area of Perth. Certainly from my point of view—and speaking from the point of view of my shadow portfolio—it would be a grave loss if the area were destroyed, because at present it is used by many school children who track through the area to do their nature studies.

At present, it is a healthy swamp. It is not infested with mosquitoes; it has frogs and fish which eat them. It is not polluted; there is no salmonella or botulism present. It is a healthy environment. One of the things pointed out to me which I have no reason to disbelieve is that it has kestrels, which one finds only in healthy environments. There is a whole range

of fauna living at the swamp. I gather there are several kinds of snakes, and six kinds of frogs; and, there are all sorts of creepies and crawlies whose names I do not know. I did not see any of the frogs or—I am glad to say—any of the snakes. However, I gather they are fairly civilised snakes which do not get in people's way.

I walked through the dust of the paths and heard the birds and I looked around and saw what would be destroyed if we allowed development to continue. If housing development takes place in any part of the area which is left, black-boys, trees and bushland will be destroyed, and that will be a great loss.

Yesterday afternoon, the Leader of the House said it would cost about \$1 million to buy the land back.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Actually, that was an underestimate; it is nearer \$3 million.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will accept the figure given by the Leader of the House. I am told it cost \$11 000 for the State Housing Commission to buy the land originally.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That could well be, but the State Housing Commission will be forced to buy other land, and that is where the \$3 million comes in.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I understand that point; I am just mentioning it to the Minister as an aside. Of course, I know we must talk in terms of what the land is worth today; I am not arguing about that. I take the point made by the Leader of the House that we must decide whether that \$3 million would be better spent in this way. My quick view—of course, it is only a quick view; I am not pretending to be an expert—is that, were I a member of the Government, having walked through Star Swamp, I would want to make further inquiries, because my view is that it would be worth \$3 million to retain the environment in its present state.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We really have no argument with the points you are making. It is simply a matter of whether we do something for one particular community, or whether we do it for the entire community.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am suggesting that, by retaining the environment in its present form, the Government would not really be doing it for only one community but, in many ways, would be doing it for the metropolitan area as a whole. Certainly, the local community will benefit, and probably will become the envy of many other communities which have less areas of hushland.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And they will promptly come at the Government for \$3 million worth in their area, too.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: They may indeed. However, from what I have seen of the area, it is quite unique within the metropolitan area and might well be worth \$3 million to Perth as a whole.

I repeat that I believe the Government did go about this in the right way. However, perhaps some of the information the Environmental Protection Authority has put forward needs updating, and further inquiries need to be made. I hope the Government does not let the bulldozers in yet—I gather there is no immediate prospect of this—but will continue to inquire into and discuss the matter. If I received that assurance, I would feel we were on the way.

As a matter of fact, when I looked across this morning and saw some of the private development taking place on the hill, I thought that if I were buying one of those houses I would be very happy if further development did not take place in the area below me, because I would be left with a glorious park over which I could look.

The really serious problem which must be carefully considered is how much of the watershed does the swamp need to remain a viable swamp. Many people who support the retention of the area claim it needs the entire 100 hectares, and that once we allow development to take place above the swamp, the swamp is likely to be destroyed and turned into a sump. It will bring down the manures used on gardens and will add to the water already in the swamp; it would tend to pollute the whole area by bringing about salmonella infections which previously did not exist in the swamp.

If the honourable member who at present is examining the contour map notes how close the proposed development will be to the swamp he will realise—as I am sure he has—what such development is likely to do to the area. Certainly, I am hoping that later in the debate I will hear from the Hon. Robert Pike in support of Mr Cloughton and myself on this motion.

The motion moved by Mr Cloughton does not seek to condemn the Government; it merely sets out the reasons he believes the Government, in fact, should have another look at this area. I believe it is highly desirable the Government does have another look, and continues to examine the area and to argue out the question.

One of the things which has happened as a result of the tremendous interest raised over the whole Star Swamp issue is that various scientists and other experts from the university and elsewhere have taken a great deal of time to study the

swamp and to submit reports on the entire area; they have advanced suggestions as to the management of the environment of the swamp. They are all happy to have their findings made available to the Government. They have done much of the work, and they are happy for the Government to use it to assist it in the management of the area.

We would have the added advantage that people outside the area are prepared to put in a co-operative effort to save Star Swamp and maintain it. This in itself is a good thing; that we do have people from various parts of the metropolitan area who are interested, co-operating, and thinking this is highly worth while.

Unfortunately I have not had a chance to inquire fully—I found out only today, far too close to my making this speech to be able to do anything about it—but it seems at one stage the Education Department had thought it would be desirable if it could get hold of the area in order to use it as a nature study area for the schools throughout the metropolitan area. Certainly there is no doubt, as we can see by letters which perhaps other members have copies of—certainly I have copies—from all the schools in the area just how important Star Swamp is to their schools in the whole field of nature study; it is an area where they can go out and have a look at a live swamp. I realise the word “swamp” has, for some of us, unfortunate connotations as we think of it as a dead sump. That is what the supporters of the retention of the whole area are claiming; that is, if the area is cut down too much, down to 20 or 30 hectares, that is what the swamp will become. They are afraid the swamp will become infected with salmonella, mosquitoes, and other health problems which are not present now. This is fairly obvious. At present one can see the gambusia and the fresh vegetation growing.

One of the unfortunate things is that when the EPA looked at the swamp it was shortly after a fire had been through the area and many of the tuarts had been burnt. It was thought they would not regenerate. Today, many young regenerated tuarts were pointed out to me. All through the area there are different trees, blackboys, and heath growing. One can hear a great range of birds including my favourite, the kookaburra.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is an Eastern States import.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The kookaburras are there and they seem fairly happy. Perhaps that is why I found we were kindred spirits, with them coming from the Eastern States.

I do not want to labour the point, because I have not done as much work on this matter as I would like. I certainly intend making further inquiries and doing more work between now and the next session. I hope we will be in the position of being able to discuss this question during the next session. I am hoping—because I think the Minister from what I have heard is not an unreasonable woman—the Government will have another look at the question so that during my Address-in-Reply speech I will be able to congratulate the Government for having considered the question further and saved Star Swamp, even at the expense of \$3 million, as a fine sesquicentennial gift to the Perth metropolitan area. The metropolitan area could use the swamp.

The Government did the right things in the beginning and it has shown it will perhaps continue to have an open mind on this question. I think it has had some wrong information fed to it. Further inquiries need to be made and I am convinced by such reading and observation I have myself made that perhaps 21, or even if it is 30 hectares, is not enough.

The amendment, although it is an acceptable amendment under the Standing Orders, does negate the proposal put forward by the Hon. Roy Cloughton. If the amendment were carried and the 21-hectare area or whatever area is kept of this delightful spot, Star Swamp will be negated and “Star Sump” will remain as a sad monument to a failure to look ahead sufficiently. I hope the Government will follow the example of an illustrious predecessor in Sir John Forrest, will continue its inquiries, and eventually spend the money which I think would be well spent in retaining this unique piece of wetland within the Perth metropolitan area.

I oppose the amendment and I support the original motion.

**THE HON. R. G. PIKE** (North Metropolitan) [2.28 p.m.]: In rising to speak on the amendment to the motion I indicate there is nothing of substance in the comments regarding the ecology of the Star Swamp area that has been mentioned by speakers with which I would disagree. It is fairly important to realise that the proposition regarding Star Swamp is one of degree.

I point out to honourable members, particularly those who are not in support of the amendment, that the amendment guarantees further investigations will be undertaken. Indeed, I have taken those words from the amendment itself. I hasten

to point out these facts lest the local member (Mr Jim Clarko) and the Liberal Party which we represent should be judged to be not concerned and not interested in Star Swamp.

It is reasonable, because we are discussing hectares to be reserved, that we realise that in November, 1975, the member for Karrinyup (Mr Jim Clarko) initiated the discussion on the preservation of this Star Swamp reserve. In a conversation with Mrs Anne Bloeman who spoke to me shortly before the Council sat today, I mentioned that fact and it was freely acknowledged that Mr Clarko was the initiator of the move to preserve the area surrounding Star Swamp, she agreed with this comment. He suggested land should be requested from the Government for the nature reserve and in this respect, on the 3rd December, 1975, he wrote to the then Minister for Housing (Mr Jones) as follows—

I write to you to support an application that has been made to you by the Trigg, North Beach, Waterman Community Association, requesting that the portion of Star Swamp, Waterman (location 564 Hope Street), be vested in the City of Stirling so that the land can be amalgamated with the portion that they control (Lot 218), so that the area can be made a Flora and Fauna Reserve.

For some years the children of the nearby North Beach school have been studying the flora and fauna in this area, and I believe that through your portfolio of Conservation and the Environment, no doubt you would find it easier to support such an application.

I believe that this is a significant coastal "Wetland" which is eminently suitable for preservation, and I earnestly seek your support to ensure that this area can be preserved for the benefit of, not only the local community, but also the State in general, for there are few areas like this remaining.

I appreciate your past assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Clarko, M.L.A.  
MEMBER FOR KARRINYUP.

It is pertinent to realise that as a result of initiative, again by Mr Clarko, the secretary of the local progress association wrote to the Minister in December, 1975, requesting more land be reserved for ecological purposes. The association and Mr Clarko acted in concert as they have continued to act ever since. The result was that

in January, 1976, four hectares were offered by the SHC providing it was for future public open space.

Of course, this was an endeavour by the SHC to divest itself of the responsibility of giving any land other than that which a normal developer would have to give by way of open public space. It is significant that in 1976 Mr Clarko did not accept that land with the strings attached, and again in the interests of the community he had a personal interview with the Minister. At that time Mr Clarko consulted with me on the subject of Star Swamp, as he has continued to do since, and he wrote to the then Minister indicating that the SHC should give four hectares without any encumbrances whatever; he did that in a very forthright fashion, and strong representations were made by him.

The Government's eventual agreement to this was indicated on the 30th March, 1976, when the following letter from the Minister for Housing was sent to Mr Clarko—

Dear Jim,

I refer to your letter of 18th March, 1976, concerning the STAR SWAMP at North Beach.

I would advise you that the Housing Commission is prepared to set aside from its holdings, an area of 4 hectares—free of any relationship with public open space requirement. The area of 4 hectares is in line with that suggested by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, as providing an adequate buffer against subsequent residential development.

The Commission is now setting in train the necessary action to have this holding transferred or vested in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, which would be prepared to be responsible for the management of the area as a flora and fauna reserve.

The City of Stirling will be advised in these terms.

I hope this solution will prove satisfactory to yourself and those on whose behalf you have made representation in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

P. V. JONES,  
Minister for Housing.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What year was that?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The letter was dated the 30th March, 1976. Copies of the letters will be tabled.

The next significant major development was that the City of Stirling received an application from the SHC for special development of the area in consultation with RDC. The guts of the issue was a higher zoning for Star Swamp. If adopted it meant that twice as many people could then be living within the precincts of Star Swamp as would be the case if it were gazetted as a single residential zone.

Again the member for Karrinyup took issue on this matter with the City of Stirling. Both he and the progress association objected very strongly to the proposal: so much so that the member for Karrinyup initiated a public meeting. He personally distributed leaflets and a meeting was held with Councillors Gale and Rose in attendance. A petition circulated by the member for Karrinyup on the 21st July, 1977, reads—

Dear Resident,

Are you interested in finding out the details of the proposal to erect 650 homesites, consisting of single residences (on small blocks) and group or cluster housing and attached housing, on the bushland between Hope Street and Marmion Avenue, which is owned by the State Housing Commission?

The City of Stirling has supported rezoning the land so that the density of population will be approximately twice its present zoning.

If you are concerned at this proposal, then I would urge you to attend a meeting that is to be held at the North Beach Autumn Centre, Castle Street North Beach at 2 p.m. on Sunday 24th July.

I understand that your Ward Councillors, Neville Gale and Peter Rose will be in attendance together with members of the Council's Town Planning Department, to explain the plan.

This proposal, if undertaken as now agreed to by the City of Stirling, will have wide reaching effects on the people of North Beach and Waterman. Join me at this meeting so that we can exchange views.

Yours sincerely,

JIM CLARKO, M.L.A.,  
Member for Karrinyup.

From that date the progress association, together with Mr Clarko—although sometimes Mr Clarko acted independently, which is right and proper—has made many representations and excellent submissions, some of which we have seen today and some were referred to yesterday by honourable members.

By this time Mr Clarko had made numerous approaches to various Ministers for release of more land. He approached particularly the EPA, the Department of Conservation and Environment, and the SHC.

It is pertinent to realise that the situation at present is that when the Star Swamp issue was first initiated by Mr Clarko in 1975 there were only 5.6 hectares belonging to the City of Stirling in two small reserves in the area and, as a consequence of his initial approach and others since, 15 hectares were provided by the SHC, making a total of 20.6 hectares or 51½ acres now set aside. Also there is the submission inherent in the amendment moved by the Minister that if part of that area of approximately 20 acres which it is proposed be transferred from the south of the swamp—and I see it agrees with the contour plan—and an area is reserved on the east side of Star Swamp there would be a total of 73 acres reserved. I prefer to talk in acres, because we would know what we are talking about. It is hard to multiply hectares by 2.4 to ascertain how many acres is involved.

So in 1975 when the moves were first initiated by Mr Clarko, there was only 5.6 hectares set aside and now there could be 73 acres. This is a commendable step forward.

It is also not without significance to be aware that investigations are currently being conducted into all reserves on the Swan coastal plain including all the wetland areas. It includes Star Swamp and many other wetlands which should be preserved.

There are at least seven major areas in the City of Stirling alone. They are Herdsman Lake, Lake Gwelup, Carine Swamp, Little Carine Swamp, Karrinyup Swamp, which is privately owned, Lake Karrinyup, and Jackadder Lake. Further north there are Lake Gnangara, Goollelal Lake, Lake Joondalup, and many others including those which are privately owned. So the investigations by the Government authorities are being undertaken in cognizance of the problem which exists.

To conclude, I emphasise again that only five hectares were set aside in 1975 and if this amendment is put into effect 73 acres within the immediate surrounds of the swamp will be reserved. That is an achievement; and I point out that the amendment encourages further investigations to be undertaken.

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [2.41 p.m.]: I was one of those who went out this morning to have a look at Star Swamp. It was the first time I had visited it. I

listened intently to what my colleague (the Hon. Robert Hetherington) had to say about the matter and I am in accord with much of what he said.

I listened to the previous speaker (the Hon. Robert Pike) but I cannot recollect that he clearly indicated what his views were on the matter. He quoted from letters which had been written by the member for Karrinyup in another place but I did not hear him say where he stood in relation to preserving a greater area than that provided for in the amendment.

However, let me make my position quite clear. I support the motion moved by the Hon. Roy Cloughton for the preservation of 100 hectares or an area which would render Star Swamp safe in the future. I do not believe 21 hectares will be sufficient. In fact, if members read the report on the Star Swamp wetlands and watershed which was given to us yesterday, they will find it states quite clearly that 21 hectares is definitely not sufficient.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Clearly to whom? It was not clear to the EPA.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I have been advised today, and it is mentioned in this document, that the EPA report was not an in-depth study.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is an amazing remark.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: As the Leader of the House has raised the matter, would he during this debate table for the information of members the documents which have been submitted to the Minister for Local Government? They are the table and graph indicating the level of salmonella infection in Dog Swamp and other wetlands which are named in this report.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You can ask for them to be tabled but you have not done so.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am now asking the Leader of the House to table them, and also to table the graph showing the rise in the water table level at Star Swamp during the last 20 years and the photographs of the area and its wildlife. I would like those documents to be tabled during this debate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have no chance of getting them, have you?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I want them to be tabled.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Shall I send a messenger down to the city to get them?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Leader of the House could send a messenger down and I will continue speaking in the meantime. We have not enough information.

I do not know why members of the Government parties were not at Star Swamp today. I understand all members received an invitation to attend.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I have been there dozens of times.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Nobody else took the trouble to go out there today. I went out to have a look at it. I say to the Leader of the House: for heaven's sake put off any decision in relation to the amendment on the motion until he has had an opportunity to go out to Star Swamp and have a look at it for himself, because when he does he will be better informed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am quite happy to do that but you should get Mr Cloughton's agreement. I will be quite happy to have the motion put on the notice paper next year. Mr Cloughton could move that it be now removed from the notice paper.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: If Mr Cloughton agrees to that he will give an indication during the debate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You said that was what you wanted.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is what I want.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Move that it be taken off the notice paper.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I was disappointed that no Government members went out there today to have a look at Star Swamp.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I had not been invited.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I apologise to members if that is the case, but I understood both Government parties were invited. It would be to everybody's benefit to have a look at it.

I have a bias in conservation issues because I am interested in them. As the metropolitan area develops, more and more of these areas are being taken away for housing developments and so on. That is what is happening with this particular area. If that housing project goes ahead, that will be the end of Star Swamp, because the environment provides a natural habitat at the present time and it has a very delicate

balance. If we allow infiltration of manures and lawn fertilisers into the swamp we will finish up with the same problems as exist in many other lakes.

I have here a letter dated the 14th November, 1978, to the town planning committee of the Stirling City Council. One of the requests contained in it is that the Government be asked for its support, and a request is made for the supporting documents on which the recently announced reserve boundary was based. That is what I want to have a look at. I want to compare it with what is said in the report on the Star Swamp wetlands and watershed. If the Minister assures us the buffer zone now being provided is sufficient, we ought to have an opportunity to see the documents on which it was based. Some of the eminent people who wrote this report indicate the buffer is not sufficient.

Another matter which worries us is the State Housing Commission land. Other land in the area is currently shown on the map as being vacant Crown land. It is further up the hill. There could be a swap. If the housing project is moved further up the hill and the vacant Crown land is utilised so that the State Housing Commission does not lose any land, the housing development could proceed. I do not know for what purpose the Crown land is required. Perhaps the Minister could explain that to me later. Looking at the map given to us yesterday—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How can I explain it later? You tell me a technique that will enable me to do that. I would be interested to hear one.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Leader of the House could do that if the debate were delayed until next year, or perhaps he could do it through another member on his side.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You didn't say that; you said I could do it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am aware the Leader of the House cannot do it, but perhaps he could get one of his members to do it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You were not aware of that, otherwise you would not have said it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The wetlands are, in fact, being gradually diminished. In the case of Star Swamp the preservation of the wetlands and the rare and unique fauna would benefit the human population. Furthermore, one finds in the report a number of reasons given in support of

the preservation of the swamp. I would like to quote from page 8 of the report in respect of the hydrology of the wetland system, as follows—

Any development on the eastern catchment of the wetland must inevitably lead to contamination of the ground water by the leaching of nutrients from lawns and run off from roads resulting in eutrophication, Salmonella build up, algal blooms and mosquito breeding.

No mosquitoes breed in Star Swamp; and that is unusual. There are few swamps like that; in fact, I doubt there are any other swamps in which no mosquitoes breed. It is possible that if housing development occurs and insufficient protection is provided to the swamp by way of buffer zones, the leakage of nutrients and other impurities through the soil could result in all sorts of problems that have occurred in other swamps throughout the State. I continue to quote from the same page of the report as follows—

The basis for this conclusion is contained in the Metropolitan Water Board's publication 'Harvesting Underground Water' (January 1978). On page 17 it is stated that 'Perth's underground water moves slowly to the sea'. Information from Metropolitan Water Board officers confirmed that the Star Swamp area is no exception and this helps to explain why Star Swamp has remained relatively non-eutrophicated despite building on its western catchment. That is, although storm water run off flows down the roads into the swamp, the nutrients leaching through the lawns on the western catchment percolate into the westerly moving groundwater—away from the swamp and towards the ocean; the same would be true of the eastern catchment except that the groundwater from one side would flow towards rather than away from the Swamp.

That is likely to happen if insufficient reserve land is left to prevent the flow of water towards the swamp. Such water would bring with it impurities which may affect the delicate balance of the area. Experience in respect of other swamps around which development has occurred warns us that we must be cautious. Some other areas mentioned in which insufficient buffer zones were left include Lake Blue Gum, Lake Claremont, Dog Swamp, and Lake Jackadder. They are a few examples of areas in which we have experienced problems to the detriment of wetlands as a result of development. Therefore, it is most important that a sufficient area be reserved to prevent the types of problems we have experienced in other places.



As this is one of the few wetlands left in the metropolitan area, it is important that we give close consideration to the matter.

Another matter contained in the report—and this is an aspect about which the people concerned feel very strongly—in support of the case for the preservation of the area is that of heritage. On page 10 of the report members will notice quite a deal of history is associated with Star Swamp. Next year is our 150th anniversary year, and it would be wonderful if the Government were to accede to the wishes of the people and leave an area of 100 hectares, or maybe a little less, which would be adequate to protect the swamp. That would be a wonderful thing to do in the year of our birthday celebrations.

I know the Government has made provision for 21 hectares to be left, but the people concerned certainly do not consider that is sufficient. They say the minimum area which should be preserved is all that land up to the limestone ridge.

I oppose the amendment, because I do not believe a sufficient area is to be reserved to provide for the preservation of the habitat and the environment.

Not many areas are left where people are able to go and say, "This is what the place looked like before development occurred in Western Australia." It is a beautiful, tranquil area and extremely pleasant.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It was, indeed, after last night's celebrations.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Yes, it was delightful, apart from the kookaburras which were a bit noisy. However, the noise of birds is music to the ears; it is like living on a farm. We do not have much of that in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: "Hear that train whistle blowin'."

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is right. Maybe if we had a rail line running north we would not have to worry about putting houses in this area. We could put them further north and provide the people with fast transport to the city. Then we could retain this 100 hectares, even though it is prime land.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Mr Cloughton didn't think of that, otherwise he would have mentioned it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am glad Mr Gayfer reminded me, because he has provided me with the opportunity to inform the House that I travelled to Star Swamp with Mr Hetherington this morning. We had a harrowing experience

driving through the traffic. Somebody told us to take the freeway, but once we got off the freeway we had a terrible time. The traffic on Scarborough Beach Road has to be seen to be believed. We travelled along West Coast Highway and, being a hot day, the beaches were crowded, so there was a great deal of traffic. We finally turned into Castle Street and travelled down to the swamp.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the member that he should get back to the amendment.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr President; I have just reached the swamp now, so I can tell you about it. We walked around the swamp, and I found it had to be seen to be believed. One would not believe that large tuart trees and the species of birds are to be found in the area which is a few hundred yards away from the mad volume of traffic. However, the kookaburras knew we were there. In addition to the kookaburras, kangaroos and other animals are to be found.

With the development of Marmion Avenue some kangaroos have been killed on the road. Not only will it be necessary for us to reclaim the swamp—whether it be 21 hectares or 100 hectares, and I am hoping it will be 100 hectares—but it will also be necessary to fence the area to keep the fauna in. This area is the natural habitat for the birds.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Who would fence the area?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am quite sure that if the people in whom the land is vested are not prepared to fence the area, the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife will be prepared to do so.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: There are no fences around the parks in the country or around Kings Park.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I know, but this reserve is not the same. There is not the mad rush of traffic within a couple of hundred yards in the other parks. If we are to preserve the species of kangaroos and fauna then the area will need to be fenced.

I said earlier that there has not been an in-depth study carried out by the EPA; that is reported in the document I have been quoting, and the people of that area have reminded us of this. I have the greatest respect for them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have not. You said the EPA has given a report to the Government, and it has not done the job properly. That is a ridiculous statement.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I have been quoting from the document before me. I have not seen the EPA report. I would like to see it being made available, and I have asked the Minister to make it available but he has declined. If we are to debate this question and listen to one side of the story only, it would be onesided; we should hear the other side.

The EPA report has been submitted to the Government, but has not been made available to members. What is the reason for the secrecy? Perhaps I would arrive at a different viewpoint after seeing the EPA report, but at present I cannot. From what I have seen, if the housing development is proceeded with and the boundary of the area is pushed back, the swamp will be destroyed.

It would be like what we saw at Lake Claremont, or sometimes known as Butler's Swamp, with dead trees all around. It is now a horrible area and quite barren with dead tree stumps in the middle of the lake. We will find the same thing happening in the Star Swamp area if we do not take action to preserve it. We should not be merely looking at this matter from the point of view of dollars and cents.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Perhaps the swamp is too shallow to enable an in-depth study to be made!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Maybe it is shallow. I have some photographic features here of the swamp. It looks beautiful. Members might desire to look at the photographs. If they do before the vote is taken, I am sure the amendment will be defeated and the motion will be carried.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: Why are there no mosquitoes in the area?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Because of gambusia fish to be found in the lake. When I noticed the absence of some members from this Chamber, I was under the impression they had been invited to visit the area and had responded to the opportunity to attend and see the area for themselves.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They have been invited.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: If they have been invited then something must have happened to the invitations. It would be to the benefit of members generally to look at the area; if they did they would have a different viewpoint.

I oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [3.05 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment and support the motion. I have been out to look at the Star Swamp area this morning. Mr Berry asked why there were no mosquitoes to be found, and someone said it was because of the fish in the swamp. Perhaps no mosquitoes are to be found there because they cannot stand the flies! I am not sure.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is the comment of the day.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There is certainly no shortage of flies. I was very interested in the enthusiasm shown by the people who invited us out there; they represented a wide cross-section of the community. Evidently the Leader of the House has upset these people by referring to them as an action group.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not call them an action group. Do you recall my saying that?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I cannot reconcile the fact that the Leader of the Opposition would make such a statement. I told those people I would take this matter up with the Leader of the House.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I was a little disappointed. I know there were reasons that many members of Parliament could not be there. It was not so many years ago when a similar debate centred around the Reabold Hill area or Bold Park. On that occasion buses were provided, and all members of Parliament in company with members of the Perth City Council, visited the area. As a result of that visit and public involvement, action was taken along the lines desired by the residents concerned.

I congratulate the group for the presentation of the small model of the Star Swamp area. Some members may have referred to it; I do not know. I have looked at maps and plans of the area, but it is very difficult for me to understand what is involved. However, looking at the model on the Table of the House we can understand the concern of the people.

If the land which has been marked for building is built on, the fertilisers used in the gardens will leach down the hill into the swamp. Of course, in a short space of time this unique swamp, which contains the ecosystem and food system for the birds and animals, will become something like Butler's Swamp, which is now known as Lake Claremont; it will be a type of monument to man's misuse of the environment.

Some figures have been quoted to indicate that it may cost \$3 million to do the kind of things the people want. That is only a figure; I do not think it would cost that much, and certainly it would not cost that much in the long run.

We have to preserve the wetlands. More importantly, we should take notice of the people involved. Already in respect of the Star Swamp area 7 000 signatures have been collected. I do not think that in general this is a political issue. I am sure that all members representing the district, irrespective of the political parties to which they belong, have an interest in this question and support the move made by the people.

It has been suggested by the Leader of the House in an interjection that he would not mind this motion being left on the notice paper at the conclusion of the present session of Parliament.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would not mind if Mr Claughton moves for the motion to be taken off the notice paper.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I am quite happy to agree.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I was answering a comment that was made out of the blue by Mr McKenzie. I did not give it any thought, but any move will have to be made by the mover of the motion.

The Hon. D. K. D'ANS: I do not doubt that the Leader of the House is sincere, and he has accepted the circumstances. It is possible for him to ask Mr Claughton to move that the motion be left on the notice paper at the end of this session of Parliament.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would have to be withdrawn. It cannot stay on the notice paper.

The Hon. D. K. D'ANS: I should like to ask the Leader of the House why it cannot stay on the notice paper. If he recalls, we left the liquor legislation on the notice paper on one occasion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is the end of the session, therefore, it cannot be left on the notice paper.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The debate is getting out of hand. The Leader of Opposition should proceed to make his comments.

The Hon. D. K. D'ANS: I am trying to be virtuous and speed up matters a little. Perhaps I can discuss the matter with Mr Claughton when I sit down. It should be taken seriously. I was impressed by the sincerity of the people involved. A total of 7 000 people in Waterman or North

Beach is not a small proportion of the total population in the area. They are the people who signed the petition and I was assured that, given a little time, a great many more signatures could have been obtained. These people are mindful of what has happened in regard to Reabold Hill.

The Government should act quickly to preserve this unique swamp. I must confess I was not particularly impressed when I first looked at it. However, as I walked through the reserve and around it and saw the very special features of the area, and particularly the features of the swamp itself, I came to understand that these are the kinds of matters we should be looking at. I do not believe we could put a price in monetary terms on preserving such an area.

On other occasions when I have spoken on matters such as this, I have said that I am firmly convinced in my own mind that man needs beauty to survive and every piece of natural beauty which we remove is another step towards the elimination of man. People may say, "It is only a swamp." However, if one adds together all the little pieces of land which are not preserved, we arrive at a large area which is being disturbed.

I hope the Government is not so thick that it does not see any virtues in preserving the life support system on which we depend. Everything living on this planet is here for a particular purpose and if we put everything together, we have the very genesis of the life of man. I hope people will remember that, because it is an important issue.

I hope the Government takes note of what we have said. I hope on a future occasion members of Parliament will see fit to take part in an inspection of Star Swamp similar to the inspection made of Reabold Hill. I am sure it could be arranged. I agree that the inspection this morning took place at short notice and I believe members of the Liberal Party had a meeting to attend. There would be some very tired people from all parties after last night and the long sittings we have been having. Next session, in the cooler weather, this matter could be reinstated on the notice paper and the Leader of the House and members of Parliament, both in this place and in the other place, could make an inspection of Star Swamp.

On the previous occasion we carried out such an inspection we were supplied with overalls. With all due respect to Mr Claughton, I believe overalls should have been supplied this morning. I certainly had to return home to get changed. The inspection would not necessarily be an in-depth one. The swamp may not be quite deep

enough for that, but a study of the swamp and surrounding areas could be made. I am sure members who took part in such an inspection would come to the same conclusion I came to this morning which is that the people are quite justified in their stand. They are very restrained and very responsible people. Most of them are professional people. They have a genuine concern for preserving this area and, if we have the kind of activity and support I have suggested, the fears of these people would be unfounded.

I support the motion and oppose the amendment.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [3.15 p.m.]: In rising to support the amendment I do so with some little knowledge of the swamp areas and bushland north of Perth. As a boy I was reared in the North Perth-Mt. Lawley area and I used to swim in the swamps at the back of Mt. Lawley amongst the snakes, flies, and goannas. I have a fair knowledge of the ecology of those areas at that time. Admittedly it may have altered to some degree as a result of the housing development which has taken place since those days.

I have before me a metropolitan street directory. After looking at this particular area which is shown in the directory, had I attended the inspection this morning, which unfortunately I could not do because of a previous commitment, I would not have gone out to Star Swamp via Scarborough Beach Road. I would have taken the Mitchell Freeway as far as Karrinyup Road and then made my way across to Odin Road. From there I would have gone to Balcatta Road and across to Star Swamp. By taking that route I would have passed the Lake Gwelup area.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I wish we had you with us.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: We would have been able to look at Lake Gwelup, and then on our way to Star Swamp we would have passed the Karrinyup golf course and other reserve areas. In the Balcatta Road-North Beach Road area there is the big Carine Swamp and one would have seen some of the reserves which exist in that particular locality. There are a host of reserves in that part of the metropolitan area. One would wonder, when the motion was moved, who decided that 100 hectares should be reserved around Star Swamp.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is what is left.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Who undertook a study to say 100 hectares should be reserved there? I believe the amendment should be supported, because it proposes that the powers-that-be

will look again at the original proposal that a reserve of approximately 21 hectares be set aside in the vicinity of Star Swamp. The investigations would then prove whether the reserve should comprise 21 hectares or up to 100 hectares.

I would not like to see an area of 100 hectares reserved on the say-so of ordinary people without an in-depth study and investigation being undertaken by the Government.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: They are not just ordinary people. There are a number of scientists involved.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: With Reabold Hill another 500 acres was added which is twice as much as is being asked for here. You were quite happy to let them have 500 acres.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not talking about Reabold Hill. I am talking about Star Swamp and the area surrounding it. In the course of his speech when moving the motion, Mr Claughton said—

Whilst the EPA has looked into this matter and has recommended a certain size to be set aside, quite obviously it is not sufficient. That is why the people of the area are getting upset.

Those words appear on page 4808 of *Hansard* No. 23.

I agree that perhaps the people in the area are justified in being upset and saying that an insufficient area has been set aside for the reserve. However, I believe the area to be reserved may be sufficient and that is why I am prepared to support the amendment.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: In other words you do not agree with the members of your party who attended the meeting and said that the National Country Party supported the proposal.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know which members of my party went on the inspection this morning.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I am not talking about this morning. I am referring to the annual meeting of the association.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Only one member of our party was there.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr Lockyer was there.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I would not necessarily agree with everything Mr Lockyer said in the same manner as I would not expect Mr Claughton to agree with all the views expressed by one member of his party on a certain issue.

Probably some members of Mr Claughton's party have views with which he does not agree.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Lockyer spoke on behalf of the National Country Party. They were not his own personal views.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr Lockyer had no right to give views on behalf of the National Country Party.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is the same as the situation in regard to bauxite mining.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr Gayfer is correct. The situation is the same as that which was created when members of the Labor Party gave their views on bauxite mining and since then they have been rapped over the knuckles, because the party has come out in support of it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We are not opposed to bauxite mining as such.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To say that Mr Lockyer spoke on behalf of the National Country Party is erroneous. He has no authority to speak for the party in any way. I have received a letter from an association formed for the preservation of Star Swamp. Perhaps I was favoured to receive an invitation to visit Star Swamp.

The Hon. Roy Claughton, in his introductory speech, referred to several matters, and he particularly referred to the bird life in the area. He mentioned the white necked heron, the blue crane, the large egret, the black duck, the kestrel, the moorhen, the dab chick, the spotted dove, and the white tailed black cockatoo.

The white tailed black cockatoo is a migratory bird. It goes right down to the deep south-west during the summer, and in winter it goes back north. So really it is not a permanent inhabitant of the Star Swamp area. I am not certain about the spotted dove, but doves are found all over the State. With regard to dab chicks, I have them on my own property, and they are also found all over the State. I am sure that they are migratory also. Even though the kestrel, the black duck, the large egret, the blue crane, and the white necked heron may nest in the area, that does not mean they are permanent inhabitants. Most birds of the types mentioned are of a migratory species. Other birds, such as the ring necked parrot, are more inclined to stay in one area.

I believe the Government has given a lot of consideration to the amendment. It is prepared to examine the matter further, and after a close investigation it will decide whether there should be an increase in the area to be reserved. In bringing forward this matter, the honourable member has opened up the issue, and he is to be

commended for that. The area to be reserved will be considered further, and a decision will be made by the Government after that consideration.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

## MINING BILL

### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

### *Consideration of Tabled Paper*

Debate resumed from the 16th November.

**THE HON. M. McALEER** (Upper West) [3.24 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to raise a number of matters which are of concern to my electorate. Before doing so, I compliment the Government on bringing down a balanced Budget. I know very well that members opposite regard the Budget as being anything but a matter for congratulation. If I remember correctly, the Hon. Don Cooley asked how the Federal Government could allow for such a large deficit, while this State Government resolutely shunned one. The honourable member would be aware, of course, that the Federal Government has been making a great effort to reduce its deficit, because the only way it can be financed is either by borrowing abroad or by minting money. The minting of money certainly is inflationary, and borrowings abroad carry with them the risk of inflation also if the funds are not applied productively. The whole thrust of the Commonwealth Government policy is to reduce inflation—which it is doing very successfully.

I believe the crux of the matter is, as I have said previously, that State financing is different from Federal financing. I believe I have discussed this matter briefly on a previous occasion. The fact is that if the State Government has a deficit there is only one source of repayment, and that is from loan funds which, for general purposes, are in short enough supply as it is.

Of course, the State Government has now obtained the approval of the Loan Council for very large borrowings for three particular projects. The loans will be taken up over a period of years, and are specifically to finance the infrastructure for large industrial projects. This concept originated with our State Premier. It was only as a result of his persistence, enthusiasm, and skill that the idea was agreed to by the Fed-

eral Government. I join with other members, and other people in our State, in congratulating the Premier on his success.

Having said all that, I acknowledge that the problem of unemployment is still with us. There is not anyone who does not deplore this. I suggest that painful and damaging as it is to so many individuals, the larger long-term projects which the State Government is encouraging hold out great hope for long-term stable employment. I know very well that is cold comfort to those presently experiencing unemployment, and those who have tried to get jobs. However, already some projects are coming on stream. I speak feelingly on this matter, because the unemployment rate is still very high. In Geraldton there will be some amelioration of the situation, now that the crayfishing season has started—and shows signs of being very good—and harvesting will begin which will employ a considerable number of people.

The building industry in Geraldton is very much in the doldrums. It is quite true that the Government has spent a great deal of money in and around Geraldton, over a number of years. Money has been spent on the harbour in the provision of another berth. Additional head-works have been carried out to improve the water supplies. Without those works Geraldton would not be in a position to take advantage of the opportunities as they come along.

Geraldton is hopeful of receiving a spin-off from the north-west gas field development. People living in Geraldton are able to plan and take steps in order that they will be in a position to take advantage of the opportunities when they come along. However, those opportunities still have to come.

It is all the more important that the Government should encourage such projects which may come within the reach of the Geraldton region. The Hon. Norman Moore referred to the application of Northern Mining for an extension of its agreement. The development of Northern Mining has been held up for the want of firm markets, and it may well be some time yet before its persistent efforts are successful.

Of more immediate concern is the proposed development at Yeelirrie. It is understood that the Government has left the decision to Western Mining as to the port which it will use for importing its requirements. The Government has just provided an additional berth at Geraldton, and the port is now in the situation of having a far greater capacity for shipping.

The Government's whole regional plan is based on a decentralisation policy, and it rests on the development of the resources of a particular region. The Government has defined the Greenough mid-west region, and Yeelirrie certainly falls within that area. So, I believe Western Mining should receive every encouragement and whatever assistance can be given to use the port of Geraldton.

If the Government is serious about regional development, it ought to be prepared to take the opportunities that do arise when they offer. Twelve months ago the Government sent its spokesman to Geraldton to discuss the unemployment situation, and it was said then by the Minister for Labour and Industry (Mr Grayden) that the possibilities at Geraldton were immense, and so they are. However, it would be inconsistent with such assurances if the Government were not to press on to assist and encourage the development of every resource when it could.

On a smaller scale the Government should also lend its support to the processing of fuller's earth at Mullewa. Certainly the Government could argue that it has no way of influencing the company in its choice. The company has three choices, one of which is processing at Yanchep. Certainly Yanchep is in need of all the industry it can acquire, but it would be logical to process at Mullewa which is 60 miles from the site of the mine operation.

The Mullewa Shire Council is prepared to do everything in its power in the way of providing a road at considerable cost to the shire. Although the processing plant would not be very large and would employ only about 20 people, those 20 people would bring more people who would need extra services and facilities. This would afford some compensation for the people lost to Mullewa by the closure of the Meekatharra railway line. I ask the Government to examine the situation seriously to see whether it can assist in securing the project for Mullewa.

While on the subject of population and employment, I would like to compliment the Government on its efforts to keep the population of the drought-stricken areas from fleeing to the city. Certainly the funds the Government made available to the shires in these areas have been used very effectively. For instance, Perenjori was one of the hardest hit areas, and its shire has been able to claim that its population has not declined as a consequence.

I would also like to thank the Government for its proposal to modify the State Energy Commission policy so that people will be allowed to be connected to the grid system whenever technically

possible even though their costs will be above the \$3 000 limit. I compliment the Government also on its policies to provide generating plants in the areas which cannot be served by the present distribution lines, and the further proposal to assist with the capital costs of individual generators where the State electricity alternatives are not available.

Needless to say, the people who will benefit by these proposals in many cases will do so at very considerable cost. However, just as the cost of country electricity is not always understood in the city, neither is the high value that country people place on their connection to the SEC supply. I hope that the Government will implement these proposals with all possible speed.

The Government is of course aware of the nervousness with which people in the province regard the SWATS report and its implications for the railways and freight services they still enjoy.

I understand the Minister for transport is prepared to go out in the country to discuss the implications of the report as soon as he has completed his own studies. I understand further that he is doing his utmost to ensure that no country areas are deprived of services, even where the services are a substitute for rail. Again I hope he will be able to begin his programme of discussions with country people before too long in order to allay the very real fear they express that *ad hoc* measures will prejudice their position.

I would like to remind the Government of a number of other matters, and I will try to do this as briefly as possible. One of these is the Moora Hospital which I have spoken of before. I know it has a high priority on the Medical Department list, but loan funds were not available for it because of the reduction in Commonwealth funds.

The situation in the old part of the hospital is truly awful. There is a shortage of toilets, only one bath, and too few beds. The children's quarters are quite inadequate and inconvenient. There is no real possibility of isolating infectious cases, and it is really only by the grace of God and the care taken by the staff that a serious situation has not developed there. The basic sum required to rectify the matter is not extremely large—about \$400 000. It ought to be possible to find it one way or another. Magnificent efforts are now being made by the Premier and I certainly hope they will be successful.

I must say, in respect of Moora, that the Government has done many good things for the town. It can now lay claim to a good senior high school,

a good water supply, a well-built Department of Agriculture branch, and, most recently, a new railway station. However, I must refer to the hostel. Although the requirements of the hostel have been outlined and planned for by the local committee for some years now, it is very strange that they have never been clearly understood either by the Government or the Country High School Hostels Authority. I realise that the authority has a limited amount of money and a large responsibility, but certainly greater consideration ought to have been given to the extension of this hostel which is one of the more successful in the State.

One of the most cheering events for the people of the district, apart from the good season most of them are enjoying, has been the Government's decision to include in its application for Commonwealth funds the development of the Agaton bore field and the reticulation of part of the Moora shire, as well as the dry areas of Dalwallinu and the shires further to the east.

I believe it is well understood that the project has a very long way to go after this decision before it can materialise, but at least it is seen as a realisation by the Government of the plight of these waterless areas, such as Bindi Bindi and Miling, where it has proved impossible to obtain plentiful supplies of water.

I suppose of all things that country people can find themselves without, water is the very worst. Carting water is a hardship and a heavy expense, and even then there is the necessity to ration what one uses for domestic purposes. There is none left over for those amenities which make life more pleasant. Many people take water for granted, but I suppose since last summer that is not so, and there cannot be very many people in Western Australia who have been able to use unlimited water on their gardens.

I would like to draw attention to the situation of the small town of Mogumber. Mogumber consists of a school, a hotel, and a post-office store. It also had a railway station, but it is losing its station master. The population of Mogumber will be reduced by two. It may seem that this is a small number of people to lose, but in a township of the size of Mogumber it is of the utmost importance.

Mogumber has no water supply of its own, and the hotel, which is a boon to travellers on the road, finds that every summer it has to cart water. Of course, that water is coming from the farmers, and therefore is by no means secure.

The Government has been approached to render assistance in the provision of a water supply, but because of the extremely small population it felt that the cost has not been justified. Nevertheless, the Government ought to look at the situation again, perhaps in combination with the shire, because if this summer is a severe one the hotel may have to close because it cannot comply with the health requirements. If that happened there would be a considerable outcry, and disappointment would be felt in the district on a wider scale.

I would like to go back to the coast and remind the Government of the need for more residential land being made available in the coastal towns. Among these towns, the need is most urgent at Cervantes, and the delay in providing it—while not entirely the fault of the Government—seems far too great.

I am glad to say that private subdivision has eased the position at Jurien, and that the Government does have the intention of providing the town with a fishing harbour. There are certainly some fishermen who have reservations about this proposal in case it should bring about a concentration of fishing boats in the cray-fishing areas. I believe that steps could be taken to combat this, and that the majority of fishermen would welcome the marina. Certainly it has been appreciated at Port Denison. The establishment of such a harbour would not only bring about an increased number of boats, but would also encourage ancillary industries, thus providing more employment and making the population more stable.

Coming further south, I would like to draw attention to a problem which exists in the Shire of Wanneroo. Members will be aware of the speed at which the population of the shire has been growing, and the way in which other developments have kept pace with that growth. The shire council is a pace setter and has, I think, an enviable record of close communication with its people. It was an eager contender for the new Education Department building to be built within the shire, and it is chafing at the slow development of Joondalup.

One tends to think of the Shire of Wanneroo in terms of youth and strong community activity. Both of these things are entirely true, but it has also a growing percentage of older people, many of whom have been attracted there because their sons and daughters have established homes within the shire. As the older people become older

they begin to have requirements which they cannot supply themselves and which the shire is not able to meet on its own, either.

An association of senior citizens has been formed, and it is made up of senior citizens' clubs from various parts of the shire, such as Whitfords, Sorrento, Wanneroo, and Two Rocks. But they have an increasing need for the clubhouse type of meeting places, for separate accommodation, and perhaps also for a frail aged home adjacent to a hospital.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members should refrain from engaging in audible conversation. I am sure the *Hansard* reporter is having difficulty in hearing the member who is on her feet.

The Hon. M. McALEER: The senior citizens' association is a vigorous association. It is an independent self-help organisation, but its funds are extremely limited.

In order to establish the types of development that the association sees as being necessary for older people, it will need Government as well as shire council assistance. I hope the Government will be considerate of such application for land and other assistance that the association will put forward.

Finally, I would like to touch on an agricultural problem. The season generally throughout nearly all the province has been a greatly improved one. In these areas which were drought declared in the province three years ago, the prospects are much brighter; but although there are some very good crops to be seen, there are also poor ones. The season has been patchy, and in many cases the feed position is poor. This has not mattered so much in one sense, because stock numbers are greatly reduced. One very noticeable effect has been the deterioration of the quality of the pastures, the enormous increase in various weeds—and among the worst and most prolific is the doublegee. I acknowledge that the Department of Agriculture has certainly been devoting attention to this, although I hope the present costs for treating these plants with sprays will be reduced. However, it is about Patersons Curse that I really want to speak.

*Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.03 p.m.*

The Hon. M. McALEER: Mr President, before the suspension of the sitting I was discussing Patersons Curse, which is a declared plant. In the areas of my province where it grows it is an annual, and certainly has feed value and can be controlled by heavy grazing. However, it germinates early, is extremely resilient, and like doublegees can survive a considerable drought



period when everything else dies. It certainly makes the establishment of slower growing, better quality pastures extremely difficult, because it smothers the young plants. In a crop, it spreads out occupying the space of half a dozen wheat plants and often more.

Spraying is a costly business, and hazardous in the sense that it may not be very effective, or may be too effective and destroy a lot of other things as well. It is known that CSIRO has developed a form of biological control for Patersons Curse; however, no decision yet has been made to allow it to be used—mainly, I, understand, because beekeepers use Patersons Curse when it is flowering for their bees. South Australia in particular is against the release of this organism for that reason, and there are certainly beekeepers in Western Australia who hold the same views.

It seems that if Patersons Curse is a declared plant, measures must be taken for its containment, control or eradication, and it is not logical to deny farmers the possible benefit of a more effective and cheaper control than they have in spray. Nothing is foolproof, but Western Australia is sufficiently isolated by distance and desert to minimise the possibility of the organism transferring itself to South Australia and the Eastern States. I believe the Western Australian Department of Agriculture and the Minister for Agriculture should press in the Australian Agricultural Council for its release in this State.

Certainly, biological control has yet to be proved, but a great deal of time and effort has been expended by CSIRO on its development, and it will be completely wasted if this method is not tried out, and many of our farmers will be deprived of a considerable possible benefit.

Finally, I wish to refer again to Geraldton, and express my appreciation that the Minister for Works was able to find employment for those workers who seemed to have no prospect of future employment. I know there is not a great deal the Government can do in the way of creating public works, short of speeding up its school programme.

However, I remind the Government that the Town of Geraldton has in the pipeline a project for a cultural centre. I understand no provision has been made in the Budget to assist in the construction of this centre; however, it is felt that the Government might in some way facilitate the commencement of this project—in combination, of course, with other regional centres. The Premier has promised to look favourably at the project and to study the possibility of providing funds to assist the town in this matter.

Time is passing, and it is crucial to the Town of Geraldton that this project be decided on and commenced at an early date. So, I hope consideration of this project will commence as soon as possible, with further consultations with the Town of Geraldton.

I support the motion.

**THE HON. TOM McNEIL** (Upper West) [4.07 p.m.]: My colleague from Upper West Province has effectively covered most of the problems being experienced in our area, so I shall simply endorse her remarks.

However, one additional area about which I have particular concern is the further erosion of our rail transport system to country areas.

I realise this may be history, but I should like to quote to the House some figures resulting from the closure of the Mullewa-Meekatharra railway line. As a result of this closure, the jobs of 97 rail personnel, attracting wages amounting to nearly \$1 million, have been lost to the area. This has affected the viability of country towns between Mullewa and Meekatharra.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: That is not strictly true.

The Hon. TOM McNEIL: Quite obviously, if \$1 million in revenue is lost to Mullewa, Yalgoo, Mt. Magnet, Cue, and Meekatharra, it would have a serious effect on the viability of those towns.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It has not made any difference to the viability of those towns.

The Hon. TOM McNEIL: I am sure that if Mr Moore were operating a small store in Cue or Mt. Magnet, and had little children attending the local school, he would feel a little less viable as a result of the reduction in his business.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: In fact, viability has increased in some areas.

The Hon. TOM McNEIL: I do not know how Mr Moore works that out! In addition, there has been a further reduction in services in that the train which used to run on Fridays and Saturdays to Perenjori, Morawa, and Mullewa has been removed from the service. The fact that the Railways Department intends to replace this train with a bus service will not cater for the difficulties which will arise in the years to come.

It would appear from the action taken to reduce services north of Mullewa that one can expect a closure of the Mullewa-Wubin line in

the years ahead. The people of the area anticipate the eventual closure of this line, following the Government's closure of the Mullewa-Meekatharra line and its general reduction in country train services.

If the Government does decide to close the Mullewa-Wubin line, it will be responsible for the loss of five jobs at Perenjori attracting some \$45 000 in annual income; four jobs at Morawa, with an annual income of \$36 000; and three crew at Mullewa being paid a total of \$27 000 annually. Therefore, 12 jobs and \$108 000 in revenue will be lost to this area as a result of a complete shutdown at Mullewa.

In my maiden speech to this House I referred to the concern being expressed at a national level at the inadequate funding to Australian sportsmen and sportswomen. It was stated at that time that the Federal Government had admitted it had a responsibility towards our national sporting bodies, and was establishing an inquiry into the matter with a view of making additional funds available to more effectively cater for the national sporting scene.

Recently, the Hon. Lyla Elliott expressed her concern at the lack of funding to Australian sports. She drew our attention to Australia's past performances at the Olympic and Commonwealth Games and a quick glance at the records reveals her concern to be a very real one. Prior to 1970, Australia was considered to be one of the more advantaged countries, capable of producing world-class sportsmen and sportswomen. However, we have fallen from that position of very high ranking by world standards to somewhere near the bottom of the list, as an also ran.

In the 1970 Commonwealth Games held in Scotland, Australia took home 36 gold medals, England 27 gold medals, and Canada 18 gold medals. At the 1972 Olympic Games, Australia won eight gold medals and finished sixth on world rankings. This was a particularly gratifying performance and obviously reflected from our tally of 36 gold medals at the 1970 Commonwealth Games; the enthusiasm generated at those games rubbed off on athletes at the 1972 Olympic Games.

However, the slide commenced at the 1974 Commonwealth Games held in New Zealand, where Australia slipped to 29 gold medals, dropping seven gold medals from the previous Commonwealth Games tally. Canada increased its gold medal tally from 18 to 25, and England from 27 to 28. Obviously, this was the start of the decline in our national athletic performances.

The 1976 Olympic Games saw the ridiculous situation of Australia slipping from sixth in the world Olympic rankings to 31st. We won no gold medals, one silver medal, and four bronze medals. Countries which normally would not be within "cooee" of Australia had a much more effective influence at those games.

The disappointment felt at home in Australia would have been trebled by the athletes themselves who for years had been complaining that the Federal Government was not doing enough to provide sporting facilities, technical know-how, and coaches. The loss of top rated sports coaches such as Harry Hopman, who went overseas, and Don Talbot, our top swimming coach, who went to Canada, undoubtedly had a major effect on Australia's performances. While we have other good coaches in Australia they are experiencing great difficulty because of the lack of funding.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It could spread to cricket, too.

The Hon. TOM McNEIL: We will take care of the Poms this year!

We reached our lowest ebb during the 1978 Commonwealth Games, where we won only 24 gold medals. As a result of the influx of funding to the Canadian sports association, Canada's tally rose from the 25 gold medals it won only four years previously to 45 gold medals. England won her usual 27 gold medals. Obviously, there had to be a reason for Canada winning an unprecedented total of 109 medals, and adequate funding is the answer.

Members should look at the funding for cultural affairs and recreation; it makes interesting reading. I have nothing against art and cultural affairs; I realise there are people who like to visit art galleries, and attend plays and the ballet. I like to see a lot of other people go to sporting events and watch our athletes perform to the very best of their ability.

We see for the years 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79, the only grouping that has taken a loss is youth, sport and recreation. That allocation went from \$9.7 million down to \$7.4 million. Ethnic broadcasting went up \$3.9 million; libraries went up \$1.2 million; the Australian National Gallery and Collection went up \$7.3 million; film industry development went up \$2.6 million; assistance to the arts went up \$2.3 million; the national estate went up \$1.3 million; wildlife and national parks went up \$1.8 million; and the cultural and recreational activities in the Territories went up \$400 000.

The last figure interested me and I noticed the amount in the Budget for 1976-77 was \$17.8 million, and in 1977-78 it was \$14.3 million. The estimated figure for 1978-79 is \$14.7 million. When that allocation is broken down it can be seen it is mainly to maintain theatres, parks, gardens and sporting facilities in the ACT.

We have had \$1.3 million allocated to promote national sport and for three years they have been pouring money into Canberra to build up its theatres and recreation areas. Over these last three Budgets we have allocated \$75.5 million for assistance to the arts; \$40.9 million to libraries; \$32.7 million to national galleries; and \$46.8 million to cultural and recreational activities in the Territories. Most of that last amount went to Canberra with just a small amount going to the Northern Territory.

The estimate for sport in 1977-78 was a miserable \$1 million, but this actually came down to \$366 000 of which \$5 280 found its way to individual organisations. We have been allocated \$1.3 million for sport this year, but we shall just have to wait and see.

From the figures I have produced it is quite obvious that funding for national sports is inadequate. It is a disgrace that we should expect Australian athletes to go to the other side of the world wearing the green and gold colours of this country and perform well when we do not provide them with the necessary coaching and practising facilities which would put them back to the top where we want our national sportsmen and women to be. They have the ability, but they need the additional funding to produce the goods.

It would not be right if I did not mention something about the situation facing Australian footballers. In the Melbourne Press this morning a copy of a Taxation Department letter was published which had particular significance to Australian rules footballers. The letter indicated that one-third of the income made by footballers in the WANFL would be taken by the Taxation Department. This could be done in several ways. The club could take the money from the players' earnings and forward it to the Taxation Department, it could advise the department of the amount of money the player had earned, or it could be left to the player in his honesty to forward the correct amount to the department in his taxation assessment. The letter reads as follows—

According to information in the possession of this office, it would appear that in addition to the income disclosed in your returns for the years ended 30 June 1976 and 1977, you also derived income from other sources.

You are requested to review your records for each of the above years and furnish a statement of all income which may have been omitted from the returns of income lodged by you.

Particular note should be made of

- a Signing on fee, renewal of contract fee.
- b Bonuses, after match receipts, etc.
- c Payments from supporter groups.
- d Best and fairest awards, etc.
- e Prizes from television, newspapers and advertisers awards.
- f Payments from sponsors for advertising, promoting goods, etc.
- g Payments for interstate travel, for self and family for holidays.
- h Board and sustenance provided by your club.
- i Education expenses, etc. paid by your club.
- j Rental, dividend and interest on bank and building society accounts.

Where the payment is received, other than in cash, furnish full details surrounding the circumstances of the payment.

You are requested to advise full details of loans, etc. received from the club, provident fund or groups associated with the club.

Any explanation which you may desire to make should form part of your reply.

I am not standing here trying to say footballers should not be taxed; the money they earn is part of their income. However, I remind honourable members that just over 12 months ago we had a look at the subject of workers' compensation and because of an approach and a deputation from the WANFL we considered, quite rightly—and I voted for the particular amendments—that the league should not be held responsible for serious injuries suffered by players during sporting events.

I in no way apologise for the way I voted because, as I explained when I made my speech, the men who form the committees of football clubs are very human and they should not be held responsible should a player become a paraplegic as a result of a sporting injury.

However, having removed the player's right to receive compensation for injuries received in his sport he is nonetheless expected to pay tax on his earnings from that game. A player could have one good year and perhaps earn \$30 000

and then damage a cruciate ligament which would end his playing career. A player should be able to average out his earnings over what would be considered an average number of years in a particular sport.

We also had a private member's Bill on football introduced but we decided the Government should not legislate on sport. I said at the time that we were passing workers' compensation legislation that would deny the player the right to a scheme whereby he could claim compensation for serious injury and that we denied the player the right to choose the club he would play for, thus restricting his ability to negotiate with a club to his own benefit.

When introducing amendments to our workers' compensation legislation the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth indicated that South Australia and New South Wales were considering the situation, that it was under surveillance, and that they would forward a report on a national sporting scheme whereby players would receive compensation for serious injury. As the Minister was representing another Minister I do not know if he would be aware now if anything has been done about this.

There should be a Commonwealth or State scheme under which footballers would know they had a right of redress and were not being utilised purely for the benefit of a club which they might not want to play for and which did not look after them. Some definite inroads must be made into this matter. I have written to the Minister for Education asking that an approach be made to Mr Groom to ascertain just what are his intentions in respect of protecting sporting participants now that we are taking a portion of their earnings and putting it into Consolidated Revenue. The time is ripe for a fund or scheme to be set up to cover the players in case of serious injury.

**THE HON. T. KNIGHT** (South) [4.25 p.m.]: I am pleased to have the opportunity to put forward a few points that have arisen in my electorate over the past six months, particularly since the introduction of the recent Budget. My constituents and I were very pleased with the Budget and the money that is to be expended in our electorate. This is especially so in regard to water supplies where the allocation has been elevated considerably.

In the Lower Great Southern region the allocation for stage I of the headworks, which will cover towns such as Albany, Tambellup, Cranbrook, and Donnybrook is \$991 000. The allocation for the Plantagenet main is \$695 000. The allocation for the Albany Town itself—the water supply extension works—is \$50 000.

In the last 12 months \$27 000 has been spent on the Tambellup water supply which was an extension of the Wellington Dam water supply going down the southern line. The residents of Tambellup will no longer need to fear the problem they have experienced in recent years because of drought conditions. Most people in the Tambellup area have faced the situation where every summer they have had to cart water—especially the farmers. With the extension of the service the people will have the scheme water laid on which will be of great benefit to the townspeople and farmers alike.

We have had \$50 000 spent on the Borden water supply extension; \$95 000 on the Denmark extension; and tomorrow we will have the opening of the Rocky Gully extension. Last year \$254 766 was spent on this work and tomorrow the extension will be opened by the Hon. David Wordsworth, the Minister for Lands, who will represent the Minister for Works, and Water Supplies.

We are having \$22 000 spent in the Mt. Barker area, and last year, after a lot of hard work by my colleagues and myself, we were successful in having allocated \$452 000 for the Frankland River water supply. As most members are aware, this area is the centre of the Frankland Valley wines. The small town is growing and is in need of a water supply system. As a result I have been pushing to see that this comes about, and last year \$38 263 was spent on preliminary works and buying materials before prices rose, which has been of considerable help.

In the Esperance area the Government has allocated \$171 000 for water supply works. Most members would be very pleased to hear that, hopefully after this announcement, I will not have to mention the Hopetoun water supply again. I have been successful in having the Minister announce that \$273 000 has been made available for a water supply for the small town of Hopetoun on the south coast.

This has been a matter of discussion in every Address-in-Reply debate and Budget speech I have made since being in this place. I am pleased to think the Hopetoun water supply will become a reality by next year, which will mean the little town will have water as well as electricity and other modern conveniences which are expected in other places.

In addition to this, in the South Province we have the country towns sewerage scheme and I have mentioned before, and I say again, that the expenditure by the Government in my province is very welcome. It is well received, and I do compliment the Government for it.

An amount of \$415 000 will be spent in Albany; and additional \$80 000 in Denmark; \$610 000 in Esperance; and \$55 000 on the provision of headworks for subdividers.

Another point on which I have spoken before is the high cost to subdividers for the preparation of land for sale to prospective home builders. On many occasions I have said that the installation of power, water, and other facilities in subdivisions was, and still should be, a Government responsibility. We hear prospective home owners complaining about the high cost of residential and building land and it all comes back on the developers who are said to be making exorbitant profits. However, when we stop to consider the responsibilities placed on land developers which many years ago were the responsibility of local government and the Government, we find the developers are not making the profits people think they are making. We know that \$3 000 and \$4 000 a block is spent on reticulation of sewerage and I have mentioned before that, when a subdivider puts all the capital works on the subdivision, the land should be exempt from sewerage and water rates for four or five years once it is handed over to a prospective home builder. After all, that person has paid the high price of installation of capital works which in the past was the responsibility of local government and the Government.

I would like to add at this stage that, as I said when I spoke earlier in the year, the Government should be taking some definite steps with regard to the damming of the Denmark River. The longer we leave it, the more it will cost.

In 1974 it was estimated the damming would cost some \$18 million. Last year in discussion with an officer of the Public Works Department and the Water Supply Department I was told the cost had escalated to approximately \$40 million. In the discussion I was told that, as I had mentioned, the cost would be closer to \$70 million in another year or so. It is true in private enterprise, business, or the Government, that the quicker we spend the money, the cheaper it will be in the long run because of inflation and rising costs. If we build quickly we give the people concerned a cheaper commodity, because the capital repayments are not so high, and the less it is necessary to borrow the less one must pay back.

The Government should consider the damming of the Denmark River or the Kent River whichever it is felt will be the better to dam, and get moving, even if the dam is built in three stages.

The Hon. W. M. Piesse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: At least we could have water which could be proved. As the number of potential consumers increased, so the dam could be built higher. Even if we had to pay higher costs for, say, the third stage of development, at least we would have saved on about three or four years of inflation up to that point.

I am aware that for two or three years Cranbrook has been pushing for a new police station, police quarters, and courthouse. Several years ago we were assured these facilities would be included in the following year's programme, but as yet this has not occurred.

At the moment the Government is hiring a hall from the shire council in which to conduct court proceedings. Cranbrook is in the centre of a small area which extends out to the Stirling Range and Franklin River and quite a few people live there. They have a police station of sorts in a house. We should look seriously at the establishment of a new police station, police quarters, and most definitely, a new courthouse.

In Albany, as in most seaside resorts, a sea search and rescue squad has been established. The people involved have raised a great deal of money in the interests of the balance of the community. In my opinion they are willingly taking over the responsibility of the Government in making their time, craft, and in many cases, their vehicles, available for sea search and rescues.

It surprises me that the Government has not seen fit to help these people in the purchase of larger craft. At the moment they are using their own fibreglass runabouts, launches, and what-have-you. Albany has just purchased—and it is being commissioned on Sunday—a new aluminium craft at a greatly reduced figure of something like \$30 000. If this craft was not available the Government would have to establish some facilities because of the large amount of fishing and water activities in the area. Such facilities would be used by the police and civil emergency groups to rescue people and follow up on reports of missing people, which are made every weekend during the summer.

Members of the squad give up a great deal of their time and money and I believe they should be supported by the Government, which should make available finance for safer craft which are used in an attempt to save lives.

Following on from that point there is another aspect I would like to raise. These people for rescue purposes must buy fuel at the full rate. In all areas like Albany the Government has depots such as Public Works Department depots where fuel is available at reduced costs. I would

like the Government to consider allowing these people to buy their fuel supplies from Government sources at reduced costs. These people are helping the community and the Government by being available and they are saving the police a lot of time and expense. These people have little enough time as it is and they are doing a magnificent job which the Government should appreciate and so assist them in any way it can.

At this stage throughout the South Province there appears to be a great shortage of SHC homes. Albany in particular has a waiting list longer than ever before, because there has been a tremendous industrial and commercial growth in Albany over the last 18 months and the population increase has been such that now there is no housing accommodation for rent or purchase in the Albany area. The same situation applies in Mt. Barker, Denmark, Lake Grace, Esperance, and many other places throughout my electorate where I believe the SHC should supply rental accommodation for people moving into the area because of the job opportunities which exist throughout the region. We do not appear to have been hit with unemployment that other centres experience. However, if housing is not available, the people will not come to the area.

At the moment the Albany High School is overcrowded and too small. I have spoken to the headmaster and several teachers, who have told me that the school is beyond a workable point for a high school.

I have mentioned this before and I know my colleagues—David Wordsworth and Leon Watt—on numerous occasions have pushed the Government to look at the possibility of establishing another high school at Albany. With the present rate of growth in the town and the suburban shire areas, it is imperative that we start moving on the establishment of a second high school now, because on the facts and figures I could get from the people involved in this type of establishment I understand it would be three or four years before the high school would be ready for use, and by that time the position at the high school would be drastic.

The people will be up in arms and the parents will not be happy, because the accommodation will not be available for their children. We should make a move now so that we do not have as great a problem in 12 or 18 months' time. If the people can see that work is in progress and that they will soon have a new high school, they will not be so worried.

No allowance has been made in the Budget this year for the Albany technical annexe. This is possibly one of the most important educational

centres in the great southern region and, as we have been working on a regional concept, it is imperative that this complex, which is of a high standard, should be kept moving with the growth of the area, so that it fulfils the needs of trade, business, and hobbies in the area.

I know a new electrical section is required because of the increase in the number of apprentices in the Albany area. At the moment they must come to Perth. Also a plumbing section with a full-time licensed instructor is required. I understand there is also need for an abattoir-type section in order that people might be taught the killing, boning, and slaughtering of animals. This is now carried out in a workshop 10 miles from the centre of Albany and it is paid for and sponsored by the Government. However, all these particular facilities should be established in the one area. The need is there and the technical school should be extended and improved as the need arises, and that need exists now.

With regard to planning in all country areas—I am not dealing wholly and solely with the South Province, because I believe the situation is the same everywhere—we have regional centres for the Public Works Department, the SEC, the SHC, the police, and courthouses, etc. No matter what aspect we consider, the Government has led in the field of decentralisation or regional development and has set the guidelines for the private sector. The Government is demonstrating its confidence and the people should follow.

However, one aspect brought to my attention on many occasions is that once a subdivision is planned, the proposals go backwards and forwards between Perth and Albany on as many as nine occasions. Hundreds of dollars are paid out on plans and preparations which go backwards and forwards to Perth and the land cannot even be advertised for sale until approval is granted and by that time developers are hundreds of thousands of dollars out of pocket for this full period.

We have engineers in Albany who would be capable of carrying out this work, but for some unknown reason everything is sent to the metropolitan area. This is not necessary. We should follow the concept of regional development right through. We have regional administrators but the hold-ups and delays in country subdivisions and the cost of overheads borne by country developers, because of the lack of a business attitude by Government departments, are immense. They are such that the Government should install an engineer in Albany to undertake this work.

I have taken a great interest in the Government's move to support shire and town councils in regard to their town planning schemes. We know that on the south coast many beach shacks must be removed, because the owners are not abiding by the law and they are virtually squatters. At Cape Ridge many of these shacks had to be pulled down by March of this year. Accordingly, one of the residents of Cape Ridge set aside an area and applied for approval for a subdivision and caravan park to allow the people involved to transfer their shacks to a legal area from which they would not have to shift.

The Town Planning Board stated that it was not prepared to consider a subdivision of this type until the shire completed a coastal plan of development for its coastline. As we all know, the Albany coastline runs from Denmark to Paleniup estuary, which is approximately 80 miles long. Shires cannot afford to employ a person or to pay an engineer to undertake a planning scheme of this consequence while they have all their other engineering work to complete. They do not have the finance to employ a town planner.

As a result, the whole of the Albany Shire area is being held up for residential subdivision by virtue of the fact that the Town Planning Board will not agree to any further subdivision until such time as the shire submits an overall plan of development of the Albany Shire. The Albany Shire is something like 80 miles long and 15 or 20 miles wide, and the planning for an area like that is too great a financial burden for the shire to carry.

I would like to suggest to the Government that if this rule is to be adopted for all shire and town councils in Western Australia, it should be prepared to send a town planning officer from the board, where the rules are made, to these areas to draw up plans, in conjunction with the shire planners or engineers, which the shires will know coincide with the Town Planning Board's wishes and to which the local authorities are agreeable. The Government will thus help in the development of the State, which is closely tied up with local government bodies, and the councils will not be carrying the full burden and having the Town Planning Board knocking back their subdivisions. In a town like Albany, which is expanding rapidly and which does not have an overall planning scheme for the region, this would prevent considerable waste of time and effort.

I was recently a member of the South Coast Fisheries Study group which investigated fishing on the south coast. One matter which was not brought out in that study and which I believe should now be brought out is the establishment

of a marine research centre at Albany which was considered by the group to be the centre of the south coast fishing industry. That is not to say Albany will remain the centre. In years to come, with the development of the tuna industry at Esperance, perhaps Esperance will become the centre. If that is the case, a marine research centre should be established at Esperance also. Fishermen need background information and at present it seems to be a tedious task to obtain it from the CSIRO, and even then it is usually based on hearsay or feedback from other people.

I believe the State Government, through the Fisheries Department, should establish a research centre such as the one at Waterman. It would be of benefit to the fishing industry on the south coast. I mention that for what it is worth and I believe it will be of some worth to the State's development.

I have referred in other addresses in this House to the need for the Government to be aware of frail aged persons' needs. I think the State Government should in some way bear the responsibility for the aged people in this State, knowing full well it is the Federal Government's policy to make finance available for the care of the aged throughout Australia. The situation at the moment is that the Federal Government makes an allocation for the care of the aged once every three years. If an application is submitted at that time and approved, the project will go ahead, but we have a three-year dead spot between allocations of finance, and three years is a long time if one is in the 75 to 80 age group and requires immediate attention.

I believe I know of a source of a couple of million dollars which we could borrow to establish some homes for the aged throughout Western Australia in this interim period, provided the State Government could persuade the Federal Government to guarantee the repayment of the money plus interest at the end of that time. The source is a self-supporting group involved with aged people. It has the money available for particular purposes, which I am afraid I cannot discuss. I believe the group would permit us to utilise the money only on condition that it was paid back with interest when the next Federal allocation is made. This is an offer the Government should not refuse. It should go ahead and investigate this matter to ensure an on-going situation in the establishment of homes to care for the aged.

Another project on which I have been working for the past few months is pensioner caravan parks. If any members do not like the word

"pensioner", I will call them retired persons' caravan parks. I have been approached by many people who, at the end of their working life, have sold their home, bought a caravan, and taken a well deserved, extended holiday. After a few years they have found touring too much for them or they have become fed up with it. They have then found the cost of housing has increased to such an extent that the sale of the caravan at its reduced value would not enable them to purchase a home and they have difficulty in finding a home unit.

These people have suggested they would be more than happy to live in their caravans where they have everything they want. I suggest the Government could make available areas of land in different parts of the State and establish caravan parks for retired people, with slabs on which to erect an annexe, a central meeting hall-cum-shop, and so on. Such a scheme would save us a fortune in comparison with supplying accommodation for aged people in units, hostels, aged persons' homes, and so on. The only finance required would be for the cost of the land and perhaps the reticulation of water and sewerage.

I believe these people would form their own boards of management to run the villages, as they might be called. If they wanted to go on another holiday, they could simply hook the caravan up to the car and drive off. If a couple in Albany wanted a holiday in Geraldton, it might be possible for them to swap places with some people in a similar park at Geraldton.

Many retired people would be happy to stay in caravans. They cannot afford to buy a home, and they want to be in an environment where they are mixing and joining in activities with people of their own age. We could consider allowing them to establish a little garden area. They would carry out all the maintenance of the park themselves, such as lawn mowing and general cleaning up.

I think the Government would be very popular and wise to establish something like this. The people would be able to retain their estate in the way of the caravan, rather than have to sell it and pay a deposit on a home unit or other dwelling. We would save a lot of money, time, and exasperation, and retired people would be in accommodation where they were near people of their own age. They would keep an eye on one another, rather than be living in an area where no-one really cared about elderly residents and where they might not be noticed for days if they became ill. People in the same situation look after one another.

I would like the Government to do something about my suggestion and would be prepared to back it up as being very popular. A pensioner couple in Albany went around talking to people on my behalf and obtained the signatures of something like 1 000 people who would be interested in supporting a scheme like this. I think the Government could do something in this direction and be acclaimed for doing it.

In Albany we have a therapeutic pool committee which has been formed by the Lions Club. In the last few months it has been running fund-raising functions and food stalls, giving talks on the air, and advertising in the paper. Plans have been drawn up for a therapeutic pool to be built at the Albany Regional Hospital, and I am pleased to say on my representations the Premier has offered to meet us on a \$1 for \$2 basis. In other words, if the committee raises \$60 000 the State will contribute \$30 000 towards the pool. The way things are going it will not be long before a therapeutic pool and physiotherapy unit will be a reality in Albany.

I believe the therapeutic pool will be the first one outside the metropolitan area. The 1 500 people in Albany who suffer from rheumatism, arthritis, sciatica, asthma, and other complaints which can be treated in a therapeutic pool will no longer have to bear the extreme cost and inconvenience of having to travel to Perth for treatment.

We will also have established in Albany next year a speech therapist. On three occasions this year we have tried without success to obtain the services of a speech therapist for the Albany Regional Hospital.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Where did you get one?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I will not say. At the moment people who have children with speech problems are travelling 180 miles on the return trip to Kojonup to see a qualified speech therapist. The trip is very uncomfortable in the temperatures we experience at this time of the year. The speech therapist in Kojonup is expecting her first child and will not be available any longer. However, Albany will have a speech therapist next year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is surprising that they are not being trained. They are in very short supply.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Fourteen will be graduating this year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That will be a help. They are almost as scarce as hens' teeth.



The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I understand the number undergoing training has almost doubled. I think as a result many more centres will be able to obtain speech therapists, except that, as with most professional people, they do not like going to country centres. People often leave a country centre to come to Perth for training and they do not want to return to the country.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Perhaps the Government should give more funds to tertiary institutions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Every Government has been trying for years but has found it very difficult to get people to do the course. Do they train in Perth now?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: At WAIT. Fourteen will finish this month and will go to various centres. Fortunately, I have been able to obtain the services of one who will be pleased to go to Albany. I gather she will be starting in the new year.

I now move on to another matter I have mentioned previously in this House; that is, the situation of the unemployed. Recently the Government parties formed a committee called the Government Parties' Youth Affairs Committee. It published a notice in the newspapers inviting people to put submissions before it. I made submissions to the committee on the theme I have expressed previously in this House; that is, a national training type scheme—not a defence training scheme—in which young people can be brought together.

With working mothers and fathers, children are not getting sufficient parental control. They are spoilt with things which in our days children did not get, because mother was always there when we came home from school. Parents do not agree with children being reprimanded at school. I believe if children are in an institution, educational or otherwise, they must learn to accept and respect discipline, authority, and responsibility, and to work as a team. So many young people today say, "I want to do my own thing". All young people today seem to want to do their own thing.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Or do you think the point is that people use the word "I" all the time and want to build up their own ego?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I think that could be part of it also. However, the thing that is mainly lacking in our community—and we are losing national pride as a result of it—is that most young people have no respect for discipline or authority. Young people are not really prepared to accept responsibility; and the reason

is that that they have never had to accept responsibility. They are not prepared to work as a team.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Teamwork is most important; it is what counts.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: When I did national service training in 1954 I worked alongside, played alongside, and pulled along with 20 other national servicemen. In that time we had young men entering the Navy who had the intention of showing the instructors who they were. They thought they would not toe the line and would not be told what to do. Six months later they came out of the Navy as top line civilians who in my opinion would be respected in any quarter.

As a result of our high rate of unemployment we have young people with idle hands. I think there is a proverb to the effect that idle hands are mischievous hands, and this is where half of our problems arise. We have young people committing vandalism and creating trouble. We should give them something to do. We should give them something to strive for. We should give them some national pride.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We should teach them to kill.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Mr Cooley said that, not I. If that is the way he wants to look at it, it is his right to do so. I am simply trying to put forward an idea which I believe will help this country to fight its way out of the situation in which it finds itself. I do not want to enter into any cross-Chamber arguments, because I believe everybody has a right to say how he or she thinks the matter should be handled. I have my view, and I will express it within this House.

I have put my view to the Government Parties' Youth Affairs Committee, and I intend to mention a few of the points I put to the committee. I think if we encourage young people to go out and work together, play together, and do their physical training together subject to some sort of disciplinary control, we would make better citizens of them. There are some 450 000 young men and women between the ages of 18 and 20 years in our society. I do not think my scheme should be confined only to young men, but should include young women. They will be helped to find jobs by a national training scheme.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How long do you want to put them away for?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I do not like the term "put them away"; I am trying to do something in their interest. I think they should have a training period of approximately 12 months.

If before they entered the training period they had a job, the job should be waiting for them when they finish, just as my job was waiting for me when I came out of the Navy.

If we put 200 000 or 300 000 young people into such a scheme then possibly 200 000 jobs would be created and this would be a great help in respect of the unemployment situation. The scheme would give young people the chance to obtain a job when they finish training, because they would have a reference. Today if young people have not held a job they have no references.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Are you talking about a defence or a civilian training scheme?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I said at the outset it was a national training scheme and not a national training defence scheme.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: What will you do with them all?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: There are sufficient national projects on which they could be employed, using capital funds. We need people to work on the roads in the north of our State. These young people could be sent up there and housed just the same as Main Roads Department employees are housed. They could receive benefits similar to those offered by some iron ore companies; they could fly back to the metropolitan area two or three times a year. These young people could be clothed and fed, and be doing something in the national interest. At the same time they would be working together as a team and perhaps learning a trade. It does not matter what they learn; this country would benefit from it, because these young people would be working and we would not have on the streets and causing trouble the type of young people we see there today.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Why couldn't those jobs be made available to the Public Works Department now?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I am thinking about the amount of \$600 million which is paid out in unemployment benefits for no actual return. These young people could be utilised on the building of bridges, the construction of houses, the extension of buildings, and so on. The potential is endless.

I would look upon this as an idea which, given a little sane, reasonable consideration and without a great deal of opposition from people who I think sometimes do not want to solve the unemployment problem, could be of benefit to the country.

I know there are some young people on the dole who will not accept jobs. Last year I phoned Mr Paterson of the Commonwealth Employment Service in Albany, because I wanted to offer a week's work to two young chaps. I had been very busy, and I had a lot of work to do around my home and garden which I could not attend to. Mr Paterson said there was not one person he could send me. I told him I did not want a skilled worker, but just a couple of young chaps who might be moving through the area and might want a week's work. He told me there was just no-one available of the type I required.

I asked him whether there was unemployment, and he said there were unemployed persons but mostly in the Gnowangerup, Tambellup, Wagin, and Katanning areas. He said most were coloured people who did not want a job, anyway.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who said that? Mr Paterson of the Commonwealth Employment Service?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: He said there was a situation in which people did not want to work. He said there were young people moving through the area but the service could only offer them jobs and if they did not want to take the jobs that was it. However, they could be removed from the benefits.

Last year my brother-in-law was doing a job in Perth. He phoned the CES, because he needed the worksite cleaned up. He asked for two men to be on the site the following day. He was told two men would be sent there at 7.45 a.m. My brother-in-law arrived at the site at 7.45 a.m. and waited until 9.30 a.m., but no-one turned up. So he phoned the CES again. He was told, "We are terribly sorry. We contacted two young men who should have been there. However, we will have two there tomorrow."

The next morning my brother-in-law again went to the site and waited. At about 8.30 a.m. one young chap turned up and asked, "What do you want done, mate?" My brother-in-law asked him where the other chap was and was told, "I don't know anything about anyone else; I was told to turn up here this morning." My brother-in-law told the person that he wanted the site cleaned up and all the rubbish put into a disposal bin, and he could work at it for a couple of weeks if necessary. The young man said, "Oh God, I won't do that. I am not looking for a labourer's job. I want a job in an office or something like that."

My brother-in-law again rang the CES and told the officers there that he wanted the names of the four unemployed persons, because he

wanted their names circulated throughout every employment office in Australia. He said if the CES did not do it he would do it himself, because he was sick to death of reading about unemployment and the problems of young people in the newspapers when he could not get anyone to work for him.

I believe we are not going to solve the problem of unemployment by asking companies to take on more personnel; it is just not possible to place 200 000 to 300 000 people in industry, and expect industry to maintain its present capacity. Therefore we must consider a training scheme where unemployed people will receive physical training and learn to respect authority and hopefully gain job opportunities.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Why not write to the Federal Treasurer and see what he says?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I have.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Did he reply?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I have even sent a letter to the Prime Minister and I have made a submission to the Government Parties' Youth Affairs Committee. Unfortunately there seems to be a feeling within Federal Government circles that we should not be able to force people to do something against their will. That surprises me, because I am a taxpayer, and I happen to believe that if my taxes are being used to pay unemployment benefits then we should be getting something back. It is time all people of this country received some benefit from the taxes being paid out in unemployment benefits to people who do not want to work. If this goes on we could get to the stage of becoming a welfare State. If we let the situation continue for long enough somewhere along the line the money must run out because the people working to pay taxes to support those who are unemployed must sooner or later give up the ghost. If no-one is earning money, from where will the money come to pay unemployment benefits? Somewhere along the line the equilibrium must change.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: After you have trained all these young people, where will they get jobs?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: It appears to me Miss Elliott is really not trying to listen to me. I said many of these people would be leaving behind jobs which they would come back to. Those who did not have jobs would at least have a reference they could use when looking for a job. Perhaps many of them would be employed, because the employers would know they were prepared to pitch in and work.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott interjected.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I was in business, and I know how it works. The problem now is that the employers in this country are keeping their work force to a minimum. They are keeping only those employees whom they can rely on to do a decent day's work for a decent day's pay.

Last year I travelled through Europe and visited Sweden and Switzerland. Both those countries have never been involved in a war. Both have national training defence schemes. I do not know why they are called defence schemes when the countries have never been at war.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Sweden is very active in nuclear energy.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Here are countries with national training schemes, and they do not appear to be experiencing the sorts of problems being experienced by other countries which are prepared to pay unemployment benefits to people who do not want to work.

A national training scheme would not need to be of a compulsory type. In fact, when I put the submission to the Government Parties' Youth Affairs Committee I also made a news release to the *Sunday Independent*. The following week that newspaper carried out a survey, which was published in the next issue of its newspaper. Of the eight young people interviewed, all of them approved of the scheme I suggested. I think that is a fair indication that young people are looking for some guidance from Governments of this country. I believe it is our duty to ensure we give them guidance. The young people are prepared to do something about it. This Government is supposed to be running the country, and we have done nothing about it. I know the State Government cannot be held completely responsible, but at least we should be putting pressure on the Federal Government.

There are ways and means of making this scheme work and of getting young people into groups and working together, and giving them national pride. There are many areas of work which could be added to those I have mentioned. If a national scheme is formed, young people in it would have to be housed. This would create work for the building industry. The young people would have to be clothed, which would mean more work for the textile and clothing industries. There would be a need for typists, stenographers, cooks, laundry assistants, and many other types of employees. We would find many jobs would be created.

My suggested scheme would not be the be-all and end-all; it would not be the ultimate answer to the situation. However, at least we would be trying to do something. We would be making an effort. We will never get anywhere by sitting on our backsides and doing nothing. We must make a move in some direction, and I see the scheme I have suggested as the type of direction we should be considering.

I am concerned for the young people of this country. I have seven children of my own whose ages range from 15 to 21, and I think I should be concerned about them. Fortunately all of my children have jobs, and I am very pleased they have. Only one other member in the Chamber can equal my claim; that is Mr Pike, who also has seven children. I am interested in seeing young people getting ahead; I am very interested in seeing them attaining national pride such as I had when I was a young man.

When I was a young man I had respect for the police and law and order. I respected discipline and authority. I have endeavoured to bring up my children to have the same respect. I want to see the young people of this country have the opportunity to gain the same outlook. If we can achieve that I am sure our country will be much better for it.

I am not saying our unemployment problem can be changed overnight; no-one can solve the problem overnight—I do not care who it is. However, I think we can do something. If we all sit here in Parliament and argue backwards and forwards about minor interests and intricacies, and everyone is arguing against such a scheme, we will never get anywhere.

One of the members of the Opposition said last year or early this year that there were times when we should work together. If we are interested in the young people of our country, this is a time when, instead of knocking one another or trying to knock one another's ideas, we should work together in the interests of the young people. Many of the young people looking for jobs are not yet of voting age.

I am prepared to try to help. I am prepared to advance my views. I am prepared to try to substantiate the situation. I have four pages of suggestions to make. However, in the spirit of co-operation that the Leader of the House mentioned earlier, I will not go through them.

I do not wish to complete my speech yet. There are other matters I would like to discuss. However, I feel obliged to stop. I have had a good airing of my feelings on these matters.

One of the most important things for us to do is to look after our old people. The second most important thing is to look after our young people. We should do those things in the interests of our country. I believe we live in a great country. I am prepared to fight for it and to die for it, because I respect it. I have grown to love my country, and I hope that young people will feel the same way.

I support the motion.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) 15.16 p.m.: I was not going to speak about unemployment tonight; but after hearing Mr Knight, I feel I should make a couple of points. I respect Mr Knight's views; but he seems to be very naive about the economic well-being of this country and of the world.

If we were to implement the schemes Mr Knight has in mind, it would mean the revival of a lot of the war-time or emergency regulations. There would have to be national security regulations, among others, to allow people to be impressed into some kind of training scheme. When one talks about training schemes, one recalls the grey-clad figures seen in Germany prior to 1939 who had shovels on their shoulders and who preached "Strength through joy". When the dispute occurred over the free port of Danzig, the shovels were quickly replaced by rifles, and the world was plunged into the most horrific war—

The Hon. T. Knight: That was done for a particular reason.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: May I remind Mr Knight, if he wants to talk about the question of unemployment, of the great suffering of the German people after the first war. It was the unemployment that led the German people into the folly that plunged the world into war.

The Hon. T. Knight: That is when that sort of thing happens, when you get your ills and your depressions.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The only thing Mr Knight did not mention was the need for our country to have a couple of good forgers. We would need them to set up printing presses to print the money to pay for the schemes Mr Knight envisages. In the daily Press we read of more schemes requiring more money from Canberra.

The schemes suggested by Mr Knight may have some merit; but there simply is not enough money to pay for them. When the money supply starts to dry up, unemployment is created. Let me remind members that in the countries of the

European Economic Community there are 15 million people aged between 15 and 25 who are unemployed.

I wish to refer to an article which appeared in *The Australian*. In that article, the Victorian Minister for Social Security, who is a member of Mr Knight's party, predicts that 31 per cent of the work force will be unemployed by 1984. That particular date has significance in relation to a book. That is a prediction that horrifies me. Mr Dixon is a very responsible Minister, and he predicts an unemployment figure of 31 per cent. There is not much point in talking about training people when there will be that number unemployed.

I asked a question in the House the other day. The question related to the State Engineering Works, and it read as follows—

- (1) Over the past 12 months, how many workers have been retrenched from the State Engineering Works in North Fremantle?
- (2) Are any further retrenchments contemplated?

The answer I received is pertinent to the comments made by Mr Knight. The Minister belongs to the same party as Mr Knight, and he is very responsible and honest. The first part of the answer read—

- (1) Formal retrenchments have been 10 in the past 12 months.

I did not go to the trouble of asking what the informal retrenchments were, and how many of those there were.

The Hon. T. Knight: That is when they are retrenched in their boiler suits.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not know about that. The second part of the answer read as follows—

- (2) No further retrenchments are contemplated immediately. However, work is very short in the blacksmith, boiler-making and carpenter shops, and if work continues to decline up to five blacksmiths, 20 boilermakers and 25 carpenters may have to be retrenched.

That is a typical understatement. Those people will be retrenched although they are extremely well trained. What is the point in having them trained again?

If one looks at the figures of unemployed people in Australia today, one finds that many bread-winners are involved. Those people will not take kindly to the type of training proposed

by Mr Knight. I am not discounting his suggestion, because we may reach a situation where this kind of action will need to be taken.

The Hon. T. Knight: Do you realise the greatest amount of building in Australia was done during the depression?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not like anyone to suggest to me that the years of depression should be repeated.

I attended a meeting in Carnarvon recently. Somebody suggested that people should be provided with food coupons. A very large group of Yugoslav people were at that meeting, and they nearly lifted the roof in their opposition to that suggestion. No-one with any human understanding would want to see such a thing reintroduced.

I agree it is not much good quoting statistics. However, behind every single statistic on unemployment there is a real person. Those people are old, young, and middle-aged; they are married or single. If one goes back to square one, one finds that each unemployed person represents a story of human misery.

One comment made by Mr Knight interests me greatly, and I intend to take it further. He said that the Director of the Commonwealth Employment Service in Albany—a Commonwealth civil servant—had the gall to say that people did not want to work. I can only say that the man is a liar or he is not doing his job. If the director knew that a person did not want a job, he had the responsibility of taking that person off benefits. If the situation is examined, it will be found that the director did not make the statement, or that it was not correct.

The Australian economy has never been in a worse state. It is the worst it has been since the great depression. The present State and Federal Governments must take a heavy share of the responsibility for the state of the economy. I am not saying the present situation is completely the fault of those Governments.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: It would not be if we were in office.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The question of unemployment has gone too far for Mr Knight to make that suggestion. The people of Australia are saying that political slogans and phrasemongering will not cure unemployment.

Members should remember the situation at the State Engineering Works. That is a very capable and well equipped engineering works. It is one of the premier engineering works in this State. However, 20 boilermakers, 25 carpenters, and

five blacksmiths will be retrenched. That does not take account of the tradesmen's assistants and labourers who will also be retrenched.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: That is not the only place. What about the Midland Abattoir?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will not go into that one!

Some radical changes need to take place in our society. When one mentions the word "radical", people usually think of the marching in the streets that takes place in the People's Republic of China or the Soviet Union. I am not talking about that kind of radicalism. There is another term being used today in America and other parts of the world. That term is "post-industrialism". Post-industrialism, as far as I can make out, is a term used by a person named Herbert Cahn of the Hudson Institute. What the term means is that, as the world entered the industrial revolution, we are now moving out of the industrial phase and into another phase of human development. We are moving into the technological phase in which millions of people will not be able to find work, whether that is their wish or not.

In this new era, we should consider anew what we are to do. In Australia, despite the fact that we are far from Europe and North America, we will take part in the post-industrial revolution. It is all very well to say that there are all kinds of markets which are open to us. However, we should be saying that a number of countries to our north have large numbers of people and we hope they will buy the goods that we produce.

I have some notes on unemployment which were prepared recently. I wish to indicate how researchers boil down all of this human misery into a few words. They use fancy names. I am not knocking the researcher who prepared the information for me. He is a very capable member of my party.

The researcher has told me that there are several different types of unemployment. The first type of unemployment is structural unemployment; the second type is frictional unemployment; the third type is seasonal unemployment; and the fourth type is cyclical unemployment—that is, employment that goes in cycles. Suddenly it has been discovered that there is another type of unemployment which is now branded technological unemployment. In order to work out what all of this means, the more academically minded people use what is called a Phillips curve. However, it all boils down to the fact that we are talking about people.

There may be status involved in the category of unemployment of which one is a part. If a person could say, "I am one of the technological unemployed", he would probably be better off than a member of the seasonal unemployed category. Other categories may be further down the ladder. The information I have sets out where unemployment is occurring, and the groups of people in which it is occurring.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Where are you on the curve?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: What does it really matter? It seems to me we spend a lot of time and money on things which do not really matter. However, I am not knocking the researcher who provided this information for me, although it does not provide information on how people will obtain jobs in the future.

The information does not provide any hope for long-term benefits, or even long-term opportunities for people to obtain jobs. The situation seems to be becoming worse.

When I speak about post-industrialism, I find it difficult to accept the proposition that Australia will move into the post-industrial cycle. I agree that a lot of development will be done in this country; but that development will only be carried out if there is a world demand for the goods we produce. Most of those goods are produced from the mine, the forest, and the farm. If other parts of the world do not need these commodities, it will be difficult for us to be able to climb out of the situation.

It is no good just hopping up and making do with a few smart quips or reading off some of the propositions put forward for alleviating unemployment. Obviously the present Government's economic policies have failed, and they will continue to fail and fail to the extent that we will have nearly a million people unemployed unless the downward trend is halted. Even I would not envisage the present economic policies being maintained by Fraser.

I have some statistics here to prove my point, quite apart from the comments made by Mr Knight. As in America, when large volumes of youth are unemployed, we have many other problems. In the bayside suburb of Frankston 80 per cent of young people are unemployed. That is in one small area. There is an increase in the incidents of suicide, drug taking, breaking and entering, assaults committed with violence, and so on. We have the same pattern. I have the information in front of me. The same pattern has occurred in Europe and America and it is occurring now in Australia. In the Dandenong

area of Victoria, where most of these studies have been carried out, the suicide rate among the unemployed is creeping up. These are the social problems which arise as a result of unemployment. I agree with Mr Knight: we have to pay for these problems collectively.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: A greater number of young people are committing suicide.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I agree with the honourable member. The average young person born into our society has high expectations. He looks forward to a job and wants to join the work force. He wants to save enough money to buy a motorcar and to be with the group. The first three months on the dole might seem fairly attractive to him; but in the second three months he gets a little despondent; and if he stays on the dole for nine months studies conducted both here and overseas show that he may never work again. These young people get into a trough and they are destroyed well before they reach the age of 21.

If this trend continues one can imagine the types or problems we will have. If the Victorian Minister's predictions are borne out—and I hope they are not—that 31 per cent of the work force will be unemployed by 1984, which is exactly six years away, we will have all the problem we see now in Europe with the urban guerilla movements and the other difficulties which go with them.

I was horrified to discover the other day when the West German President, Mr Scheel, was here that Hans Vander who was travelling with him from the German trade union movement—and we have the German trade union movement rammed down our throats in this country—travels around Germany with six bodyguards.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: One of the problems about the German delinquency situation is that a great number of the people involved come from the affluent section of the society.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Medcalf has hit the nail on the head. Two per cent of the work force in Sweden is unemployed and I believe when the Attorney General went to lunch with the Swedish Ambassador he referred to it. The urban guerilla movement has grown up in Sweden despite the fact that only 2 per cent of the work force is unemployed.

The young people who join the guerilla movement are well educated. Their expectations have been built up by the State and they cannot get what they expect. The guerilla movement is fed by the unemployed. A person who is not so well

educated is probably more easily controlled, mainly because he does not think about his situation.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: A lot of those Germans do not want to be employed at all—the ones I am talking about.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have a copy of a German newspaper—

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The Bader Meinhoff group.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not suggest the members of that group want to work. They are working overtime as it is. The fact is over a million people in Germany are unemployed. The point I am trying to make is youth unemployment is not confined to Australia. It is a world wide problem. The difficulties experienced in other parts of the world are occurring here. Some of the problems experienced overseas have not been felt here and I hope we never suffer from them; but there is a good chance we shall have similar problems. We are not insulated against them and we should not pick up statistics and quote them. We have to front up to the problem and it must be fronted up to by the leaders of the country—by Parliaments and Governments.

The RED scheme was most successful; I should like to see a scheme similar to that brought back on a smaller regional basis. When the Tonkin Government came into office unemployment was at a reasonably high level. I recall being taken to a meeting at Kwinana which 900 to 1 000 men attended. I went to it along with the Hon. Don Taylor and Senator Hallett who was a Country Party member in the Federal Government. We stood up on the platform at Medina Hall while the people whistled and cat-called. We had to provide job opportunities. We went about it in a very low key manner, because we did not have very much money available for a more extensive programme. Mr Gayfer and other members would remember the situation.

The RED scheme started by the Federal Government could have been modelled on the scheme put into operation in Western Australia by the Tonkin Government. At the last election we incorporated a blueprint in our policies to help overcome unemployment. I will not read it. It was very low key. It does not matter which Government is in power; unemployment will not go away because a couple of slogans are written. I believe this Government, as a State Government should be having a look at the matter. It should be seeking the co-operation of the Opposition to try to determine how we can best handle the unemployment situation in this State.

Only a couple of years ago I went on a country tour and I spoke about the problems which were made known to me in this House. It was asked that money be made available to country districts to stop the drift—I think Mr Knight mentioned it—from the country to the city. I do not know whether we said that at the time; but the Premier made available a million dollars or half a million dollars.

I agree money is running out rapidly and the problems are mounting. One has only to walk around the cities or anywhere else to see the problems. The schools will close at Christmas time and some students will have completed their last year of education. They will be disgorged into the work force. We should not forget when looking at the statistics on unemployment the young people who have spent another year at school in the hope that the situation will improve, because the situation simply is not improving.

We need to take radical action. There has to be a complete change in our thinking in relation to the employment situation. Some of the suggestions which have been made, and which are rather radical in their approach, are set out in a paper written by Barry Jones, a Federal Labor member who was well known as a quiz kid.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: He is better at that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: But at least he comes up with ideas which are food for thought. I do not believe we are thinking enough about this great problem. We are more inclined to get up and talk about it, and I am no exception, to try to earn our living by flinging statements backwards and forwards. I will refer to the comments made by Mr Jones which are as follows—

There are several ways of tackling the problems of job-displacement caused by the new technology. All of them are to be regarded as options for investigation. None will provide a complete answer.

It is a completely new situation. New answers have to be found and it will be necessary to use new terminology.

'Post-industrialism' is a better term than automation because it is far more comprehensive. 'Automation' generally refers to job displacement in manufacturing industry only.

I just want to make that point. I do not know how long it has taken for the penny to drop, but when we talk about the jobs which have been lost as a result of technology we should perhaps look at one of the old bumper boards which used

to be outside Trades Hall and on which appeared the names of all the unions. The last time I noticed one was 10 years ago and three-quarters of the unions which had appeared there previously had disappeared. They were no longer in business. They had been taken over by new technology. The members of the wheelwrights union and other unions have gone into other fields of work. As new technology comes along it has swallowed up people and disgorged them into another area of work. Now technology has taken over to such an extent that it swallows up people, but it does not spit them out again. They remain within the maw of the new technological age.

Post industrialism includes automation, the growth of the information sector and miniaturisation in which smaller machines have greatly enlarged functions. Some of the issues were discussed earlier and we have some options to help us overcome the problem. One such option is work sharing. What a bad word that is! Another is *flexible options on retirement*. The Japanese retirement age is 55. A further option is sabbatical leave for workers, although it appears to me that university staff have just had that sawn in half or curtailed. Other options are a shorter working week, longer annual holidays, and abolition of overtime. One could look at some of the research I have carried out on this matter as to how many hours we work. There are other options open to us. When I say "a shorter working week" it will mean our society will take on a completely new structure. Some of the alternatives include the recognition of domestic workers as a separate economic sector. What a horrible thought! However, I believe we have to think about it.

Other alternatives include guaranteed minimum incomes, redefining work, expansion of non-vocational education and further education, a greater absorption of young people in full-time education, and encouragement of arts and crafts work, hobbies and other useful and productive ways of employing time. That is what it comes down to and Mr Medcalf has referred to this matter.

The radicalism which has to be embraced by all Governments all over the world would have to begin in the not-too-distant future. We in the western democracies are masters of our own destinies. We must start redefining work. I have touched on only a few of the options open to us, but redefinition of work is important. Recently when I raised the matter of domestic employment people just about went through the roof; but every housewife in Western Australia works in domestic employment and in many cases they are unpaid, unrewarded, and unsung.



The Hon. T. Knight: Are you going to send that to your wife?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: She would not believe me. I hope members understand the trend of my thoughts, because I should like them to understand the type of radicalism I am advocating. We may have to forgo our 35 or 40-hour week. We may have to work a 25-hour week. The work week may have to cover 24 hours, seven days a week, and be split up between the workers. I know that does not meet with any popular support; but real problems are in front of us and the only way we will solve them is to come face to face with them. They will not be solved by the slogans of the right or of the left. There is no way in the world that will happen. The very fact that someone says, "A capitalist economy will fix it up more quickly than a socialist economy," or, "A socialist economy will do it better than a capitalist economy" or, "The capitalists and socialists are both the same and the only people who can solve the problem are the Trotskies" is not necessarily the answer. The answer lies with us and it is no good someone saying, "Give Malcom Fraser an opportunity to put another million people out of employment and we shall then solve the problem and everything will be rosy. The private sector will be rejuvenated."

It will not happen that way. Any sane person would hope it would, but it will not. Unemployment will be with us for some time unless we open up new options and new opportunities. If we do not start to do something very quickly then some of the things will occur in this country which are occurring in other countries. We simply cannot have upwards of 500 000 people—some of them highly educated—marching backwards and forwards without having some sort of consequence arise. If the figure touches the one million mark, and nothing is done, other people will come here, slip into the breach, and do it for us. Perhaps they will bring with them more violent types of options, but the people will be ready to accept anything.

If any further confirmation is necessary—without talking about the people of Germany or Sweden—I ask members to look at what is happening in Italy. That is an intensely Catholic country, but it has the biggest Communist Party outside the Soviet Union. In Italy the people go to church on Sunday mornings and to red rallies on Sunday afternoons. They are looking for a way out. They are promised action—a riot a week. The situation has gone even further because, as a result of answers not coming forward, the red brigades have been formed. They have followers and it horrifies me to see news

items to the effect that another three or four people have been assassinated. In many cases, they are innocent people.

One could go on for several hours and talk about unemployment. The point I am making is that many of our debates should be centred on ways to get out of the problem. It can only get worse; it will not get any better. It will not matter who is the Prime Minister or who is the Premier; the problem is with us and we have to do something. I am afraid that Mr Knight's suggestion is not the answer, but at least he popped up with something.

I now want to talk about a couple of matters nearer to my home province. The first concerns the replies to some questions I asked about the state of the surface of Canning Highway. If members from this Chamber travel along Canning Highway they will know that between Riseley Street and Stock Road a large area of the surface has lifted from the foundation. On the 6th September, I asked the Minister the following question—

- (1) Who were the contractors responsible for re-surfacing Canning Highway between Riseley Street and Stock Road?

The answer to that question was—

- (1) Pioneer Asphalts Pty Limited (WA Branch).

It is a very serious matter when public funds are spent on resurfacing a road, and then that surface breaks up. I was not satisfied with the answer I received to that question, so on the 21st September I asked another question. I asked—

Further to my questions Nos. 253 on the 6th September, 1978, and 295 on the 13th September, 1978, can the Minister advise—

- (1) The cost of the contract for re-surfacing Canning Highway between Riseley Street and Stock Road?
- (2) When the contractors will repair this section of Canning Highway?
- (3) Why there was a lack of compaction and low bitumen content in the hot-mix surface used by the contractors?
- (4) What steps does the Government intend to take to ensure that inferior re-surfacing work does not occur in future contracts?

The answer to that question was—

- (1) \$132 460.

- (2) An early start on the removal of faulty material is being negotiated with the contractor.
- (3) and (4) Detailed investigation by both the Main Roads Department and the contractor is still in progress to be sure of all of the reasons for failure, the most appropriate action to be taken to correct the failures, and the steps which are necessary to ensure that there will be no recurrence in future works.

Fortunately, very little trouble of this nature has occurred which is partly due to close supervision of both the specifications for the bituminous concrete and the laying of the material on the road. This close supervision will continue.

What happened, of course, was that there was a low bitumen content in the hot-mix which was placed on the road. There was a lack of compaction. However, at no stage did the Minister say that any action would be taken against the contractor, and to the best of my knowledge the road has not been properly resurfaced yet. I think that is a scandal. I am not saying that the contractor did a bad job deliberately, but surely to goodness when the Government pays for a job to be done by a contractor, through the Main Roads Department, the department should have someone in attendance to see that standards are met. It is the taxpayers' money that is involved, and taxpayers are entitled to some protection. I would hate to think we were reaching the stage where we have scandal after scandal such as those which occur in America when someone wants to make a fast buck.

If one wanted to be mischievous one would ask embarrassing questions. However, that would not be correct. The answers to my questions did not set out what was to happen; they did not give me the information to which I am entitled. I know the Mayor of Melville is concerned, and many citizens of Western Australia are concerned.

On the 7th November, I asked another question, as follows—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the state of Canning Highway due to the break up of the hot-mix surface at the Hislop Road intersection?
- (2) When is it expected that repairs will be effected?

The reply to that question was—

- (1) Yes.

- (2) During November. The material which failed at Hislop Road was removed allowing traffic to use the original surface pending replacement with satisfactory material.

A number of points are involved. Firstly, the job should have been completed to specifications and, secondly, the people who use the road while it is under repair have to put up with certain disadvantages. Up to today's date, there does not seem to have been any attempt to repair the road. I hope some action will be taken very shortly. If the contractor cannot clear up the work satisfactorily then the Main Roads Department should do it. Perhaps we should go back to the old-fashioned methods and have the Main Roads Department carrying out all the roadworks. There is nothing wrong with the roads which were built by the Main Roads Department all through this State.

If a building in Perth started to break up because the building contractor had not used the proper materials, there would quickly be a court case seeking damages.

If the Main Roads Department is not able to do its work, and the work is done by contractors, then why should not the department have someone present? I do not suggest any drastic action should be taken, but I would like to receive some assurance that there will not be a recurrence. I do not know how supervision should take place, but I imagine the Main Roads Department would have an engineer who could see that the correct procedures were carried out.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: We would probably have an army of inspectors.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No-one wants an army of inspectors. They would not be inspecting one another. One or two people could do the job.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I think you may be right.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Would it not have been a good idea to get in touch with the Minister?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would imagine that in the case of a very serious matter like this, the Minister would be well aware of the problem. I could get up and scream "corruption".

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That would not help very much.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It would make headlines. However, all I want is the road.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You won't make headlines unless you wake up the Press.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There are no members of the Press present. They know what a dreary place this is.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: *Hansard* is still here.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not be surprised if *Hansard* refused to come here. We are so dreary that the Press has deserted us.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: There is one Press reporter present.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I asked another question yesterday, the 22nd November. My question was—

- (1) Is the Australian National Line about to introduce the roll-on/roll-off vessel *Townsville Trader* into the Melbourne/Hobart/Fremantle trade on a fortnightly service?

The answer to that question was—

- (1) The Minister has heard a rumour to this effect and it is known the *Townsville Trader* is laid up in Melbourne. However, there has been no official information from Australian National Line. In reply to telephone inquiries today, Australian National Line has advised the operation of an east-west service is under consideration but they are not yet in a position to make a decision.

I also asked—

- (2) If "Yes", what effect will the new service have on the monthly service at present operated by the State Shipping Service to Melbourne/Hobart and Fremantle?

The answer to the second part of my question was, "Not known". I do not think that competitors are likely to ring someone up and tell them that they are starting in opposition next week. I think the whole answer to my question is honest and correct; it is not known whether the new vessel will affect the State Shipping Service.

It is well known in shipping circles around the Port of Fremantle that the *Townsville Trader* will go into service for one very good reason: although the State Shipping Service has been kicked around considerably it has been making a success of this trade. It has been carrying goods into Western Australia from Tasmania at very competitive rates.

The *Townsville Trader* is a roll-on-roll-off vessel and I am afraid to say it will probably take cargo from the State ships. Without a shadow of doubt, the ANL is a very competent operator. As a consequence of the vessel coming into service, there could be a serious effect. The

Coastal Shipping Commission could be forced to sell another vessel and in so doing would create a great deal more unemployment not only for the port, but the port workers, the ship repairers, the engineering services, and the providers.

I would like the Minister to be a little more vigorous when he seeks replies to questions of this kind, because it seems to me I have received a lame answer which does not really do anything. The answer stated that the department had telephoned the ANL.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why will the introduction of the ship put Western Australia out of business?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Well, in reply to Mr Gayfer, he is in the business of chartering ships. The ANL could be acting as agents. The roll-on-roll-off ship will provide a fortnightly service as against the monthly service already provided. That is the difference in loading time.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is possible the service will be used more because it is cheaper.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The State Shipping Service is very competitive with its rates, and in the provision of services. I do not know that it will survive much longer.

I would have liked the opportunity to speak longer on the question of unemployment. I remind the present Government that options are open to it. When the Tonkin Government got into strife at least at some level it decided to provide some relief. The present problem not only affects people who are unemployed now, but also people who have yet to have the unfortunate experience. I refer to the people working in the State Engineering Works and organisations such as that.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.*

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [7.30 p.m.]: Before the suspension of the sitting for tea we listened to a lively speech from the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, he was replying to some of the ideas advanced by the Hon. Tom Knight.

I was a little horrified to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the last time people carried shovels over their shoulders was in Germany, prior to 1939, and we were soon plunged into war. He was implying that the whole world was plunged into war at that time because Germany was creating the illusion of a warlike atmosphere. I am content to accept the point of view advanced by the Leader of the Opposition.

At the same time, however, I was horrified by the statement, because in my travels over recent years, particularly into Russia, I have seen many

people carrying shovels over their shoulders. In fact, I noticed that in Russia the people were obliged to carry shovels; anyone who has travelled through Russia would know that what I say is true.

In my 11 day stay in Russia a little over 12 months ago I visited the seaside resort of Odessa. Before the people could visit that town for a holiday, they were obliged to seek permission from the local trade union, and when they visited the town they were required to put in work days looking after gardens and so on in the town. This requirement applies all over Russia.

As a matter of fact, the Russians are very proud that most of their underground railway system has been built by "voluntary" labour. It is a superb system. The underground stations are magnificent, temple-like structures, with chandeliers hanging from the ceilings. They are beautifully kept, with not a sign of defilement anywhere. That underground system was built virtually by marshalled, free labour. Those people literally marched into this job with shovels over their shoulders.

This worries me a little, because the Leader of the Opposition believes that once the people of any nation walk around with shovels over their shoulders the next step is war. I am horrified to think what might happen to us, having seen the number of people in Russia with shovels over their shoulders. In particular, I am concerned at what might be the outcome of the Russian attitude—as espoused by Mr Knight—that people should take a personal pride and interest in their State and activities, and should work together collectively; in fact, those were the very words Mr Knight used. If that is the medium of war, I hate to think what is going to happen in the near future, because this policy is followed not only in Russia but also in China.

Incidentally, Russia has overcome part of its unemployment problem by having compulsory conscription into the armed forces. As soon as a person turns 19 years of age, he leaves what is known as the junior cadet forces and enters the armed services. He is required to serve two years in the Army or, I understand, five years in the Navy. So, everybody is occupied.

Whilst I have never been to China, I understand from my readings that everybody in that country is obliged to carry a shovel over his shoulder and go into the fields and outback regions of China once a year to do "voluntary" labour.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Even the academics.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, even Mr Hetherington would have to do it if he lived in China.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Is that how you propose to solve our unemployment problem?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No, I am saying that Mr Knight made an excellent point when he said that Australians should have more pride in their country.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: When do you think Russia's underground was built?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The last underground system was built about six years ago and the first one was built in 1935. Nevertheless, they have adopted this scheme ever since Leningrad virtually went out of existence during the great October Revolution of 1917.

The point I am making, and which Mr Cooley seems to miss, is that there is a compulsion in these countries in this direction. I am not arguing for or against that sort of compulsion. However, if it was good enough for Mr Dans to say it caused war in Germany, it is good enough for me to draw the analogy to Russia and China, and to conclude that war is imminent.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You try to implement that sort of scheme under a capitalist system and see what happens.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have been to Israel and seen the same sort of system in operation. That country is not free of war by any means.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are wrong.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am not; I have seen the system in operation and have talked to the people. There must be about one-third of the people in Russia who walk around with shovels over their shoulders; this must mean that war is imminent.

I always thought the idea of Russia's conscripted armed forces and its voluntary-compulsory work force was to show the free world what a wonderful nation it was, and how much its people disliked war. I mention this point only because Mr Dans said that to carry a shovel over one's shoulder constituted a warlike act.

I spent some 11 days in Russia, and did not confine my visit only to Moscow. I talked to the people and discovered that they did not want war. It was amazing to see people on farms and in country towns; they never wore a coat or a tie but they never went without their ribbons from the last campaign; one never saw these people without their ribbons on their coat pockets.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: And they were proudly worn, too.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: When the young people are married, the ceremony is conducted in front of the shrine of remembrance, one of which is in every town. When the ceremony is over, they leave the bouquet on the shrine of remembrance. The service is conducted by a civil member of the local governing council, which is their trade union. These are the people who allocate cars, housing and everything else.

These people do all the things Mr Knight suggested were good, yet Mr Dans said these very acts in Germany led to a world war. That is the only point I want to make.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You are over simplifying what Mr Dans said.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not think so; I am just drawing the analogy.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: If Mr Knight is advocating we adopt an authoritarian system like they have in Russia, I would be surprised, too.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am only a simple layman; I am talking about something I heard in this Chamber and I am relating it to my personal experience.

I am not denying that Mr Dans is right when he states that this sort of martial conscription caused Hitler to go to war. There is no doubt about it: If we train a boxer in the corner of a ring for weeks and weeks and never give him a fight, that boxer is likely to turn on us. Hitler was feeding these people raw steak, and he had to give them a scrap.

I sympathise with what Mr Dans said. However, he reminded me of what I had seen, but did not notice, during my stay in Russia. I thought, "My goodness, how absolutely horrifying." I recalled I had seen people carrying shovels over their shoulders, and smiling and singing.

I was very busy during my 11 days in Russia and the only place in which I had a chance to walk around was Odessa. I can recall watching a queue of people waiting to catch a bus at 6.30 in the morning. When the bus was full, it moved away, leaving several people at the bus stop. Immediately that bus departed, those people took up birch brooms—virtually, only twigs on the end of a stick—and started sweeping the street.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I just cannot believe that!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I can assure Mr Cooley that is the honest-to-God truth. They were pleased to do it because it was expected of them. I can bring 10 witnesses to Mr Cooley

to prove what I am saying is true. If I could have taken a photograph I would have been able to show Mr Cooley it was true.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You were not allowed to.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Cooley should go to Odessa and see if he can walk freely around with a camera.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Were they paid penalty rates for this early morning work?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No; that is the point I am making. They loved their country and they were happy to do this work. This is the principle which should be instilled into the people of our country. It is the sort of principle under which the Apex organisation operates, and I can only surmise that Apex carries out this sort of voluntary work for the love of its country. These people in Odessa swept the dirt into little heaps, and trucks came along later in the day and picked them up.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I cannot accept that. There is no rubbish in the street. Trucks wash the streets every morning.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not know what I am saying to upset Mr Cooley so much; I do not particularly want to get anybody upset. As members know, we are a House of Review—Mr Cooley admits that—and we have an obligation to listen to the debate and work out in our own minds exactly what the speaker on his feet is talking about.

When Mr Dans spoke, he mentioned he was worried about our shipping arrangements to the north-west. I felt very sorry about the fact a decision had been made to move to roll-on-roll-off cargo ships. The Leader of the House will recall that some years ago we discussed the possibility of purchasing LASH vessels. We went to a lot of trouble to send people everywhere looking at LASH ships, as did the Labor Government when it was in office. Now, roll-on-roll-off vessels are to be put on this run.

Mr Dans said that, personally, he was against such a move, because it would create unemployment; I feel sure that is what he said. I said, "Why would it create unemployment? Is it the cost factor—that it is cheaper to run, therefore people will use these ships and get their commodities north cheaper? Is that why they are putting on this form of transport, or is it that the other methods are virtually pricing themselves out of existence?" Mr McKenzie may recall I used the very same phrase in respect of our railway

system, which I protect. These are the sorts of things we must consider generally in our community today.

I managed to procure some figures from a friend of Mr Cooley's during the tea suspension which rather intrigued me in respect of State ships servicing the ports along our coastline right up to Darwin. In 1968 the total tonnages carried backwards and forwards was 217 000. It progressively reduced until in 1977 the tonnages carried totalled 144 000. I was interested because of the question I put to Mr Dans which was: Why is it that the tonnages are decreasing, yet whenever one visits the towns they are always clamouring for items to come up? At the bottom of the paper given to me are the wage structures.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What friend of mine?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Masters. I thought he was a friend because of the terms of endearment that flow between Mr Cooley and Mr Masters. It is true that the two members do not look alike. The number of seamen manning the vessels in 1968 totalled 346. Mr Dans said that when we bring on this new ship we will create unemployment, yet in the State Shipping Service the tonnages have dropped to 144 000. That is a drop of 202 000 tonnes or about 66 per cent. What caused this?

Let us consider the wage structure—and I am not arguing that the men are being overpaid. In 1968 an able seaman was paid \$5 064. In 1977 the figure had risen to \$14 337. In 1968 he was given two days off for each week of service plus two weeks' annual leave. In 1971 he was given 20 weeks' leave after 32 weeks in service. In 1977 he was given 23 weeks of leave after 29 weeks of service.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is progress.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, but is the service pricing itself out of the market? This is the point I have made in respect of the railways. If people are to expect consumers to pay for this sort of thing it is just not on. Naturally, consumers will look for a cheaper way of transporting their goods. In the earlier days I understand there were 407 men to each vessel. The iron ore tankers serving Port Hedland would have how many men? Can Mr Tozer tell me?

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Fourteen.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Regrettably I did not hear Mr Tozer, because he has lost his voice. He will not be able to take part in the debate tonight!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Don't try to make up for him. He said "fourteen".

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is fair to imagine that with these roll-on-roll-off ships there will be a further reduction in the labour force. This is most likely the reason they are being introduced, because the position has got out of hand. It cannot keep going at the present rate. There is a limit to what the consumer will pay because of rail or maintenance costs. The time will come when the consumer can no longer afford the transport system now available, and this is why the alternative is being looked at and why I say to Mr McKenzie that unless he watches out this will happen to the railways. Rail costs will compel people to use other forms of transport.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: If you check the CSB bulletin you will see rail workers are among the lowest paid in the community.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am talking about Mr Dans' speech. The point he made did not give me the answer I was looking for. I am not criticising the salary being paid to the seamen. I am not criticising the leave they get. They have priced their services out of the market and this has been proved. People are looking for a cheaper alternative. That is what will happen to the railways if the freight is moved by motorised transport.

I will now deal with the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the railways. On page 138 of the Estimates we see that the total estimate for the Railways Commission is \$184.825 million which is balanced by the inclusion of an expected deficiency of \$27.281 million. Included in this for Mr McKenzie's benefit, is an item for depreciation—and it is only a book entry—of \$10.6 million. The General Loan Fund Estimates show a figure of \$13.549 million. The railways standardisation agreement shows a total of approximately \$2.4 million, with loan repayments of approximately \$2.4 million, a total of \$29 million approximately. The unforeseen payments of the Railways Commission total \$29 million. Even if we made their repayments \$2.4 million we would find that with the normal running of Westrail we would break even if we compared freight charges with what is spent.

The interesting thing to note is that of that \$184 million there are two big figures which make up that amount; one is the deficiency of \$27 million and the other is for goods and livestock freight contributions totalling \$129 million.

It is of interest to note—and Mr McKenzie said that we should increase railway usage by catering for the passenger service—that the passenger service shows a total of \$4.7 million. Parcels and mail show a figure of \$2.5 million.

whilst the figure for goods and livestock is almost \$130 million. The figure for the refreshment service is \$2.1 million and the figure for miscellaneous and general is \$2.1 million. That is countered by the metropolitan rail system of \$13.194 million. The only capital charges by way of depreciation and interest charged against this section is \$750 000. If we wipe out the book entry of depreciation from that figure we are left with \$477 000. Traffic receipts total \$2.3 million which makes up the deficiency. The estimated contribution from Consolidated Revenue carried down to summary of operations shows a figure of \$11 million.

That last figure is squared off and is transferred into the main account. The metropolitan system figure is shown as \$13 million when it has already created a deficiency of \$10 million in its own balance sheet. It is equalised as a contribution to the estimated deficiency of \$27 million. It is an amazing way of making the service pay. This concerns me, because last year we again increased the rail freights to make up the deficiency, and the main source of revenue hit was the country rail service carrying the bulk commodities that have already earned the State \$134 million—or it is estimated it will earn that figure.

There is an allocation of \$34 million to make up for the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust balance sheet. There is a contribution from Consolidated Revenue of \$18 million to square the books. We already know that figure is way out, because it has been announced that the MTT expects a deficit of \$25 million. This astounds me as we were told that because of high cost increases the freight rates would have to be increased and the Government would put another 10 per cent into the service in June this year making, as I said, a 108 per cent increase in freight rates over the last six years.

Is there any wonder I said there should be a moratorium on freight charges? I was quite sincere when I asked for that moratorium, but the Minister when replying in the Press on Monday, the 6th November, had the following to say—

The Minister for Transport, Mr Rushton, has admitted that rail freight charges have increased by about 108 per cent in the past six years.

However, the charges really represented an increase of 108 per cent over the past 13 years because rates were held at the October 1965 level for eight years, he said.

That is exactly why I asked for a moratorium. If there is no moratorium the Government will price its services out of business. This will happen if

it keeps trying to catch up on the deficiency, caused in the main by the metropolitan railway system and the MTT. The Government has gone about as far as it can in this regard. It is getting a load that cannot be carried, yet the service is still inadequate.

The employees in the Railways Department are a fine bunch and they will have to move 105 000 tonnes of grain every week this year before they will have a carryover from the next harvest. The record is, I think, 103 000 tonnes and that is not day-in-day-out, 52 weeks a year. I am saying I do not believe the department has an adequate number of trucks, nor are the facilities adequate to carry the necessary weight in certain areas.

I blame the Labor Party and the Liberal Party to a degree for this, because the easiest way to cut costs in the past was to close down railway lines. It was only the National Country Party which stood against those closures. To move the bulk commodities out of those areas, where there are no railway lines because they were pulled up, would be a money spinner to the railways. There would be more throughput and so there would be more revenue. The higher the throughput the lower the costs. That is an elementary part of business. Yet here we are saying that this rail service and that rail service should be discontinued in an effort to economise, because the only other alternative is to increase rail freights. All I have tried to emphasise is that if it is good enough for revenue to be poured into the service in the metropolitan area—where the votes are, I might add—it is good enough to plough some into the services in the bush instead of loading the expenses against the users of today.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: That \$27 million deficit must amount to interest and depreciation.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I said all that. I said that interest and repayments made up \$29 million so the railways would be \$2 million in front. Is the honourable member with me?

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Yes.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: All I am saying again is that, if rail charges are increased to match the expenditure which must be made, we will get nowhere. We have 25-tonne railway wagons which on some lines are permitted to carry only 12 tonnes, and this is not good for business. In this way money is lost and that is the situation exactly as it is in Israel.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: They want interest-free grants the same as they have for the roads.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is interesting to consider where the costs lie and whether we are not placing the charges in the wrong places.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: I think you are.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I believe we are too, and yet I do not have an answer to the problem. It is a simple thing which is taking place. It is like the cost-of-living indexation. I know Mr Cooley has always said it should be a flat increase, and those who are receiving high salaries should not get the same percentage increase as those on a low salary. But when we apply a 10 per cent freight increase what do we find? The ones who are furthest out, who are disadvantaged the most, and who pay the highest freight, have the highest increase, while the ones who are closer are not affected so much despite the fact that in both instances one tonne of bulk commodity is being carried. I am not sure that we should not be looking at some scheme where the increase is relative to the commodity being carried.

I will give an illustration. We have telescopic rail freights in this State and I agree with that concept. The ones who are closer do pay relatively more than those out further, and that is not a gimmick for those living further out. It costs less for the turnaround of the train and loading and everything else. We know why it is done.

For the previous four years in Queensland the increase in freights for 120 kilometres was 48 per cent; for 320 kilometres and 420 kilometres the increase was also 48 per cent. The freight for 420 kilometres was \$4.25.

In New South Wales the increase for 120 kilometres was 27.5 per cent; 320 kilometres 39.03 per cent; and for 420 kilometres 40 per cent. The figures varied a little in New South Wales.

In Victoria the freight charge for 120 kilometres for the past four years was 34.5 per cent, as it was for 320 kilometres, while for 420 kilometres it was 34.56 per cent.

In South Australia for 120 kilometres the increase was 24 per cent; for 320 kilometres 25 per cent; and for 420 kilometres 24 per cent.

In Western Australia in the last four years the increase for 120 kilometres was 105.12 per cent; 320 kilometres 107.14 per cent; and for 420 kilometres 104 per cent.

The situation is similar to that with regard to shipping. If we are not careful we will price ourselves out of business.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: It is not due to wages.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Actually at no time did I mention the word "wages". For a fair day's work a man must receive a fair day's

pay. I do not know that I agree with what I heard on the wireless a while ago; that is, that public servants will retire at 55 years of age and their superannuation will be reduced. The other day I saw some figures which indicated that a school teacher in Queensland who retires after 40 years' service takes a lump sum of \$163 000 and his wife gets a payment when he dies. That situation to me is a little rough, but I have never said that a man is not worth his salt, and I will stick to that.

What I have said is that in order to ensure that our railways will be able to handle the freight, something radical must be done, or there must be a huge injection of funds and somehow or other the interest repayments will have to be spread over the whole community, not just the railway users. Forty per cent of the GNP of this State is carried on the railways, which represent the lifeblood of our State, and they should be treated as such. The railway system is an artery of this State, but if we are not careful it will be priced out of business. I do not know how we can get over the problem. Perhaps if we put X million dollars into the railways and X number of tonnes of wheat are carted then everyone in the State per tonne would have to pay that much more. I hope I make myself clear.

With the telescopic freight increases, the further out a person is and the higher the freight, the higher is the increase until we have the figures I mentioned. In 1974 the freight for 420 kilometres was \$6.50 and now it is \$13.30, an increase of 104 per cent. For 120 kilometres we were paying \$3.90 and now it is \$8, which is an increase of 105 per cent.

I know there will be arguments against it. I do not have the answer, because we must take into consideration the rates and taxes of the person living closer, together with his other expenses. However, the present situation cannot continue.

In 1974 grain was \$151 a tonne. It is now selling at \$119, and a person is lucky to get that. However, the Premier has said that the Australian Wheat Board has predicted a strong demand for wheat, with a reasonable chance of prices being marginally improved on the \$83 a tonne received last year.

Our income has dropped 100 per cent and yet we are faced with huge increases of 104 per cent. These increases are imposed not only on freight, but also on fuel and everything else. We must also



remember that we pay freight both ways. We pay freight on our commodities going down and all our stuff coming back.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you telling Mr McKenzie all this?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am sympathising with Mr McKenzie.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are telling the Government?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes. I am not speaking to anyone in particular. I am trying to get my point over. I know that Mr McKenzie and Mr Claughton are probably the only ones listening to me. In "The Western Australian Economy" which the Premier distributed with the papers associated with the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure to which we are speaking, the following is to be found at page 4—

The outlook is for a substantial improvement in farm incomes in 1978-79, although much depends on follow-up and finishing rains for the remainder of the season in the wheatbelt.

To a degree we have had them. I have already referred to the Premier's statement that the wheat price is expected to be reasonably up on last year's \$83 a tonne. That is nowhere near what we were receiving four years ago, I remind Mrs Piesse. On page 14 the Premier said—

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has forecast a rural recovery in 1978-79. Average farm incomes are expected to rise in real terms by up to 22% ...

I have no real quarrel with that. That paper was printed some time in September, but in the *National Farmer* volume 2, No. 18 for the 21st September to the 14th October, is the following—

Thirty per cent of Australian wheat/sheep and 25 per cent of high rainfall zone farms face severe financial difficulties in the near future according to a Government document.

That document was issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That was in the same week. That could have fooled me. I am in the game and know a bit about it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You had better speak to the Premier.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The article continues—

... at least a quarter of producers believed they will be off their property within ten years, while a massive 38 per cent of the sector continues to exist purely on income earned off the farm.

This might interest the Hon. Grace Vaughan, who was having a crack at wealth the other night. I have forgotten how she used the term, but I will not enter into an argument with her.

The publication says—

That 14 000 grazing/cropping farms in the high rainfall zone are likely to be in "severe financial difficulty" ...

That at least 20 per cent of Australian farmers will continue to live below the poverty line.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I told you that was what Professor Henderson said.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: To continue—

Higher prices for farm produce meant some improvement in farmers terms of trade in the short-term—but a large part of the agricultural sector was still running into deep trouble.

And so it goes on. What is the enthusiasm which makes people boost through the Press the feeling that everything is right with the world and therefore it is all right to increase freight rates by 104 per cent, as well as increasing electricity charges and everything else?

One wonders where it will cease. I quote from *The West Australian* of the 7th August, which was about the same time the Premier made his speech—

The Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, said yesterday he was optimistic about the prospects for a general rural recovery.

The Prime Minister said that in a broadcast from his home. So he is optimistic. Yet on the 2nd November the *Western Farmer*, which is a widely read paper in Western Australia, commenting on the same BAE report, said—

Farmers set for good times, says the BAE. This paper is printed by one of our big livestock agents. On the same date another well known paper, *The Countryman*, quoting the same BAE report, said—

Farmers likely to earn less, according to the BAE report that is just out.

I have given four instances, and another is included in "The Western Australian Economy" document.

This is what I object to. If the Government prints in that report something that is false, is not based on fact, or is based on a misapprehension, as these papers have proved, someone is taking someone for a ride.

I am sick to death of the farmers being called the moneyed people in this State. Certain people are saying, "Let us get onto them, they are in

for a good year." It has filtered through to the workers and everyone else. Once it is said the farmers are in for a good harvest, everyone wants a bit of it. The farmers are sick to death of it.

A strike took place on the wharf a few weeks ago. I do not blame people for going on strike, but there had been a wool sale four days previously. Mr Oliver would know something about this. The farmers had waited for two months to sell their wool off the auction floor. The wool was sold and then the place went on strike. I admit the seamen lost their wages, but who lost money for their wool? The farmer does not get paid for his wool until it is loaded onto the vessel. The kick in the guts—I have to use that term, and the Leader of the House used it a while ago—comes back to the land again. This is the sort of thing we cannot tolerate any longer.

In a Press release on the 9th September the Premier said—

There are no increases in taxes in the Budget.

We had them all beforehand. We are getting sick of that, too. It looks good in the Budget. I do not think the Premier is responsible for producing this type of thing. It is just the way it is done now. One can fool the people some of the time, but not all of the time.

So it goes on. On Tuesday, the 19th September, we had the following Press release—

Sir Charles said the prospects for the rural sector were better than for several years.

I am not blaming Sir Charles or his advisers. I am blaming the Press for what it writes, because the Press writes what the Premier reads, and it depends how one takes it up.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How do you blame the Press?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The Premier did not make this statement. I have quoted Press statements on the BAE report. Mr Cooley will read that paper, and that is what the people in the city will read and believe.

If one goes to the areas in the city which depend on agricultural products and asks people what will be the outlook for the farmer this year, they will say, "Wonderful—he has a big harvest." Darn it all! We must have a big harvest. We have had two years of drought. Many farmers have received their second amount of \$20 000 on which to keep a family and live on a farm miles from anywhere at country prices. Farmers are in it up to the eyeballs with \$40 000

worth of debt. Had the good harvest not come along dozens of people would have walked off the land because the land has been unkind to them in the last two years. Yet because they are having a wonderful year everybody seems to think now is the time to get a bit of it. It is just not on.

This is the sort of thing that is really perturbing those of us who come into this place from the outback and read this sort of document. Okay, it is a balanced Budget and all credit, but let us look at some of the salaries and retirement allowances I mentioned a while ago—a retirement allowance of \$120 000 a year for a public servant, \$163 000 a year for a teacher in Queensland who had been teaching for 40 years. It is a long time but it is more than the farmer earns over a lifetime these days, unless he sells his farm. What hope has one of selling a farm nowadays? Pearl Buck wrote *The Good Earth*. Everything happens when it rains.

I will now mention a matter which will interest the Leader of the House because of his interest in the hospitals of this State. I know of the interest he took in health when he held the Health portfolio, and he may have been responsible for the matter I am about to mention.

My mother is a very elderly person and recently she had to go to Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital for a rather large operation. She came out of it and afterwards—Mrs Piesse warned me at the time that this would happen—she was rather demented because of the operation and the post-operative effects. I was told, "Don't worry, it is normal, but it could go one way or the other." My mother was in Ward A5 of Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and the staff of that ward fought with my mother for five days and five nights—little girls who had to hold my mother down or strap her down. They never lost their patience. I had to go and look at her through a glass door to see whether she was all right. I was not allowed in. She was talking but not very co-operative. I might add my mother is marvellous now and loves everybody there, but she did not like anybody at the time.

When I reflected on the work the staff had done, I wrote a letter to the sister in charge of Ward A5 at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. I will not read the letter I wrote. It is the sort of letter any of us should write when something like this takes place. I received a reply from Sister Rutherford saying she had taken the trouble to write to me because it was so seldom people bothered to write. They are full of praise when

they leave a hospital but they do not bother to sit down and put in writing their acknowledgment of what is done. Sister Rutherford wrote—

I do not know if you have had recent experience with hospitalization, but on our ward and A8 we have a system of nursing called primary nursing which is aimed to give patients a more comprehensive and individualised total nursing care.

This is the part of her letter I particularly want to draw to attention—

This is the only hospital in this state where it is practiced and ours is one of five wards in this hospital where it is in practice. These therefore are the reasons that I am so appreciative of your letter as we have had so much negative feedback from other more traditional and bureaucratic hospitals in this state.

I know the Leader of the House still visits some of the friends he had at that hospital when he was the Minister for Health. I hope this ward A8 system can be thoroughly investigated if it is doing so much good. There is a big "thing" going on here. The sooner we spread this primary nursing the better off many of our patients will be.

I will close on the issue of water supplies. I note the Hon. Tom Knight was very pleased about the extension of water supplies he has obviously been able to get in nearly every area in his electorate. He spoke of his personal involvement with all of them. He must be a heck of a good politician and a good member—I am not denying that—but I notice that many areas outside of the comprehensive scheme are still battling on to try to have reinstated the priority they had in 1969.

The Leader of the House, who is the Minister for Water Supplies, recently made the announcement that it is intended to extend the underground water supply in the eastern areas of our State to feed the comprehensive water scheme into Dalwallinu, etc., which is also in my electorate—and I am grateful for that. The Government intends to approach the Federal Government for \$40 million over a 20-year period, which is an expenditure of \$2 million a year, in an endeavour to extend water through that part of the State.

But I also know that we need water in the area where I live. I have to say that if it is a fact that we have been written off completely from our priority in respect of the third phase of the extension of the comprehensive scheme, and if the Government is adamant that it will not

restore any priority—and we are certainly not in the first 16 areas mentioned—the Government will have to do something else quick smart.

If the Department of Agriculture, of which the Public Works Department is now taking considerable notice, is quite convinced that water can be stored in the wet areas, which it says are the remaining unserved areas within the bounds of the original 1946 comprehensive scheme, I say the Government will have to do something about providing dams and the type of catchment which it says is needed there.

This Government brought in concessional loans to help farmers beyond the comprehensive water scheme, and \$1 million was allocated last year. It was the first great move I have ever seen to get on with farm water supplies: 244 applicants have been satisfied, 50 more are being processed, and another 47 properties from last year's applications are yet to be looked at.

It is a start, but I am suggesting we can go a great deal further. In many areas there are salt, and dams which will not hold water. Dams, of the sort of supply which the Government maintains can be on that farm, should be put there free of charge by the Government.

Let us consider what I mean when I say "free of charge". We have been told that to extend the comprehensive water scheme at the moment, even if there was a necessity to put it in this area, would cost something like \$30 to \$40 a hectare. That is the cost to provide the head-works at the pipeline. On top of that would be loan repayments, upkeep and maintenance, and the ancillary work force. Those things must amount to millions of dollars. I am saying, if the alternative is as good as the Government says it is, the Government would be a mile in front had it brought in a team of bulldozers to put in large dams. I am not including the cost of equipping the dams. I would not be so rash. Nor am I including the cost of maintenance, because such dams are of a size that once they are on the farm they may be easily maintained. If this is the answer the Government has said will apply in the area, then the Government must prove it will work.

If the Government is going to replace an expenditure of the type of which it is frightened, and which is, in fact, being spent today in the northern parts of our agricultural areas, surely to goodness a service could be provided as a free service to the farms. This is an important part of our structure.

One has only to sit down with pad and pencil—and I am sure my friend and colleague who has a Bachelor of Science degree (the Hon. Neil McNeill) would be able to do it—to work out how far the Government would be in front if the answer is to erect key dams on farms. I sincerely hope the Government will work this out in the near future.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [8.32 p.m.]: "We'll all be rooned" said Hanrahan" were the words which went through my mind when listening to the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, because he seemed to be casting a great deal of gloom across the rural scene. I recall the Hon. Gordon Masters earlier interjecting on a speaker on this side and accusing him of spreading gloom.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: I would suggest that Mr Gayfer was not spreading gloom but was rather appealing to people to be realistic.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The interjection by Mr Masters indicated he believed we on this side were spreading gloom. I am surprised he did not pick up Mr Gayfer on the same count. If we look at the speech Mr Masters made on the 2nd November, we could very well accuse him of the same intent. I quote from Mr Masters' speech, as recorded on page 4504 of *Hansard*. After spending a great deal of time attacking the work force, which he claims we represent, he had these words to say—

For this reason, many small businessmen are not expanding their businesses but in fact are reducing them. They are getting to the stage where, if they can do the job themselves and operate as a family concern, that is what they do. There are less problems and less costs involved in operating a business from one's own premises, rather than hiring factories or other premises. So, the combined effect of all these costs unfortunately is that many small businessmen either are giving it away altogether or are winding down their businesses and not risking any capital they may have because of the lack of return on money invested and because of the many costs and problems to be faced.

What a gloomy picture!

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I just stated the facts.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: What a gloomy picture he put before the House. There was not a breath of optimism in those remarks; certainly there was no more optimism in his remarks than there was in the words of Mr Gayfer.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am very optimistic.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Apparently the Hon. Gordon Masters now wants to make a speech in duet with me. It would seem that the speech he made on the 2nd November was in duet with Mr Dans. When reading it I was not sure who was on his feet, because Mr Dans' name seems to appear almost as frequently as Mr Masters' name.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That was not very good.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was not my fault.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: At any rate, they seemed to respond extremely well to each other although it is not clear if they were actually in agreement in respect of many of the arguments.

I think it is bad form for Mr Masters to attack so strongly the income of the ordinary worker and to try to lay the blame for the economic ills of this country on the very small returns workers receive from their labours. In some parts of his speech Mr Masters tried to indicate it was common for workers to receive \$300 a week. One has only to go out into the electorate and talk to people to find that is far from the truth.

Perhaps that is the case with the self-employed contractors; they may receive that sort of return. However, I think that would not be a common occurrence at this time as a result of the steep downturn in the building industry.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Quite a few in the construction game are on that sort of money.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Self-employed contractors?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: No, not at all; untrained and unskilled men on construction work at Kwinana.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They are good workers but they don't belong to unions.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They do belong to the union.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It certainly has not been my experience in my electorate that a great number of people receive that sort of weekly wage. In fact, I had a tradesman in my office yesterday who receives a net pay of \$125 a week. He is a tradesman in the furniture trade.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who works for that much?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: He is a fully qualified furniture tradesman, and that is his net return after tax. One finds it is a different picture when one gets out into the electorate and talks to people. There may be some areas where people are able to obtain the sort of wages that Mr Masters spoke about but they are the exception and not the rule. I believe people generally are feeling very much the large increases in costs that have occurred, not just in respect of the farming community about which Mr Gayfer spoke so passionately, but in respect of all sections of the community as a result of the vastly increased taxes and charges imposed by this Government.

Of course, the situation is also affected by the efforts of the Federal colleagues of members opposite in depressing the rate of increases in line with the cost of living. Generally it is a fact that wage levels have not kept pace with increases in costs in the community.

To take one example, in the Budget papers reference is made to the increases in costs of building supplies. When we consider the percentage increases over the past few years we find they are well in excess of the rate of increase in inflation. Certainly the increases in prices cannot be attributed to increases in the wages of people employed in that industry. The increases are set out on page 6 of the document, "The Western Australian Economy, 1977-1978". This is an official Budget paper to which we are asked to address ourselves. The percentage increases in the cost of materials used for house building for the years 1973-74 to 1977-78 are as follows—

					%
1973-74	....	....	....	....	11.7
1974-75	....	....	....	....	21.6
1975-76	....	....	....	....	17.1
1976-77	....	....	....	....	13.8
1977-78	....	....	....	....	10.3

The percentage increases in the cost of materials used for building other than housing are as follows—

					%
1973-74	....	....	....	....	13.1
1974-75	....	....	....	....	23.7
1975-76	....	....	....	....	17.9
1976-77	....	....	....	....	13.0
1977-78	....	....	....	....	9.7

It is apparently the form for members of the Government parties to lay emphasis on increases in wages obtained by people in the work force and conveniently to disregard altogether the increases which have occurred in prices, and cannot be related at all to the level of increases in the wages paid to people in specific industries.

For the last financial year the increase in the CPI in Western Australia was 8.9 per cent and I think it was one of the highest in Australia. If we look at the figures in the tables I have just quoted and take 10.3 per cent and 9.7 per cent which were the respective increases in the cost of home building materials and other building materials in 1977-78, and take into consideration the fact that there has been a large downturn in the rate of building in this State, then we must look elsewhere than at the level of wages paid to people working in that industry to ascertain the reason for the increases. The record of this Government judged on the home building sector is an extremely dismal one over the last two years.

These figures are taken from the same publication. For the year 1976-77 there were 19 062 homes built. For the last financial year, 1977-78, the figure was 15 982, a fall of over 3 000 homes in a 12-month period.

We have heard Mr Knight complaining about the serious lack of building by the State Housing Commission in the area that he represents. He complains of the effect that is having on the economy of that part of the State. Mr Knight has a right to complain, because the performance of this Government has been dismal. Mr Masters complained about words of gloom being spread about; but quite obviously they are justified by the record of this Government. I agree with Mr Gayfer that one can pick up a newspaper and see a highly optimistic headline, and then one can read another newspaper reporting the same events, which gives the true state of affairs with a very different picture portrayed in the headline.

It is true that this Government, and its Federal colleagues, have put a lot of effort into trying to "talk up the economy", as it is called. It was the objective of the Court Government to defeat the Whitlam Government on the ground that there was a very serious fall in business confidence during the period from 1972 to 1975. The Liberal Party said if it became the Government all that would be changed. How wrong that prediction has turned out! There has been a record number of bankruptcies, particularly amongst small businessmen. We have seen how the population in this State has increased by 2.3 per cent, if we can believe the figures given by the Government, while employment has increased by only 1.5 per cent. The Government claims that is a very creditable employment record; but that is not shown by the figures extracted from this document. The Government has not been

able to maintain the increase in employment at the same rate as the increase in the population. Mr Masters pointed out—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am getting a few mentions tonight.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I took the trouble to read the speech given by Mr Masters before I rose. He made some claims which I felt were hardly justified. Mr Masters quite rightly criticised his own Government for the fact that Government employment in the period increased by 3.2 per cent. If we turn to the manufacturing industry of this State—an area which this Government claims to represent and to be most knowledgeable about, and to be a Government that is most competent in serving the needs of the people, and a Government which is able to stimulate the economy—we find that that sector suffered a decline of 2 per cent on the figures contained in this document. Those are the figures contained in the document "The Western Australian Economy 1977-78". On its own facts and figures, this Government has a very poor track record.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not true. You talk about people making wild statements.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is true on the basis of the figures the Government has supplied. Mr Masters cannot contest the information given here. He will not deny that the manufacturing industry—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am challenging your statement. We have a good record.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Masters is claiming that a decline of 2 per cent in manufacturing industry is a good record.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am not claiming that at all. You said the Government has a bad record. I am saying it has not.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The member interjecting is admitting a fact and then claiming that to be a good record.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You made a general statement, and I disagree with you.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have quoted two areas only so far. First of all, I quoted housing, where we saw that the Government's record was a decline of over 3 000 homes in 12 months. That is a fact. That is the Government's record. I would have thought that Mr Masters would not have attempted to claim that that was a good record, and something that he could be proud of.

There was another statement made by Mr Masters during his speech. I interjected on that statement, and I said I would demonstrate to

him that he was at some variance with the Government. Upon reading his speech, I find that the words in *Hansard* do not quite appear as they were spoken. That often happens; one says the same thing, but it is expressed a little better. Minor alterations are made.

Mr Masters was saying that he believed there should be a cut-down in Government spending. He said it was foolish to believe that by increasing Government spending the economy could be stimulated. I challenged Mr Masters on that statement by way of interjection. I said I would demonstrate to him where the Premier, in fact, did not agree with his view.

If we read these documents, we find that the Government is saying it is cutting down on recurrent costs of departments so that it can increase the spending on capital works. That is a decision that the Labor Party would support. In fact, it was the policy of the Tonkin Government. That Government went to a great deal of trouble to see that Government projects were expanded to provide work in the community. There was a fair level of success in reducing unemployment in the Tonkin Government's period of office. The Premier has said that this is the process he is following—that by advancing Government projects, he is creating work in the community.

The words that best express that view are contained in the speech the Premier made on the Appropriation Bill (General Loan Fund) at page 3326 of *Hansard* on the 21st September, as follows—

This has posed a serious problem for the Government at a time when the level of unemployment calls for a maximum effort to provide more construction and fabrication work for the private sector.

The Premier is talking about the allocation of General Loan Funds from the Commonwealth Government. The Premier continued—

It is on this point—the curtailment of public sector capital expenditure—that I disagree with the Commonwealth Government's present financial management policy.

Obviously the Premier goes along with Labor Party philosophy on this point. If the private sector is not performing, then it is up to the Government to step into the gap. This is the only sensible way to go about it.

It is all very well to talk about training schemes for people; but where people are losing jobs, as Mr Dans pointed out earlier, there is very little point to it if, when they finish the training, they cannot find work. I raise that point for the enlightenment of Mr Masters. In a period

such as this, it is good sense for Governments to provide work opportunities. That does not mean increasing the numbers in the Public Service. It means initiating construction projects where contracts may be let out to private industry. In that way, employment opportunities can be increased. That is a well-established method to be used during this type of period.

A few years ago we heard the proposition that the Keynes era was dead. This suggestion is very much on Keynesian lines. It seems to me that the Premier would find he had a lot in common with the economist Keynes. In fact, at the time that the Government introduced its Budget the Press thought that that policy of the Government was the most significant, because this headline appeared, "Government trims spending to create jobs".

One of the matters which indicates a change of attitude on the part of the Government is contained in the article in *The West Australian* on the 29th September, 1978. The Premier was criticising the fall in Australian Government funding for hospitals. He made the extraordinary statement which I will quote to the House. I find it appalling that a Premier could make a statement of this sort simply to make a political point. The report is as follows—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, yesterday accused the Commonwealth of breaching an agreement over sharing the operating costs of extensions to hospital facilities and services.

The report continues—

The State Budget provided for a limited number of extra staff at some metropolitan hospitals and for the staffing of the new wing at KEMH. It was due to be opened later this year.

The allocation assumed that the Commonwealth would meet half the extra net operating costs under the terms of the agreement.

But the Commonwealth had said that it would not agree to share the cost of extensions to hospital facilities and services pending the results of a study.

That is the situation about which the Premier was talking. He said that the Western Australian Government would make no new appointments to hospital staff and it would not staff or equip the extensions to King Edward Memorial Hospital until the Commonwealth was prepared to sign the agreement. The Government is showing the most extreme callousness by loading such a burden onto patients who are in no position to take defensive action on such a matter which has resulted from the unfortunate policies of the

Fraser Government. In reply to a question asked in the Legislative Assembly in October the Minister said that \$68 357 was spent on public relations matters. There seems to be a terrible lack of understanding on the part of the Government as to where its priorities should lie when it can spend such a level of funds on public relations and yet be prepared to deny extra staff to these hospitals in order to provide adequate care to the patients. I hope that was no more than a little grandstanding on the part of the Premier and, in fact, he did not put that statement into effect, because if such a situation occurred I believe the Premier would deserve the most extreme censure.

Another matter which has been of some prominence recently arose from a statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister for Trade and Resources (Mr Anthony), on a declaration of policy in regard to Australian resources. It is set out in a Press statement published by the Deputy Prime Minister under the heading, "Future export policy on bulk raw materials".

The Premier of this State reacted with the greatest verbal violence to this move by Mr Anthony. I have a large file of Press clippings which refer to the attitude of the Premier in relation to that particular policy.

In the Federal Parliament today Mr Anthony made a further statement on that matter in which he pointed out that it was necessary and essential that Australian iron ore producers in particular act collectively when they are dealing with a group of purchasers in another country who are acting collectively also. It would be an exhibition of the greatest lack of wisdom for a country such as Australia to allow its individual producers in this field to be picked off one by one. It was suggested at the time that the Japanese would resent this interference by the Australian Government in the area of negotiation of these contracts.

I fail to see that would be the case when recently the Japanese Government sent a mission to China on behalf of Japanese steel producers to negotiate contracts worth hundreds of millions of dollars with the Chinese Government. The Japanese Government itself did not allow its producers, manufacturers, and steel industry representatives to negotiate individually with the Chinese Government. The Japanese Government did not allow its steel industry representatives, producers, and manufacturers to be plucked off one by one at great cost to the Japanese economy through a reduction in the prices obtained.

In fact the Japanese Government very sensibly sent a team to China under the wing of a representative of the Government to ensure good

sense prevailed. That is very much in the style of the Japanese Government. However, that Government is quite happy to allow a country such as Australia to leave its producers unprotected so that it can obtain bedrock prices for its products; but it certainly would not allow its own citizens to operate in the same manner.

To my knowledge this matter first arose in the period when pulp and paper manufacturing was being encouraged in Australia with the help of Japanese interests. The Japanese took our producers for a ride at the time and made matters extremely difficult. I believe what happened in that industry resulted in Rex Connor settling on the policies he adopted in dealing with countries such as Japan. Any responsible Government could react only in the same manner. I personally would be highly critical of our Premier if he permitted the situation he is suggesting to obtain where the producers are allowed to be plucked off at will by a much stronger force. It shows good sense on the part of the Federal Minister, Mr Anthony, that he did not allow himself to be bulldozed on that issue.

It is highly significant also that Mr Anthony made that statement just before he left for China where he would be meeting with industry people with the possibility of making arrangements for sales of Australian goods to that country. It would be a two-way arrangement and the Chinese would want to feel the Australian Government Minister with whom they were talking was in a position to state quite clearly the situation if they sent Chinese representatives to Australia to enter into negotiations.

I hope that the Premier has learnt something from the exercise, that we will hear no more about that particular issue, and that it is now accepted practice in dealing with countries, where the Government organises the industry in the way it does in Japan, that we will react in the same way. Spot sales around the world are a different matter. I do not believe a Labor Government would want to interfere in that situation any more than a Liberal-National Country Party Government would.

I have a number of issues which I want to mention. I do not want to refer to them in great detail; but I should like to take the opportunity to air them here. For some considerable time the "battle of the wall" has raged in the Scarborough area. It is a matter involving a retaining wall between two properties in Pearl Parade, Scarborough, where one owner excavated his block

and failed to construct a satisfactory retaining wall. Over a period of eight to 10 years it has been very difficult to finalise the matter.

Mr and Mrs Kensitt, the owners of one property, have suffered terrible anxiety as a consequence of what has happened. They have a swimming pool on their block and the block is on a higher level and has been threatened with collapse as a result of sand drifting down the slope. The house itself has been threatened also by undermining of the foundations and a retaining wall has been cracked and damaged.

At one stage Cyril Rushton, as Minister for Local Government, entered into the fray and promised everything would be settled satisfactorily; but he has departed without achieving any sort of result. Recently when I was reading the minutes of the City of Stirling I saw that it was claimed everything had been resolved, the wall was in place, and the issue was settled. The suburban news in *The West Australian* of the 11th October carried a story along those lines. When I read that reference in the minutes of the council I went down to the site immediately with a feeling of disbelief that the issue had been settled. However, I was prepared to be highly delighted that in fact the long battle had been won. I was grossly disappointed. The wall had not been completed. Some progress has taken place over the last couple of years, that is true; but there is still a certain distance to go before the Kensitts can rest happily in their home as they should have been able to do for many years past.

It is beyond my understanding that the local authority and the Government itself have allowed this situation to continue. Apparently they have been prepared to accept that the situation be allowed to go on and on. At one stage it was thought the laws were deficient and the former Minister for Local Government (Mr Rushton) intended to introduce amendments to ensure the law was adequate to cover the matter. However, we have seen no changes to the law.

The City of Stirling has behaved in a reprehensible manner, to refer to a word which has had some use recently. It has been neglectful in its duties in this matter up to this time. After I visited the site I contacted immediately the local authority to ascertain the current situation. I was told a report would be prepared and sent to me.

It has now been more than a week and I still have not yet received the report. Another article appeared in the Press on the 22nd November under the heading, "10-year wrangle over wall continues." That illustrates how things can change.



A month earlier the matter was supposed to be all settled, and yet yesterday we found that the wrangle is continuing.

I would like the present Minister for Local Government to take an interest in this affair to see whether she can stir up this local authority to bring the matter to a conclusion. I am completely at a loss to understand how it has been possible for the matter to have gone on for so long. There have been three or four court orders for the work to be done and all sorts of resolutions passed by the local authority to the effect that if the owner of the property failed to do the work the shire would have the work done. All we have had are resolutions. I believe the Hon. June Craig would make a small name for herself if she was able to twist the arm of the City of Stirling and have the matter finalised.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon recently spent some time speaking in terms that were not those of commendation about the principal of the City Beach Primary School (Mr John Roberts). I took great exception to the reference made to Mr Roberts and I took the trouble to visit him and the school and look around at the school. I was most impressed with what I saw there.

I would like to have it recorded in *Hansard* that the Education Department has, in effect, contradicted the words of the Leader of the House. An article appeared in *The West Australian* on the 14th November under the heading, "Department supports principal". The article, in part, reads—

The headmaster of the City Beach primary school, Mr John Roberts, has been told that there are no complaints in Education Department files about his running of the school.

Mr Roberts was recently described in the State Parliament as a disaster to the school by the Minister for Tourism, Mr MacKinnon.

Mr MacKinnon is a former Minister for Education.

Mr Roberts said yesterday that the Director-General of Education, Mr D. Mossenson, had written to him saying that he was unaware of what information Mr MacKinnon might have.

Across the floor of this Chamber we say many things during debate and occasionally make unkind references to each other. But, it does not do the Parliament any good if we use this forum to attack people personally when they are not

in a position to reply. I hope the Leader of the House regrets the terms he used about Mr Roberts at that time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Roberts entered the political arena. If he wants to play with the big boys he has to learn to take it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is one thing to attack the facts that were presented. If the Leader of the House had shown them not to be true, there would be no case for complaint. The tactic he used in attacking the good standing of the man himself was cowardly. It has been shown that the attack was quite unjustified.

There are other matters about which I have good cause for complaint and they concern the working of this Parliament. One concerns the replies supplied by Ministers. I have examined a number of replies to questions, and usually they are difficult to understand. One which annoyed me was the reply I received to a question in this Chamber relating to computers. I asked the question—

- (1) Is the Government planning to introduce legislation to safeguard civil rights?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) Is consideration being given to the protection of individual rights that are threatened by information contained on automated data equipment?
  - (b) Is it planned to introduce legislation for this purpose this session?

The Attorney General replied—

I have to acknowledge the courtesy of the honourable member in giving notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) and (2) questions 1463 to 1480 in the Legislative Assembly also relate to this matter.

In response to those questions the Premier indicated that the information being sought was of a wide-ranging nature and would involve considerable time in its collation. It is intended to provide a written response to those questions as soon as practicable and I will ensure that the honourable member receives a copy of that reply.

I must express regret that the Attorney General has left the Chamber briefly, because I would have preferred to mention that matter whilst he was present.

An examination of the questions asked in the Legislative Assembly shows that only one had any sort of relationship at all to the question I asked. Only one related to civil rights. The other information sought by the member in the Legislative Assembly was of no interest to me at that time. My question was directed to what the Government might be planning in the area of civil rights.

I followed up my question, on the same day, by asking a question without notice, as follows—

Do any of those questions, that I must confess I have not read at all, relate to the question of legislation to safeguard civil rights as a general issue?

The Attorney General replied—

I understand that all of those questions do relate one way or another to civil rights.

Only one of the questions could have been interpreted in any way as being related to civil rights. The rest related to computers and their effect on the work force. I feel that is treating the members of this Chamber flippantly, or at the best, with a high degree of lack of regard.

I subsequently followed up those questions with further questions. On the following day I again asked a question without notice, as follows—

Did the Attorney General personally examine the questions and answers to determine whether they touched on the matters asked by myself?

The Attorney General replied—

I understand they all related to the use of computers and, hence, it was appropriate they be answered at the one time.

I then asked another question, as follows—

The Attorney General has not indicated whether he personally examined those questions. Would he now do so?

The Attorney General replied—

I was aware of the general nature of the questions. They were not directed to me, so I had not personally examined every word in them.

I then asked—

Is the Attorney General satisfied his answer to me was related to the question I asked which was, "Is the Government planning to introduce legislation to safeguard civil rights?"

The Attorney General replied, "Yes". That would really have been a satisfactory answer to the question I asked on the previous day instead of receiving some references which were of no

interest and of which I had no knowledge. I wanted to know whether the Government planned to introduce legislation.

At the time an article appeared in *The West Australian* indicating that Senator Durack, the Federal Attorney General, was talking about the question of civil rights. In *The West Australian* of the 16th September, an article appeared under the heading, "Durack hopeful on rights body". The article, in part, reads—

The Attorney General, Senator Durack, was optimistic yesterday about the formation of a national human rights commission.

As a result of that article I asked the Attorney General whether he had been involved in discussions with the Federal Attorney General on this matter. It turned out that the matter had been raised at an Attorneys General council and not really discussed at all.

I thought that Senator Durack's statement was really a misrepresentation of the situation. However, the Attorney General should at least have been aware that these proposals were being considered and there would be further discussion on them. It is his portfolio, and has nothing to do with questions asked in another Chamber. Members of this Chamber were shown a great deal of discourtesy in the answer provided. As members we have a right to express our dissatisfaction with the Government in such cases. We are here to do a job for the public, and the effectiveness with which we do that job depends a great deal on the preparedness of the Government to provide information on request. So this is not only a discourtesy to members, but also to the electors we represent; the Government is denying information to the people who elected us to this Chamber.

I have spoken for some time, and although I would have liked to raise a number of other matters, out of consideration for the stage of the session I will resist the temptation to cover them all. One could say that the Budget is a tradesman's job; it does not show a great deal of imagination. As I indicated earlier, I proved that the Treasurer realised the Government should initiate capital works to provide employment in the community. Certainly the record of unemployment of this Government is not one of which it can be proud. The programmes that have been adopted have serious deficiencies.

Mr Hetherington referred to an amount of some \$13 million that we could almost say is stashed away in a sock. Certainly it is unused. It is all very well for the Government to say it has balanced the Budget, but it is hardly balanced when \$13 million has not been used, and especi-

ally at a time that the community could certainly benefit from the work-creating activities of Government programmes. Unemployment is not just a lack of confidence in the business community, but we can only stimulate activity by an injection from the State, and more particularly from the Federal Government.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) (9.34 p.m.): I will not hold up the House for long, but I would like to speak to some parts of the Estimates. Unfortunately two members who referred to different parts of the Estimates—one some weeks ago and another this evening—are not at present in the Chamber.

A query was raised by Mr McKenzie this evening. He said that Railways Department costs were not affected very much by wages, and I take it also that his reference was to salaries. I took the trouble to look through the Estimates to see what effect wages and salaries had on the total figures, and some very interesting facts emerged. Salaries, wages, and allowances for the Railways Commission and Secretariat amounted to approximately \$2 million. The salaries for accounts and audit is about another \$2 million. Then for traffic transportation the figure is \$42 million-odd, making a total of \$46 million. There is another \$1 million for refreshment services; road services, \$2.4 million; commercial, \$419 000; management services, \$800 000; mechanical workshops, \$16 million; mechanical motive power, \$8 million; civil engineering, \$15 million; signal and communications, \$4 million-odd; and control of stores, \$1.8 million. That makes a total of \$49 319 000.

On top of that there is the \$46 million, making the overall total estimate of wages and salaries for the Railways Department of some \$95 million. This is out of a total budget of \$145 million. One could say that is \$95 million for wages and salaries and \$50 million for the actual running costs. So it is not correct for anyone to say that salaries and wages play a very small part in the costs of running our railways. I suggest to the honourable member that if he looks at the Estimates he will see that what he said was quite wrong.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You want to speak to some of the fellows at the Midland workshops and see what they say.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I suggest that the honourable member should look at page 129 of the Estimates.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The railway workers are greatly underpaid.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not saying whether they are underpaid or overpaid. The inference was that the cost of railway wages and salaries was not a big factor in the overall situation, but the facts show a different situation. One must look at this fairly and squarely. The workers are paid according to awards, and we go along with that system. We would be in big trouble if we attempted to break the system of awards. These figures show the true picture in regard to railway finances.

Mr Hetherington, in his address on the Budget on the 11th October, indicated that he was not very well up with the study of Budgets and working out figures. However, from his speech I believe he has a good head and a good aptitude for studying a Budget. Clearly his speech indicated that he knew a lot more about the matter than he said he did.

He said that some \$5 million of the education budget had not been spent, and that the Government had not kept its promises in relation to education. I wish Mr Hetherington were here at the moment, but from the knowledge he seems to have of the Estimates he would know very well that the original figures are estimated by a department, submitted to the Treasury, considered there, and then returned to the Minister and his staff for reconsideration. This is especially so when the Treasury wishes to decrease an estimated figure. Quite often the original estimate submitted to the Treasury is in excess of the likely expenditure, but we must remember it is particularly difficult for a department to draw up a balanced budget in these days.

The officers who are responsible for drawing up the budget of a department would be aware of the likelihood of increases in salaries and wages, particularly wages. We must remember that a preliminary budget is drawn up early in the year, and then the final budget in July. It is very difficult to know what wage rises will occur in the following 12 months, although we usually know what the salary rises will be. We do not know what effect wages rises will have on other items of expenditure.

The officers of a department may estimate that wages will increase by 4 or 5 per cent in the ensuing 12 months, but the actual increase may be 2 per cent or even 1½ per cent. So this item is frequently overestimated.

I suggest that Mr Hetherington should look at the various figures. In the Premier's Department the actual expenditure was \$3 million more than the estimate for 1977-78—allowing a little bit here and there. In the Deputy Premier's

vote, there was a credit of some \$600 000; that amount was underspent. In the vote for the Minister for Agriculture \$300 000 was underspent. However, the vote for Works was exceeded by \$1.2 million. The vote for Labour and Industry was \$200 000 underspent, and for the Attorney General it was \$145 000 underspent. The honourable member was quite right when he referred to \$5 million underspent for Education. In the Mines portfolio, the budget was overspent by \$300 000; \$1.7 million underspent for Transport; \$480 000 underspent for Lands and Forests; and \$84 000 underspent for Local Government.

We now come to the really big one—Health and Community Welfare. This budget was underspent by some \$15 054 000. As the honourable member said that the Government neglected education because it did not spend \$5 million of the estimate, certainly he would say that the Government had neglected health and community welfare—and particularly health—by underspending some \$15 054 000. I do not think our hospital and health services received a setback during 1977-78 because of this underspending.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I was aware of setbacks in education due to our failure to spend the salaries estimate.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr Hetherington said there was a setback in education. This was due to many factors. If the honourable member takes the trouble to closely dissect the Estimates he will see the underspending was caused by a variety of factors, particularly salaries. The figure relating to salaries, however, is based on an estimated increase during the ensuing 12 months. The Budget is drawn up in about July, but it is only an estimate.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It also promised to increase staff by a certain number, but the department increased it by only half that amount.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That may be so. However, it may have been due to a lack of facilities. It may have been impossible, due to lack of accommodation, to appoint the additional staff. It is quite incorrect to say that, because a department did not spend its estimate, it has not been providing an adequate service.

Page 13 of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure reveal that the estimate of revenue for 1977-78 exceeded revenue received by \$18 698 000. Mr Hetherington said that the Treasurer should say straightout if he did not have the money. If the Treasurer does not have the money, of course he cannot spend it. Last financial year, the Treasury over-estimated its receipts by over \$18

million. So if one considers this matter across the board and looks at both expenditure and revenue one will find the Government has presented a fairly balanced Budget.

One of the largest underspenders was the Health and Community Welfare section, where the estimate for salaries was well and truly above actual expenditure. One of the factors influencing this underspending was that the hospital fund, which meets all the out-of-pocket costs of our hospitals, was well out in its estimate of expenditure. However, this did not mean our hospital and health services deteriorated.

Mr Gayfer referred to railways; I intend to discuss roads and railways in conjunction with Commonwealth grants. At present, we are going through a very difficult time; one of the major areas of dispute between the States and the Commonwealth is that of loan funds, particularly in relation to the hospital development programme. Promises were made about our road grants; there has been a great deal of controversy over this matter between shires, the various States and the Commonwealth. Applications have been made to the Commonwealth for grants to upgrade our railway system. Unfortunately, however, the Commonwealth has not seen fit to provide more funds for this purpose, and the State must try to scratch as much money as possible to carry out some of this work.

Mr Hetherington referred to the fact that the interest on short-term money amounted to some \$40 million, and said that \$13 million was diverted—

The Hon. R. Hetherington: To Consolidated Revenue, with \$30 million going to the expenditure account.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That money must be placed somewhere, and the Treasury always must have some money up its sleeve if it does not want to finish up with a deficit. Where possible, Governments do not want to finish up with a deficit. A good Government works towards a balanced Budget. Unfortunately, Governments in the Federal scene have been operating under deficit conditions for a few years now, due mainly to the fact we had a Government which threw money around as if it were going out of fashion. However, the present Government is taking steps to bring that deficit under control. The efforts in Western Australia have been towards bringing down a balanced Budget, and still having some capital with which to finance public works.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: If a State Government has a deficit, it must be funded from somewhere.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, and often a Government finishes up having to fund it from loan moneys. That is not a good policy because, once loan moneys are used to finance deficits, capital works programmes are reduced, thus increasing unemployment and creating other problems. Over the last few years, the Western Australian Government has found it necessary to divert large sums of money from the Revenue Fund into capital works. The Treasurer must have something up his sleeve in order to be able to divert money into capital works.

For instance, money can be channelled into our hospital programme. A commitment was made by the Commonwealth to provide this State with funds estimated at about \$52 million to develop our hospitals, particularly our teaching hospitals. Some people condemned this allocation at the time. The Whitlam Government promised the States \$460 million over a five-year period to assist in the development of hospitals throughout Australia. This was based on a programme submitted to the Commonwealth and approved by the Commonwealth Health Department and the Commonwealth Treasury. A sum of \$28 million was due to be allocated in the first year, with \$108 million being provided in each of the following four years.

The first payment of \$28 million was met, of which Western Australia received \$4 million. The following year, the first allocation of \$108 million was met, of which Western Australia received \$12 million. The following year, however, the promised allocation of \$108 million was reduced to \$50 million, of which Western Australia received only \$4 million. So, immediately, our actual receipts were some \$8 million short of the estimate. The following year no money was provided from this source, which meant that Western Australia was down \$12 million; and, it will be down another \$12 million in the current financial year. This quickly adds up to a large sum of money, which must be found somewhere. The State Government, having received a promise from the Commonwealth Government, has entered into contracts and commitments to carry out developmental programmes.

We cannot stop in the middle of a programme like that, because it would entail laying off staff and being subjected to skyrocketing prices. We could finish up paying \$300 million for a project originally estimated to cost \$150 million.

Members have complained about the lack of money for the development of our railway systems. I know that the various State Governments have applied for Commonwealth funds for this purpose, but have been knocked back. In addition,

there has been a continuing controversy over the allocation of road grants to the States. I believe that if the Commonwealth were to grant the States money to develop their railway systems, the pressure on our roads would be reduced, with a consequent reduction in our demand for road grants. It is much cheaper to transport freight by rail than by road, and I believe our people would support a more efficient railway system.

Mr Claughton referred to the Premier's statement that, where hospital development had taken place and buildings erected, the State of Western Australia would not provide money to staff those buildings. Mr Claughton said it was a very callous approach. But how can Western Australia meet these expenses if the Commonwealth Government does not honour its commitments? Under the hospital agreement, the Commonwealth agreed to meet 50 per cent of the out-of-pocket expenses of public hospitals in Western Australia. This agreement also included any development which took place in the interim period.

I believe the Commonwealth Government has been most unfair in letting the State of Western Australia down. The argument is continuing and I believe we will win out in the end. Of course, it might delay staffing some of these buildings which have been erected for some time, but I believe Western Australia must stick to its guns. We have a legal agreement signed by the Premier of this State and the Prime Minister of the day and I do not believe any Government should be allowed to go back on a commitment of this nature, whether it be a signed agreement or a verbal undertaking.

I support the motion.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [9.59 p.m.]: I thank honourable members for their discussion on these papers.

Mr President, the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure and related papers were tabled in this Chamber on the 20th September, which is a clear indication of the ample opportunity now available to members to give the Budget proposals detailed examination.

At this stage, it is my understanding that those wishing to speak on this motion have now done so, and I would like to express my appreciation to members who have contributed to the debate. It is one of those occasions when members are virtually free to speak on any subject of their choice, and a study of the speeches clearly shows the wide range of topics which have been presented.

As I have previously indicated to the House, it would be a difficult task to answer all the questions which have been posed, or to respond to each individual speaker, other than to say that note has been taken of all speeches and any matters requiring attention referred to the appropriate Minister. I trust replies will be forthcoming to those members who have sought information and, indeed, I have requested this be done. A number of members have put information into the record and that will be noted.

However, I do feel obliged to answer some matters directly concerning my own portfolios and also to acknowledge the comments made by the lead speaker for the Opposition, the Hon. R. Hetherington.

Firstly, I thank Mr Hetherington for his support of the motion and general acceptance of the Budget proposals. In fact, it was quite comforting to hear Mr Hetherington express so much agreement with the Premier and Treasurer on certain issues which have given cause for concern. As Mr Hetherington said, it seems to be a good point of departure, and something which does not happen very often.

Early in July, when the Treasurer announced the financial results for 1977-78, he went to some lengths to explain how a balanced Budget had been achieved.

The Government balanced the accounts by drawing only \$2.4 million of earnings from the investment of Treasury cash resources rather than the whole of the \$8.7 million contained in the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates.

As the Treasurer explained at that time, the result represented a net improvement of \$6.3 million on the 1977-78 Budget proposals thereby allowing the balance of these reserve funds to be utilised in financing additional capital works.

The amount of \$13.9 million to be transferred to Consolidated Revenue in 1978-79 from earnings on the short-term investment of Treasury cash balances is in fact included, and appropriately so, in Treasury departmental revenue on page 18 of the Estimates. It forms part of the interest component of the item "Recovery of Debt Charges".

Treasury revenue in 1977-78 fell \$8.3 million short of the estimate for a number of reasons but primarily because, as I mentioned earlier, only \$2.4 million of interest earnings was required to balance the accounts.

If the honourable member cares to refer to page 5 of the Treasurer's Loan Estimates speech for 1977-78 he will see that a major part of the funds remaining in the Treasury Suspense

Account after allowing for the \$13.9 million transfer to Consolidated Revenue is earmarked for the District Court building in Irwin Street.

Mention was made also of the problems facing Opposition members who tend to be busy in one way or another in grappling with the CRF and Loan Estimates, and all matters that go to make up a Budget. Mr Hetherington related this problem to the lack of adequate research assistance available to members and I think the Hon. Neil McNeill went a long way towards providing him with appropriate answers in this regard.

Many of us have experienced these problems in the past, but I am mindful also of the fact that in recent years members have been given the entitlement of an electorate office and a clerk-typist to relieve them of some of the everyday pressures associated with keeping in touch with their constituents. In recent years additional staff has been provided also to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the Secretary to the Parliamentary Labor Party.

However, as so rightly pointed out by Mr Neil McNeill, whatever assistance is available to members, it should not absolve them from undertaking a great deal of their own research and presenting their own viewpoint and opinions. I have never been in the position to enjoy the facilities members now have. I am not complaining as I am quite happy to keep the one or two benefits accruing to me in the position I now occupy.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I would be prepared to swap with you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There will be no swapping. Of course in relation to this particular debate, following the tabling of the Budget papers, members now have much more time in which to formulate their opinions on the Appropriation Bills than previously and this is shown by the greater number of members speaking on the Budget in this chamber. This has proved to be a very worth-while innovation.

Another point raised by Mr Hetherington was the lack of travel assistance available to the "shadow ministry". One thing he omitted to say was that the shadow ministry system in Western Australia is one which has been adopted by the Australian Labor Party.

Such being the case, it would therefore seem more appropriate for the ALP to met their "extensive travel requirements". No doubt every member of Parliament, Government or Opposition, can aspire to becoming a Cabinet Minister and would therefore be entitled to receive the same consideration.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The Government is very generous in recognition of the Opposition in many cases.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It has been far more generous over the past few years.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I am still waiting for it to filter down.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: While speaking on this matter, perhaps I should inform the House of the current situation in respect of travel concessions available to members of Parliament, as compared with those applying in 1974.

The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly is entitled to unrestricted air travel on regular air services within Western Australia. This applies also to interstate air travel when on official business. In 1974 interstate air travel was restricted to two return trips each calendar year.

The leader of the second party, having not less than seven members in the Legislative Assembly, is entitled to six return trips on regular air services within Western Australia and one return trip to the Eastern States each year. This has not changed since 1974.

Any member, whose electorate is served by a regular public air service, is entitled to unlimited air travel on each service to and from Perth and within that electorate.

Previously this concession applied only to members representing respectively the electoral provinces of North and Lower North, and the electoral districts of Kimberley, Pilbara, Gascoyne and Murchison-Eyre.

Also, a member representing a country electorate served by a regular air service was entitled to only eight return trips each year to and from and about that electorate. Members residing at Geraldton or Esperance were each entitled to a single trip once each week on a regular air service between Perth and the town in which they resided while the House was in session.

Additional concessions now available to members are that each member of Parliament is allowed once in each three years, on a non-cumulative basis, one return trip by regular air service to any part of the State. In respect of that visit, the member is entitled to up to 10 days' travelling allowance at the rate applicable to a Minister.

One return economy class air fare to Melbourne for a private member and his spouse once in the life of each Parliament by regular air service is provided. This concession can be split and used for two separate trips, one each way.

While there may be good argument for further concessions to be implemented in certain circumstances, it would be difficult to distinguish between the needs of private members and the unofficial positions created by the Labor Party of "shadow ministry".

Mr Hetherington raised several matters concerning the Education Department which I referred to the Minister, and have received advice on the following to pass on to Mr Hetherington. As I have said, Mr Hetherington was the lead speaker for the Opposition and I feel it only courteous to answer these matters.

Firstly, on the question of providing air conditioning for school buses at Karratha, Mr Hetherington stated that the senior high school bus is not air-conditioned and children must sit three to two adult seats.

The matter of air-conditioning in Karratha school buses was first raised by the Karratha Senior High School governing council on the 25th November, 1977, so it is not new.

The request was refused at that stage because of the prohibitive costs involved, \$17 000 per bus. Subsequent requests from the council dated the 9th March and the 11th July, 1978, and from Mr J. Tozer, MLC, on the 11th October, were similarly refused. The children spend 25 to 40 minutes on the bus and that should be compared with the five hours they spend each day in the classroom. It was considered, quite wisely, to spend money on classrooms before spending money on school buses. Seating measurements have been decided on and children in the new buses have more room. Nevertheless, the sizes are laid down and the children have a space allocated to them, which is less than for an adult but is still reasonable.

The question of car parking facilities for the new Perth Technical College, also raised by Mr Hetherington, has been a matter under active consideration by a special committee set up to examine such requirements for the overall cultural centre. It has received a great deal of attention.

The cultural centre precinct, including the Perth Technical College, is very well serviced by public transport, because it is unnecessary for most people travelling to it to utilise more than one service. This places the organisation within the precinct in a very different situation from, for instance, the institute of technology at Bentley, or the universities and teachers' colleges, all of which are located away from the central transport system. They are dealt with quite differently.

In respect of State Housing Commission rentals, the revised rebate structure—there has been some misunderstanding—is on the following base—

Where the "family income" is equal to, or less than, \$120 per week, the assessed—or rebated—rent is determined at 20 per cent of such family income;

where the family income is in excess of \$120 per week, then the 20 per cent is increased by 0.1 per cent for each dollar in excess of \$120;

in both cases, if the standard rent is less than the assessed—or rebated—rent, then the standard rent will apply;

where there are in excess of two children in the family, then the assessed—or rebated—rent is reduced by 50 cents per child beyond the second up to a maximum of \$3 per week.

The only exceptions to these guidelines is relative to single and married couple pensioners, where the assessed rents have been determined at \$10 and \$15.20 per week, respectively, representing 17.7 per cent and 16.74 per cent of basic pensions, plus \$5 per week supplementary allowance.

In revising the rebate scale, a prime consideration was that equity should prevail for all tenants, having regard for capacity to pay, with special consideration being accorded to—

- (1) single and married couple pensioners;
- (2) tenants with large families. For this purpose a large family is considered as constituting three or more dependant children.

There was also a matter concerning the change of name for the suburb Maniana to Queen's Park raised by Mr Hetherington.

Ministerial approval was given in February, 1978, to proceed with a major upgrading of the houses in the then called Maniana area. The action to carry out upgrading—rather than demolition and rebuilding—was considered an economic proposition, as the buildings are structurally sound, with a life span of 20 to 25 years. The outside walls will be brick-veneer, rather than having the asbestos replaced; and

the areas of the living areas will be extended to ensure adequate size;

kitchens will be modernised; and gas stoves and hot water systems will be put in where they are lacking.

The total upgrading of the area should take between 2½ to three years. An amount of \$1 mil-

lion of commission funds is available in the current financial year to enable complete upgrading on 76 units.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is the best thing I have heard so far.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Since the inception of the scheme, every effort has been made to ensure tenants are not inconvenienced any more than is necessary. To date, progress has been very good and there has been complete liaison between commission and council officers.

Mr Lewis raised several matters, some of which concerned the portfolios currently under my care. He referred to the sewerage requirements in Collie and, as the two members involved were at a deputation I attended in Collie, there is probably no need to put the information in the record. It is fair enough to say that the town of Collie suffered a fairly dramatic cessation in its progress a couple of years ago and there was a considerable number of empty houses. Then all of a sudden the situation picked up again and I think that perhaps the expenditure there did not keep up with the sudden burst of progress. The priority in the work has been moved up, as I advised the council the other day.

The review showed that to meet the needs of the town it would be necessary to carry out quite extensive works at Collie, costing in the order of \$2.4 million to meet Collie's anticipated requirements over the next decade. Included in this review was the fact that it would be necessary to enlarge the existing sewerage treatment plant at a cost of some \$270 000 and this work should be completed by June, 1980. The necessary action to have these treatment facilities upgraded by this date are now in course. At the request of the honourable member I met the shire and it is aware of this matter.

There was another aspect I wished to mention. One of the 21 members who spoke on the motion was Mrs Grace Vaughan who made a lot of play about income tax. I recall that at the time, I think by interjection, I questioned the honourable member's figures and, as it turned out, the amount of research I have been able to do proved she was wrong again. The correct position in actual fact is that a person earning \$125 a week is presumed to be a "battler".

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not say that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: He would be a married person supporting an unemployed wife. I will give this example. I think she mentioned they would be paying something like 30 per cent in income tax. The weekly rate of tax prior



to the 1st November, 1978, was \$6.10, or less than 5 per cent of the earnings. The tax payable on the new scale is \$7.50 a week, or 6 per cent of the earnings. The honourable member said—

Now, however, the lowest income earner pays exactly the same rate as the higher income earner; 31.5 per cent.

The honourable member said that, because that is a direct quote. She also said—

We can afford to pay more taxes, but a person on \$125 a week cannot afford to pay 31½ per cent of that salary in taxation.

The point I am making is that they do not pay 31½ per cent. Under the new scale they pay 6 per cent. I thought it would be very interesting for her to know that and she is probably grateful I am able to correct her.

Referring to another query Mr Lewis raised, in connection with primary school centres, it might be as well to put this in the record. The criteria determining the location of pre-primary centres are as follows—

- (a) as close as possible to years 1 and 2 so that the children will learn to relate to groups of older children, but still be within their general age group;—

Mr Lewis was one of the committee which helped me in the year we established the pre-primary centres. He had a hand in determining these particular points, but I put them in the record just the same.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Thank you very much, but that was not the query I had. I was referring to the Amaroo pre-primary centre.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The criteria continue—

- (b) near existing library and play area facilities;
- (c) near school buildings, generally, so that the pre-primary children regard the school, as a whole, as "their school";
- (d) proximity to services;
- (e) within close access to school approaches so as to facilitate easy "set down" and "pick up" of children by parents.

With regard to the Amaroo pre-primary centre about which the honourable member asked, an officer of the Education Department has advised that the position recommended by the school principal was superior only in providing easy access for the delivery of children, and the existing location is superior in all respects.

Mr Lewis indicated that the architects employed by the Public Works Department were not listening to the local people in these matters, and I must correct that assumption by pointing out that the responsibility for location and design of buildings does not rest solely with officers of the Public Works Department, but by liaison with the client department concerned.

The problem of the building being ¼ of an inch out of level will be checked by a supervisor on his next visit to Collie.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Checked or fixed?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Although the building should be less than the reputed ¼ of an inch out of level, it is of little significance and should not affect the function of the centre in any way.

Again, on this matter, the honourable member invited me to go to Collie to meet the council, and I did so, in company with the Hon. W. M. Piesse and Mr Jones, and we discussed the position fully.

It is a matter of general interest that the 1976 amendment to the Country Areas Water Supply Act, which brought in clearing controls on the Wellington dam catchment area, included provision for compensation to private landowners where licences are refused. Mr Lewis will no doubt be aware that the Act places the onus on the landowner to claim compensation.

To the present time the Public Works Department has received eight claims, of which three have resulted in the purchase of properties, one in compensation being paid, with negotiations in hand with the other four. In addition, the Public Works Department has also had negotiations with two other landowners who have yet to submit their final claims. It should also be noted that the claims for compensation were so slow in being made in the 1977-78 financial year that most of the funds allocated for purchase of land and compensation had to be redirected to other works.

I have reason to believe the delay may not have been all on one side; the matter is being considered.

Mr Lewis claimed that "the Government has not carried out what it promised in relation to the Pemberton Water Supply" and asked that I look into the matter to see what could be done.

The only known commitment which unfortunately could not be honoured was that a treatment plant planned for the 1977-78 financial year could not be accommodated in the Budget.

Mr Pratt raised two instances concerning the provision of water supplies to properties classified as rural. Although Mr Pratt has already

been informed of the situation in letters sent to him in June and July of this year by my predecessor, I will detail the position again.

It must be borne in mind that the board cannot undertake automatically to supply water to rural land. But where the capacity of the system allows, depending on the merits of each case, then the board will supply water to rural land, providing that those people who want the water pay the full cost, including a contribution towards the cost of providing the headworks, without which there would be no water to supply.

As I mentioned, a number of matters raised were expressions of view which will be passed on to the departments involved. Most of the speeches tonight come into that category, as I think members will agree.

I have had experience of Albany's need for another high school, because when I was Minister for Education each year I went to open another high school football competition and it was getting to the stage where it was almost a foregone conclusion that Albany would win. Whereas all the other large country towns had two high schools, Albany had only one, with the result that its team was stronger. Had it had two schools the children would have been divided and there would have been two teams.

The Hon. T. Knight: Albany would still have won.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Most other country towns are anxious for Albany to get its second high school so that Albany will have two and then someone else might win the football competition!

I want to mention a matter raised by Mr Gayfer. We were all very interested in his discussion with regard to Russia and China and I think the analogy he made in connection with Mr Dans' speech was well taken by us all and was very good.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not have the opportunity to hear it.

Mr MacKINNON: It will make excellent reading.

It was very nice of Mr Gayfer to write a letter of thanks to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. I have had some association with it and I know how pleased the staff are to get that kind of letter in regard to their training. This State has always enjoyed a very happy relationship with the nurses, and their general demeanour and their handling of the job have always been of a high standard.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Particularly the Fremantle Hospital.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is a first-class hospital of world renown, as a matter of fact.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Very true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The nurses and sisters trained at Fremantle Hospital, RPH, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, QEII Medical Centre, or any other training hospital in Western Australia, who go overseas, are very much sought after.

I wish to mention a point to Mr Gayfer which he probably knows. Some people could gain the impression if they read his comments that it was the State Government which had turned the thumbs down on the extension of the country areas water supply scheme in that pocket to which the honourable member referred.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I said that a member of the Federal Government signed the document.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It was turned down by the Federal Government.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I am sorry if I gave any other impression.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know the honourable member would not have meant to convey that impression. The argument is not that they do not need the water but that there is sufficient rainfall of good quality for the farmers to construct on-farm facilities to store the water. That is the argument which was made clear by Mr Gayfer. I accept the point that the Federal Government, not the State Government, ought to build a dam to show that is so.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We are at variance there.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The State Government has made application to the Federal Government under a new proposal to exploit the Agaton aquifer and take the water east into the areas the honourable member mentioned.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We should be putting Federal money into dams rather than pipes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As far as this is concerned, the Government has acted strictly according to Hoyle. There is a priority list worked out in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture which is based on the availability of potable water and the desirability of its being available to the farmers. The difficulty farmers have in building on-farm dams and the like are all taken into account and, as Mr Gayfer said, the area to which he was referring—I think it is around the Beverley district—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Greenhills-Bullaring.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —is now about No. 16 and the area—the Agaton aquifer—is almost No. 1, but one or two others make a better proposition for reference to the Federal Government.

I thank members for the rest of their comments. Mr Baxter in the main explained matters to those who do not enjoy his breadth of experience, and I thank him for the assistance he gave me in that connection. I repeat that I believe the proposition of tabling these papers for discussion is developing and improving each year.

Question put and passed.

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COAL INDUSTRY TRIBUNAL BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 16th November.

**THE HON. D. W. COOLEY** (North-East Metropolitan) [10.31 p.m.]: The old Mining Act, which was repealed by the Mining Bill with which we dealt recently, contained provisions relating to the Western Australian Coal Industry Tribunal. Those provisions having now been repealed, it is necessary to restore them in other legislation so that proper industrial relations may continue in the Collie area.

Several of the provisions contained in the old Mining Act have been amended and deleted. Clause 9 of the Bill now before us proposes to increase the penalty for non-attendance at a compulsory conference from \$200 to \$500. I have on the notice paper an amendment which I hope will meet with the approval of the Government.

It is true the penalty of \$200 was imposed in 1948, and an amount of \$500 seems to be in line with present values, but when one considers the impact of a fine on the parties who may be engaged in a compulsory conference one will appreciate that \$500 to, say, the Western Mining Corporation would not be a button off its shirt but to an individual worker in a coalmine it would represent something like two weeks' wages, which would be harsh and unconscionable.

There must be a penalty. I thought the amount set in 1948 was high and more than a worker could afford, but I do not suppose there is any possibility of having that amount reduced, so I will propose that it be retained.

I do not think there is any necessity to increase the penalty at this time, particularly as the provisions in the Bill are almost identical to the provisions relating to compulsory conferences in the Industrial Arbitration Act, where the penalty for non-attendance has not been increased. Therefore

it does not seem to be consistent to increase the penalty in the legislation relating to the Coal Industry Tribunal.

The Opposition supports the Bill, because without it we would have no means of conducting industrial relations on the Collie coalfields, but I hope in the Committee stage the Government will give due consideration to the amendment I propose.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. I. G. Pratt) in the Chair; the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Conferences—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I move an amendment—

Page 6, line 32—Delete the word "Five" and substitute the word "Two".

I ask the Minister, in the first instance, why it is necessary to increase this penalty to \$500. The clause reads—

9. (1) The Chairman may, whenever in his opinion it is desirable for the purpose of preventing or settling an industrial dispute, summon any person to attend, at a time and place specified in the summons, at a conference presided over by himself.

(2) Any person so summoned shall attend the conference and continue his attendance thereat as directed by the Chairman.

Penalty—Five hundred dollars.

No mention is made of a breach. Regulation 86 under the Industrial Arbitration Act, which relates to a summons to attend a normal hearing of the commission, imposes a penalty of only \$40. There appears to be an inconsistency. The provision relating to compulsory conferences in this Bill and that in the Industrial Arbitration Act are almost identical. In view of the fact that the penalty in the Industrial Arbitration Act has not been amended, I think the amendment I propose should be accepted.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I thank Mr Cooley for his indication of the Opposition's support for the Bill and confirm that in view of the changes in the mining legislation we are simply attempting to provide much the same provisions in relation to the Coal Industry Tribunal as were formerly

contained in the Mining Act. The recommendation of the committee was that these provisions be placed in separate legislation, and that is the reason for the Bill now before the House.

The reason for increasing the penalty under clause 9 from \$200 to \$500 is simply to keep up with the changing value of money. As Mr Cooley is well aware, the penalty of \$200 dates back to 1948, which is 30 years ago. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, although I am led to believe nobody has been fined under this provision. I can therefore well understand the honourable member's puzzlement about the necessity to amend it.

I can only say in explanation that as Acts are processed an attempt is made to bring penalties into line with modern values. It may be when comparing various Acts there appears to be a lack of consistency at times.

It is very important that people attend a tribunal when summoned to do so by the chairman of that tribunal. Whether it be a member of the executive of a union, a union member, or a secretary or member of a big mining company does not alter the fact that we need a deterrent.

This is a maximum penalty only. When no maximum is prescribed in an Act, the amount prescribed is taken to be the maximum. We would not normally expect a magistrate adjudicating on a matter under this legislation to impose the maximum except in an exceptional case of flagrant disobedience. Normally we would expect a considerably smaller penalty. It is entirely within the discretion of the adjudicating magistrate. Of course, he could award any amount; he could still award, say \$20 under this legislation, whether the penalty prescribed be \$500 or \$200.

This is an attempt to express a figure which was \$200 in 1948 as \$500 in 1978.

I suppose some other figure could have been selected. Some would say that if it was \$200 in 1948 it should be \$1 000 in 1978. I suppose it is really a compromise. I regret the Government cannot accept the amendment in the circumstances.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I can understand that if the figure were related to the value of money now as compared with the value of money in 1948, the amount probably would be something like \$32 000. What concerns me a little is that this presupposes that the proposals of Commissioner Kelly will be adopted. I am sure this is a coincidence, because the Bill probably was drafted before Commissioner Kelly drew up his proposals. However, he proposed the same amendment of \$500. That matter has not yet

been considered by the Parliament. In that sense it is a little imprudent on our part to presuppose what Commissioner Kelly may do. However, I understand the situation.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 17 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

## **WESTERN AUSTRALIAN OVERSEAS PROJECTS AUTHORITY BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

**THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON** (East Metropolitan) [10.49 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill. I support it quite warmly, because it is in line with the kind of thing I have advocated since I have been in this House. I think it is highly desirable that the Government carry out the kinds of activities outlined in the Bill. Were it not so late in the session I might dilate further upon it, but perhaps that might be gilding the lily at this stage. Therefore, I simply indicate that the Opposition supports the Bill.

I have the wry query in my mind of what would happen were we on the opposite benches putting forward this Bill. I wonder whether it would have such an easy passage, or whether members opposite would accuse us of socialism, because there have been times when some members have been a little dubious about Government-to-Government negotiation. However, I think in this case the Government has wisely seen this is sometimes necessary.

I would say also it is probably a good idea if the authority turns its attention to the areas around the Arabian Gulf where I think we can profitably extend our trade. This is an area to which Western Australia should look, among other places.

The only other comment I would make is a minor matter I may have missed when reading the Bill. I wonder who is the Minister referred to in the Bill to whom the authority is to be responsible. I assume it is the Treasurer, but I have not seen words to that effect. If they are in the Bill I have overlooked them.

The Opposition supports the Bill in principle and in detail.

**THE HON. O. N. B. OLIVER (West)** [10.51 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill with reservations. I can understand that the Opposition would support the Bill fully. This is not a new trend, it is a trend that has developed, following the establishment of the Iron Curtain, of Government-to-Government contracts or what are called back-to-back arrangements. These have been brought about within certain countries where there is a developing situation of complete Government involvement in trade. The private enterprise sector is being slowly squeezed out as a result of uncertainties in respect of economies in certain nations which have emerged since World War II. It is also the result of the effect of Governments being unable to trust the various agents and entrepreneurs in those countries.

Of course, it has gone further now. As these developing nations come forward the same doubt about the ability of private enterprise to perform has brought about Government interference in trade with those countries. Even within the last five years this has happened in Pakistan. Having arrived there to transact business with the principal of a textile mill, I found the gentleman concerned had been placed in gaol temporarily because he was not a political supporter of the Prime Minister (Mr Bhutto). I then had to transact the business with the Pakistan Export Corporation, as it became known.

I support the Bill with some reservations, because it is a bit of a coat hanger. It is something like the AIDC which was well intended. The AIDC was introduced by the then Minister for Trade, now Sir John McEwan. The AIDC subsequently turned into an animal of proportions that were never anticipated. I am quite certain that Sir John McEwan, with the best of intentions, never expected that the AIDC would be manipulated by the next Government.

**The Hon. R. G. Pike:** He was told that would happen when he introduced the legislation.

**The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER:** Therefore I have some reservations about this.

There are some other matters I will raise in the Committee stage of the Bill.

The only thing that concerns me is in respect of Government officials interfering in trade negotiations which have all the complexities of currency matters, and in respect of the requirement to negotiate with the Export Payments Insurance Corporation—commonly known as EPIC. We are aware of what will happen to profits which will

flow to the authority; but I wonder what will happen to any losses of the authority and how they will be disbursed.

A fair example of this is the Australian Wool Corporation which became extremely successful. I believe its success is based upon its executive, and the framework on which it was based. That corporation developed as a result of the engagement of people who had vital knowledge of and had made their living in the wool industry. As time passes a new generation of executives without such experience will arrive, and I have my doubts whether the AWC as a statutory body will be able to engage in trading as it does today and to ship surplus stocks all around the world in anticipation of orders.

I support the Bill, but I have those reservations. I think clause 6 is very restrictive. However, I still have the reservation that we could be putting in the cupboard a skeleton which will emerge as a giant animal.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition)** [10.57 p.m.]: As Mr Hetherington has said, we support the Bill. It was part of Labor policy during the last election to set up such an overseas projects authority.

I cannot see in the Bill anything relating to the AIDC.

**The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver:** I said it was just a framework.

**The Hon. D. K. DANS:** Nor can I see anything in the Bill which relates it to the Australian Wool Corporation. I would not like it to be related to the Wool Board, which tried to make wool a prestige fabric—so much so that it was priced out of the range of many people. The board must have spent thousands and thousands of dollars on promotion. However, things are running much more smoothly these days. This Bill simply does what it says it intends to do; it facilitates the export of Western Australia expertise, services, equipment, and capital goods through participation on a contract basis. Most members of this House know that in many parts of the world today Governments will deal with other countries only on a Government-to-Government basis. That does not apply only to countries behind the Iron Curtain, Iran is one country I could name.

**The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver:** Iraq is another.

**The Hon. D. K. DANS:** If this Bill does what it sets out to do, as far as the Opposition is concerned it will be a good measure.

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central)** [11.01 p.m.]: I was greatly intrigued when this proposal came before the House. My party supports the

Bill, as it is a Government measure. We support it enthusiastically, because there have been illustrations in the last 12 months of the need for such a measure.

It is interesting that this authority is not designed merely to sell a product to make a profit or to set up a market. There are some sectors in this State which wish to sell advice and know-how.

Regrettably it is awkward in some countries of the world to provide the type of assistance which is non-profit making and non-profit earning. It is difficult to tell an undernourished country how it can go about a certain project. If we could do that, we could create the goodwill that allows for trade negotiations in vastly different circumstances. I wish to tell the House an interesting story relating to Nigeria. Nigeria sent ambassadors around the world because of a particular problem it had. In Nigeria, 38 per cent of the grain harvested—and that means all grain, including millet—is absolutely destroyed by weevils and other insects. In a struggling country, that is a very high percentage. The ambassadors travelled the world, looking for the expertise to solve this problem. They did not know what to look for. They came to Western Australia, and they visited the Department of Industrial Development in relation to other matters. While they were at the department, they spoke about their agricultural problem.

The company which handles wheat in Western Australia, Co-operative Bulk Handling, was contacted. CBH was asked to meet with the Nigerian ambassadors. In due course, it was arranged that CBH would send a senior officer to Nigeria for three months. That officer advised the Nigerian authorities how a simple type of bulk handling system could be established in Nigeria. He gave advice only, because CBH does not sell grain.

The fund of knowledge within CBH is recognised throughout the world as being excellent. That knowledge is shared freely with others.

When the officer returned to Western Australia, he began to draw detailed plans for a simple receipt point. He was to return to Nigeria later to set standards for the grain to be received in bulk. It was agreed that in the interests of the expansion of Nigeria and the establishment of goodwill CBH would send three officers to stay in Nigeria for a considerable time. The arrangements were made on the basis of Government-to-private industry. It was decided that if Nigeria wanted to obtain this expertise, it was fair that it

should meet some of the cost in relation to travel and board. Three men were to live in the country for a long time to set up the scheme.

Of course, that was the last heard of the programme. It was all right whilst we were doing it for nothing. Somehow negotiations fell down.

My opinion is that this type of authority will help to foster Government-to-Government relationships, in order to keep the interest flowing. Whilst CBH was not reluctant to send men to Nigeria, there was no way of entering into an agreement because, as CBH is a co-operative, the negotiations were not on a Government-to-Government basis. That is an important aspect.

If that deal had gone through, there would have been more trade between the countries. We would have sent our goods to that country. The whole exercise fell down, because the Nigerian Government wanted to deal with a Government and not with a company.

That is only one illustration. There are others in relation to the food and agriculture organisation. We have been willing to provide expertise; but unfortunately there has been misunderstanding. Other countries believed that we were trying to rob them when we asked them to meet some basic charges to offset the costs of sending our officers overseas.

I support the Bill.

**THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South—Minister for Lands) [11.06 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of this legislation.

I can understand that members on this side of the House might have a certain amount of apprehension and reserve about the legislation when they hear members of the Labor Party saying that it is part of their platform. It is a matter of interpretation, and the manner in which the legislation is used.

**The Hon. R. F. Claughton:** No doubt the Government read our policy and decided this was one of the many good things it could do.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** I would not argue about it. It is a good idea. Get it into operation.

**The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH:** It is not intended that the authority should be a trading company as such. It is intended that it be a means by which we can utilise our expertise, as Mr Gayfer pointed out. The authority will not be at great risk, because it will not be trading in a commodity. It should not be running at a loss.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** It is not intended to.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Rather, it will be quoting prices—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not intended to trade.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I would not have been supporting it if it had.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I thank the members for their support. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. I. G. Pratt) in the Chair; the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I failed to answer a question by Mr Hetherington. He asked which Minister would be responsible for the legislation. Very few Bills actually state which Minister will be the responsible Minister.

It is usual, at the start of the term of a Government, to designate which Ministers will be responsible for what legislation. That information is published in the *Government Gazette*. Often the responsibilities are interchangeable. At this stage, I do not think the legislation has been assigned to any Minister.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Functions of the Authority—

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I take this opportunity to comment on the matter mentioned by Mr Gayfer. At the time the delegation from Nigeria visited Western Australia I was acting Minister for Agriculture. I am disappointed to hear from Mr Gayfer the outcome of those negotiations.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is how the exercise finished.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I was tremendously impressed with the attitude of the Nigerian Minister for Agriculture, who headed the group, and the attitude of his technical staff. It needs to be said that those people had travelled the world. They visited Europe, Scandinavia, America, the Eastern States of Australia, and Western Australia, which was their last port of call. The Minister commented to me that Western Australia obviously does not realise its tremendous advantages and its tremendous facilities which must surely be

of a standard greater than many others in the world. The Minister said, "In fact, we have found in Western Australia something which we have not found anywhere else in the world, and which we think is most appropriate to the Nigerian situation." That, in fact, related to our large agricultural machinery.

Negotiations were conducted with that delegation. They were most insistent that Nigerians should not come here for the purpose of studying our experience and our development, but that Western Australians ought to be made available to visit Nigeria and to advise that country. That is the point Mr Gayfer was stressing.

The understanding I reached with the Nigerian Government was that financing would be on a mutual basis. That related to the assistance and advice to be made available by Western Australia. It is on that point I speak, because in respect of governmental activity and departmental activity—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I understand there was a change of Government in Nigeria, and that was when the system broke down.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am grateful for Mr Gayfer's comment. I am disappointed, because the attitude expressed by the Nigerian Minister for Agriculture was co-operation in the extreme. They wished to take advantage of what they considered to be the tremendous experience and know-how in Western Australia.

I take this opportunity to express my support for this clause and for this Bill. I believe there is great merit in something which will facilitate the sorts of arrangements which would have been of great value to Western Australia in that instance, and which certainly would have been important to the country of Nigeria.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Membership of the Board—

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not opposing this clause. However, I notice that the board consists of three directors who are public servants. I have no objection to any of them. I think they are people who are eminently suited to be on the board. It would have been wise to have one or two directors appointed from the public at large. I wonder why the Minister has not done this. I am not suggesting the other people should be in the majority. I am merely suggesting that the board should have such members on it. On this issue I would have thought Mr Oliver might have been in agreement with me and it would be nice to record agreement for once.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Probably the second reading speech answered this question to the extent that the board is designed to be small and to be in a position where it can call upon expertise depending upon the particular trade involved at the time. It could be a little embarrassing if a director of a private enterprise company was a member of the board and his company wished to tender for work. It would depend upon the scope of the work in which the committee was involved at the time whether it would obtain advice from private enterprise.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 to 26 put and passed.

Clause 27: Funds of the Authority—

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I refer members to the wording of paragraph (b). I imagine income would be in the form of fees and the necessary travelling expenses associated with the work. When one reads that clause and relates it to the situation it would be commonly termed a joint venture arrangement. One finds the Bill is supposed to be called—to use the terminology used by the Minister in his second reading speech—a “vehicle”. When it is referred to as being vehicle legislation, it leads me to say that the income which may be derived, apart from the travelling expenses I have mentioned, would need to be divided on a 50-50 basis in the case of a joint venture. If a joint venture arrangement is involved, although the legislation is supposed to be only a vehicle—that is, it is either a principle or only giving its name, it is a *del credere* agent, if one likes to call it that—is it the intention that it operate on a 50-50 basis which means it would have a 50 per cent share of the profits and of the losses also?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Seldom will it be a joint venture. If we liken it to some of the work carried out in Libya, I doubt whether it would be that sort of arrangement at all. We are selling expertise there through the Department of Agriculture. One would not expect it to be a liability to the State and the Government would expect to get back the costs incurred in sending over the experts, and the experts would be able to quote for some of the machinery used—the agricultural equipment, etc.—but they would be quoting a price given directly by Chamberlain or some other Western Australian company. I do not imagine they would be expecting to make a profit out of it. Obviously they would be looking for a return of expenses, but not necessarily to make a profit.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 28 to 40 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and passed.

### NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES REGULATION BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [11.25 p.m.]: The Opposition opposes this Bill. The meaning of the legislation is spelt out on page 4 of the Minister's second reading speech. It reads as follows—

The object of this legislation is to make provision for protecting the health and safety of the people and the environment from possible harmful effects associated with nuclear activities. The means by which this will be achieved is by the formulation and adoption by regulation of codes of practice that will ensure that the nuclear industry is controlled to the extent necessary to meet the objects of the Act.

The nuclear activities defined in this Bill are those associated with what is commonly called the nuclear fuel cycle. This cycle includes the mining and milling of radioactive ores, processing these ores to the point where they can be used in nuclear power generation; storage of radioactive waste, both short and long term; and the recycling of radioactive fuels such as uranium and plutonium.

At present only mining and milling will take place in Western Australia but there is the strong likelihood of further processing and nuclear power generation in the future. While there is no move toward nuclear power station waste storage in Western Australia, the legislation will allow for proper control should this ever occur.

The attitude of the ALP in respect of uranium is well known. We have called for a moratorium for a period of two years on this very vexed question in order that someone somewhere in the world may be able to come up with an answer as to what to do with the waste. As I am speaking here now, it appears to me from what I have read on the subject that nowhere



in the world at present is there a guaranteed safe method of storing the waste material produced as a result of nuclear power generation.

I am fully aware that uranium ore is mined and various uses are made of it. We have to think about that. The Minister's second reading speech gives ample evidence that harmful effects could be associated with nuclear activity. I am aware this Bill is complementary to the Federal legislation and I am aware also that it is the kind of legislation all of the States will adopt at some time; that is, if I am to believe what is contained in the Minister's second reading speech and I have no reason to disbelieve it. However, in my opinion, the very fact that it is said harmful effects could be associated with nuclear activity reinforce the view of my party.

There is no guarantee when we mine the ore and ship it overseas it will be welcomed with open arms. If I read the newspapers correctly, workers in Germany are becoming increasingly incensed by the efforts to establish further nuclear power plants. Sweden has experienced all kinds of trouble in relation to the matter of nuclear power stations. Therefore, there is no guarantee that working people around the world will continue into the nuclear age unless some real safeguards are provided which will make absolutely certain that the waste material can be disposed of safely and permanently.

I am not one of the people who believe we have to charge away into the so-called nuclear age. I do not believe there is a real energy crisis around the corner. In this State alone there are vast resources of brown coal which could be used easily for the next 200 or 300 years. Some sections of world opinion, certainly in the United Kingdom, claim there is enough fossil fuel for the next 300 years. That is a fairly wide and sweeping statement. The interpretation of "fossil fuel" is said to include oil. Therefore, it does not appear to be a situation in which we need to charge away into the so-called new era.

It is all very well to say that we shall produce yellow cake only at this point, that we are not moving into the nuclear processing business, and that everything in the garden will be dandy. Let me remind the House that the Canadians, who probably have some of the strongest safeguards in the world, supplied nuclear material to India for use in a nuclear power station. Canada had all the safeguards required and it was held up as an example of how one controls this particular form of energy.

Notwithstanding that, the Indians were able to manufacture a bomb from the waste products in the nuclear plant. It is common knowledge

throughout the world that South Africa has an atomic bomb, and so does Israel. One can only assume those bombs were manufactured from radioactive materials for so-called peaceful purposes.

Not so very long ago—some 20 years ago—I attended a lecture by a competent gentleman, Kingsley Martin, the late editor of the *New Statesman*. He spoke about the danger of nuclear war by accident. It is a very real danger. The more that proliferation occurs around the world, and the more we put into the hands of people who are able to use the wherewithal to make bombs, the more danger there is of a nuclear war by accident.

Despite all the safeguards that Canada required, India was quite capable of making an atomic bomb. Other nations can do the same thing. I recently read a report where a group of people in Tasmania had constructed a thermonuclear bomb simply by reading material obtained from the Public Library in Hobart. Fortunately, they did not have the ingredients. I do not think anyone would quarrel with or argue against the fact that the more these dangerous substances are proliferated, the more danger there is of a nuclear war by accident. I imagine members will recall the film "On the Beach".

I have a real horror that this kind of material could get loose. When I was a fairly young person I landed in Japan after the war ended. Within a very short time, I journeyed to Hiroshima where the first atomic bomb was dropped. My first reaction was that perhaps we should have had a couple of hundred bombs. I saw that totally devastated city and it made a deep impact on me which I have never forgotten.

The bomb which devastated Hiroshima was dropped from an aeroplane and suspended on a parachute. It was exploded some hundreds of feet in the air. The devastation it caused, and the genetic effect it is still causing to unborn children—children that are to be born—is a terrible thing. When one considers that it now takes a device capable of creating more devastation than that bomb to trigger off thermonuclear reaction in a hydrogen bomb, I do not think anyone is able to comprehend the devastation that can be caused.

That is one of the reasons my party opposes the spread and the proliferation of nuclear material. It is not beyond our comprehension to understand it will not be very long before there is some kind of accident in one of these plants. Once that happens I will bet pennies to peanuts that there will be a sudden halt throughout the world on this sort of energy generation. After all, the

uranium material is used only as the fuel to create heat energy. In turn the heat energy creates steam in power stations; it does not do any more than that. If it is put into the engine of a submarine, the submarine is subsequently driven by a steam turbine. Used in merchant ships, it has raised all kinds of problems when leakages caused the water to boil around the ships.

As far as we are concerned, the matter is far from being resolved. It is all very well to talk of the great benefits that will flow from the mining of uranium in Australia and the production of yellow cake. But, there is only one market. There are customers who want to buy it, and there is the profit motive. I cannot see any great benefit accruing to the ordinary people in Australia from this form of activity. All I can see is a great deal of danger.

We will place ourselves in the position of being a nation that proliferates this dreadful kind of thing—and it cannot be called by any other name—no matter how we export it or what safeguards we have. We say that it will be exported for peaceful means to fuel power stations. Let me go back to what happened when Canada made uranium available to India. India was able to make an atomic bomb. If members in this Chamber were to read accounts of the terrible mutations at birth which are still occurring in and around Hiroshima and Nagasaki, they would be horrified. Babies are being born without any brains at all, without even the capacity of ordinary animal existence. Some are born with their intestines outside their bodies. Members should go to the museums and hospitals where they can see those things.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Can they be seen in both cities

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not saying there is a hospital in both cities, but I am aware of one in Hiroshima. That is where the worst devastation occurred, because the city lies in a valley. The explosion was confined with a resultant heat storm. The honourable member knows what happens when a nuclear bomb goes off. Terrible heat is created.

If people have in mind that they are prepared to take this dreadful risk—and it is a risk—then we will go ahead and export uranium. The words of Kingsley Martin come back to me. He asked what would happen if a small country to the north of Australia had a bomb and it was irresponsible, and a small neighbouring country also

had one of these bombs. If those countries were to fire a missile at each other, the resultant explosion would be monitored by the super powers—that hotline between Washington and Moscow. Some strange character sitting in Moscow, and another sitting in Washington, will press the buttons and that will be the end of the world, because there will be no survivors.

We oppose the proliferation of nuclear material until the safeguards are met. There is now a neutron bomb. I did not know how it worked until my young son told me. The reaction set up as a result of a neutron explosion is able to travel through buildings without causing any damage, but the neutrons passing through a person's body cause such a shock that the person is killed. It is a sophisticated weapon. No damage is caused to buildings, and whoever uses it moves in after and sweeps up the dead.

The first reaction I had when I saw Hiroshima was that we had won the war. However, my reaction soon turned sour when I realised that in that flash of flame thousands of people perished. It cut exactly nine days off the war.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Chemical warfare causes far more devastation than a blast from a nuclear bomb.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is open to debate. I know there are certain types of gases around. However, in the case of a neutron bomb the buildings are not damaged. The same would apply to chemical warfare. The neutron bomb is able to cause 10 times more damage than a hydrogen bomb, and it will kill 10 times more people.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You are discussing top secret stuff.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not know whether Mr Oliver was privy to top secrets. If he did have access to them, the security of this nation was at very great risk!

I am pointing out our opposition to this Bill. People seem to have the idea that somehow or other we are backward because we oppose these things, but we are not backward at all. All we ask for is a safeguard. Notwithstanding what has been said, nuclear power is dangerous.

We are not crazy enough to say that at some time the world will not run short of energy. Perhaps then power will have to come from a nuclear power station. However, the risk of accident would be minimised if some safe way was found to dispose of the waste. The waste should be monitored and controlled by a world

authority. After the power stations have been fuelled, the waste should be disposed of to the very last grain or drop. However, that was not done in India, Israel, or South Africa, otherwise those countries would not be in possession of nuclear bombs. It is unfortunate that any country has such a bomb.

The super powers around the world are always counting their nuclear bombs. Every time one picks up a magazine one sees diagrams showing how many bombs each country has. I am not sure about the Chinese but in the case of the French, despite all the opposition from successive Australian Governments, they are still letting the things off in the Pacific Ocean. It is no good anyone saying we overstate the case as far as nuclear danger is concerned, because we do not. Perhaps I over-react to some degree because of my concern for the future of the human race.

Until the criteria for the safeguards are met we should expect to be a responsible nation. In the case of Canada, it set certain conditions on the supply of nuclear products to India, but we know what happened there. That is not Labor Party propaganda. Everyone knows it happened. In India they built and exploded a bomb to make sure it worked.

I do not know the expertise of the Indian scientists. Perhaps it is not very high. It must be much easier to build a bomb now than it was previously.

We accept the fact that at some stage in the future the generation of power from nuclear sources will come about. I do not think it is beyond mankind to find a safe way to dispose of the waste. I do not think enough effort has been put into the disposal of waste, mainly because companies throughout the world see our nuclear products as a ready source of profit rather than of value to mankind.

If there were no value in uranium for the individuals, there would not be the clamour to go and dig it out. If a Government agency were to mine it, we would have a lot more people on side.

Right throughout Australia, people of all political persuasions, of all religions, and from every walk of life, are concerned about uranium. I have no doubt that the Bill will be passed in this place, but I want to place on record my party's opposition to anything to do with the proliferation of nuclear energy until we have proper safeguards. In particular I want to express my own opposition to it. I sincerely wish that common sense will prevail here tonight, but I know it

will not. However, I do not want it on my conscience at some time in the future that my simple little vote, in this small Parliament, caused the mass destruction of millions.

I oppose the Bill.

**THE HON LYLA ELLIOTT** (North-East Metropolitan) [11.46 p.m.]: I will find it very difficult to add very much to the debate, following the Hon. Des Dans, because he put the case for the Opposition very ably, and he said all the sorts of things I wanted to say. Despite that, like him I feel I must rise to oppose this Bill strongly. I want to indicate my total revulsion at the thought of this State being involved in promoting nuclear technology. It is very wrong that legislation such as this and the next measure—I do not know whether that will be dealt with tonight—which are so important to the future of mankind, should be debated at nearly midnight. This legislation was introduced very late in the session, like so many other Bills in previous years.

I have a book at home entitled *The Sane Society* written by Erich Fromm. In the first chapter he poses the question: Are we sane? He suggests that western society is not as sane as it thinks it is. Since reading his book I have often stopped to ponder that same question.

In the twentieth century we have made outstanding advances in medicine, transport, communication, science, and technology. I believe the human race has shown it is capable of great intelligence, but does it display much reason in the way it conducts its affairs? For example, is it reasonable that vast sums and resources are spent on building large luxurious office blocks and bigger and faster automobiles while we are starved of funds for such things as health, welfare, and houses.

Is it reasonable to dump good, nutritious food in the ocean, or to shoot perfectly healthy livestock because the price it brings is not good enough? Is it reasonable to tear out healthy fruit-bearing trees while millions are malnourished? Is it reasonable to promote a form of power that will add to the horrific prospect of destroying mankind altogether through nuclear war? If it is conceded that these things are unreasonable—and reason equates sanity—we must begin to question whether we live in a sane society and whether the policies being promoted by Governments of today are sane.

Mr Dans referred to the policy of our party. I will not read it all because the hour is late, but it is well known that we believe, in view of all the problems and dangers associated with the

mining of uranium and nuclear technology, there should be a moratorium on uranium mining and treatment in Australia. That policy was adopted at our thirty-second conference in Perth last year.

I want to now refer members to clause 2 of the Bill which says—

The object of this Act is to make provision for protecting the health and safety of the people of the State, and the environment, from possible harmful effects associated with nuclear activities.

It is just not possible to implement that provision. No Government in the world can guarantee to protect the health and safety of the people from the harmful effects associated with nuclear activity. How can a Government guarantee that by passing an Act of Parliament?

Let us look at what is involved in subscribing to the policy of supporting nuclear mining. In his second reading speech the Attorney General had this to say—

At present only mining and milling will take place in Western Australia.

I ask members to listen to this—

but there is the strong likelihood of further processing and nuclear power generation in the future. While there is no move toward nuclear power station waste storage in Western Australia, the legislation will allow for proper control should this ever occur.

Those are ominous words. We are given fair warning that if we pass this Bill not only are we giving support to uranium mining and the export of yellow cake to other countries, but also we can expect the strong likelihood that there will be further processing and nuclear power stations in Western Australia, and the possibility of storing this lethal waste in our State.

Of course, the Government does not care about public opinion. Already it has shown contempt for that. The Government has already signed an agreement with Western Mining Corporation without insisting on a final environmental impact statement or an ERMP. In the next Bill, the Government will present a *fait accompli*.

We should ask ourselves why the Government is insisting on the mining of uranium and the export of yellow cake in the face of so much opposition and all the fears that have been expressed about the dangers of nuclear technology. What is in it for the citizens of Western Australia, in view of all the bad features we are aware of? What are some of the positive things?

Furthermore, what will be the economic benefits to the people of Western Australia? Will we receive a great income as a result of extracting this element?

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Yes, we will.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am glad the honourable member said that, because I will show it is not so. A Press statement appeared in *The West Australian* of the 3rd November. It was headed, "Yeelirrie to yield government \$130 m". The article stated—

The WA Government will receive about \$130 million in royalties from the Yeelirrie uranium mining project over its projected 22-year lifespan.

This is based on an estimate given yesterday by the Minister for Industrial Development, Mr Mensaros, that the Government will receive about \$6 million a year in royalties, working on a rate of 3.5 per cent of the value of yellowcake production.

Members may remember on the 9th November I asked, in view of the Minister's statement, the following question—

... Does this mean the f.o.b. value of the yellowcake is expected to be approximately \$3 714 million?

That is what it would work out to on the estimate given by Mr Mensaros. That means of an estimated value of \$3 714 million, the State would receive a miserable \$130 million. Where are the great economic benefits to the State?

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It costs money to get it out of the ground, to develop it, and to pay wages, etc.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Do not tell me that the overheads, etc., would eat up the difference between \$130 million and \$3 714 million. But that is not all. If members look at the agreement, they will see that the company is getting all sorts of concessions from the State—roads, water supplies, railways, and it is even talked about—

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Are they getting those free?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (the Hon. I. G. Pratt): I draw the speaker's attention to the fact that the Bill we are now discussing is about nuclear activities. She is referring to the clauses of the agreement contained in the next Bill.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am quite aware of that, Sir, but I drew attention to the agreement to indicate one of the reasons for our opposition to this measure. Apart from the aspects I have referred to, there will not be a great

financial benefit to the State. I agree that I was probably out of order, but I believe you will appreciate my reasons for mentioning it. What about the employment benefits?

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It will employ 800 people.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Ranger report dismisses the value of uranium mining in regard to employment.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Which one?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The first report. It reads—

The total employment created if the uranium mining projects go ahead will be small in relation to the size of the Australian labour force.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You ask those 800 people to go there whether it is small or not; it may help the people on the dole that Mr Dans was talking about.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would like to ask the 800 people, who might have been employed at the beginning of the Wittenoom asbestos mine because of the lack of employment in other industries, what they would do if they had another chance. Would they still agree to work in such a mine? I repeat: The very thorough Ranger inquiry found that, in its opinion, the actual number employed would be very small.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I think 800 is better than nothing, apart from the flow-on benefits.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Is that in the construction stage?

The Hon. N. F. Moore: No, 800 permanent employees.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would much rather see construction workers employed in building homes than in building uranium mines and power stations.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: The money has to come from somewhere.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is the same old story—money is the god. It does not matter about the lives of people or the future of our planet.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you saying housing is non-productive?

The Hon. N. F. Moore: No, I am not. Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (the Hon. I. G. Pratt): Order! I ask members to cease their cross-Chamber conversations, and to allow the Hon. Lyla Elliott to continue her speech.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Another point raised is that we have a world energy shortage, and we are being very selfish if we hang on to our uranium, and that we should export it so that the energy-starved countries may benefit. What does the Ranger Uranium Environmental Enquiry have to say about that? The following statement appears at page 164—

It is also clear that world energy resources are not in danger of imminent exhaustion. Total world coal resources are so large that they will not be approaching depletion for many decades, even if the rate of energy use continues to increase exponentially as it has this century. We have examined the relative cost of electricity generated by coal and nuclear energy, particularly in those countries which are said to be critically dependent on Australian uranium. If coal is in the future made available to such countries at prices equivalent to recent prices, the cost of electricity generated from it is likely to be only marginally higher than the cost of electricity generated from nuclear energy.

We conclude that, while the economies of countries heavily dependent on imported oil have been adversely affected by increases in world oil prices, it is incorrect to say that there is a presently existing world energy crisis which will create disastrous economic effects. The nature and extent of the energy needs of countries which could conceivably be Australia's customers for uranium have been examined in Chapters 7 and 8, and it is clear that it is incorrect to suggest that there are energy impoverished nations which need Australian uranium for survival.

That answers the question of whether Australia is being selfish if it chooses to deprive these other countries of our uranium or yellow cake.

So, if there are no great economic benefits to the State, or no enormous employment opportunities and no real energy shortage, what is the real reason behind the great push by the Uranium Producers Forum to mine uranium?

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Money!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I believe it is like a lot of other things we see, where the motivating factor is the enormous profits which can be made. These great mining companies and multi-national corporations like Westinghouse and General Electric, which build nuclear power plants, stand to make huge profits. I have already quoted a figure of \$3.7 billion. We have not been told that is the actual figure, but we can follow

the figures through and estimate that this is how much Western Mining Corporation expects to receive out of Yeelirrie.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: If you look at Western Mining's past performance you will find it has ploughed most of that back into the State. It makes a profit on investment of only 4 per cent.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have said I cannot see any great benefits from mining uranium. What are the potential costs in human terms if Western Australia goes into the mining and export of uranium, or in fact if we establish a nuclear power plant in this State?

Firstly, let us consider the actual mining of uranium. What does the Fox report have to say about that? I am sure many people would be alive today if that sort of report had been available to workers who had the option of working or not working at Wittenoom. On the question of mining, the Fox report states as follows—

Breaking up the ore during mining facilitates release of the radon gas. The evidence shows that radon poses the principal radiation hazard in uranium mining. Its solid alpha-emitting decay products, which can be retained in the lung, are the direct cause of the hazard.

So, there is the danger which will be faced by people involved in the mining process.

Then, there is the production of yellow cake. In part, the Fox report had this to say about yellow cake production—

Radon and dust can also present radiation hazards during milling... The evidence suggests that the main hazards associated with yellowcake production arise from the material, known as tailings, left over after the uranium is extracted from the ore. This material contains all the radioactive decay products of the uranium, which were responsible for most of the radioactivity in the original ore.

If Western Australia decides to establish its own nuclear power plant, grave dangers will be associated with that project. The first point which must be considered is the possibility of accidents. Last year we were visited by a nuclear engineer (Dale Bridenbaugh) who worked for the General Electric Company in America for 22 years. He discussed the possibility of accidents occurring in nuclear power plants, and made the following statement—

If there is a malfunction in the reactor it will release the equivalent radioactive material of about 1 000 Hiroshima bombs.

What a frightful prospect! Dale Bridenbaugh also discussed the accident which occurred at a plant in Turkey Point, Florida. He states as follows—

In fact, at one plant in Turkey Point in Florida, the pool is full and has been leaking for two years, at a rate of 90 gallons an hour, into Biscayne Bay. The utility announced they can't do anything about it because the radiation levels are too high to get anybody in there to fix the leaks in the pool and they can't ship fuel out of there because they have no place to ship it. So that is really a summary of the sorry state of our waste processing and waste storage facilities.

Bridenbaugh made the following statement about his employment in the nuclear energy industry—

I resigned from my job earlier this year after spending about eighteen years in the nuclear energy business and after having worked for the General Electric Company for twenty-two years because I became convinced, seeing the way the nuclear programme was being implemented, that it represented a very great risk to the continuation of life on Earth.

This was a man who had spent 18 years in the business, and who had worked for the General Electric Company for 22 years.

To continue on the possibility of accidents at nuclear power plants, the Fox report makes the following statement—

Abnormal occurrences at nuclear power stations, caused by equipment malfunctions and operator errors, have included partial cooling failures, such as occurred at the Dresden 2 BWR near Chicago in 1970, and a major fire at the Browns Ferry 1 and 2 BWRs in Alabama. Among noncommercial reactors, one of the most serious accidents that has occurred was a large heat and radiation release in 1961 at the SL-1, a small U.S. prototype military power plant, which killed three operators. Another was a severe fire in a British military plutonium production reactor at Windscale in 1957, during which considerable quantities of radioactive material, notably an estimated 20 000 curies of iodine-131, spread over the surrounding countryside.

Of course, these are not the only accidents which have occurred; there have been others but I have not had the time to research them all. It is all very well to talk about safety in these plants; however, accidents are always possible, and they

have occurred. I believe there was one in Russia, which was mentioned in the newspapers a few months ago.

One of the greatest horrors associated with all nuclear reactors is that they produce plutonium. Pluto was the name of the god of Hades, or hell in Greek mythology.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He was also Mickey Mouse's dog.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: *Chambers Encyclopaedia* describes Pluto as "Pluto's character fierce and unyielding, hence he was the most hated of all the gods . . . a grim and terrible god, deaf to prayers and unappeased by sacrifice."

That is a very appropriate name for an element which poses such a serious threat to mankind. The Fox report was very definite in saying that the spread of nuclear technology posed a serious danger in that it would assist the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The report also referred to the real possibility of terrorists getting hold of plutonium.

One of the principal findings—finding No. 3—of the Fox inquiry states as follows—

The nuclear power industry is unintentionally contributing to an increased risk of nuclear war. This is the most serious hazard associated with the industry.

That is really a frightful prospect, and it should be enough on its own to stop any Government from rushing into promoting an industry which will add to that danger. Dale Bridenbaugh makes the following statement—

. . . each year in a thousand megawatt reactor we produce about 500 pounds of it.

"It" is plutonium. He continues—

One millionth of a gramme . . . a piece you couldn't even see were inhaled into your lungs, it would give you lung cancer. 10 pounds of it, or 15 pounds of it . . . could form a nuclear bomb.

The sixth report of the British Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, which conducted an inquiry into the environmental risks associated with the nuclear industry also expressed grave fears about the spread of nuclear weapons. Once again I quote from the Fox report—

The problem, common to all considerations of nuclear technology, is that, while the risk of the event may be very small, the consequences can be shockingly great.

That is the thing which frightens the Labor Party; namely, that the consequences can be shockingly great.

I do not believe we should be contributing to the advancement of nuclear technology which is capable of unleashing enormous dangers on mankind. We should be rapidly researching and supporting the use of the non-polluting renewable energy resources such as the sun, the wind, and the tide.

If we proceed with the mining of uranium at Yeelirrie and help to promote nuclear technology, we will be toying with the fate of generations to come. We have a grave responsibility to do everything possible to ensure a healthy, safe environment, and to safeguard the future of human life on this planet.

**THE HON. O. N. B. OLIVER (West) [12.15 a.m.]**: The Opposition must have their heads in the clouds—I hope it is not the mushroom clouds of a nuclear explosion. There is already enough plutonium in the world to make sufficient weapons virtually to destroy the world population. That is a *fait accompli* yet I can still sympathise with the thoughts put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

The previous speaker alleged that this Bill is being rushed through this House because the session is drawing to a close. The member's memories are either terribly short or non-existent. I can remember last year during September, October, and November when we had an exhaustive debate on nuclear energy and its uses. The debate was in support of the Federal Government's policy on this subject. I recall on that occasion that two Opposition members spoke in support of the motion.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You must be joking; no Labor member would have done that.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Perhaps my memory is also short. References have been made to the Ranger inquiry and the two reports made by Justice Fox. The Ranger inquiry was called for by the previous Federal Labor Government. Based on that report that Government signed an agreement in October, 1975, for the Ranger project to proceed. Not only did that Government sign the agreement, but it also decided to be a joint venture partner. I do not recall the exact percentage it wanted, but it was perhaps around 51 per cent. That Federal Labor Government was in favour of the mining and exporting of uranium and wanted to be a partner in the project.

At that time I made a speech, part of which is as follows—

A total refusal to supply uranium would place Australia in clear breach of article 4 of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, and

could adversely affect its relations with countries which are parties to the non-proliferation treaty.

I also said—

If Australia does not export uranium as a producer, how then can it become an effective force in achieving improved international safeguards and controls?

I am amazed at the attitude the Opposition has taken. I refer now to an editorial in *The West Australian* dated Monday, the 31st October, 1977, referring to Dr Mabon who was the British Labor Government's Minister for Energy. The editorial read as follows—

Dr Mabon made no secret of the fact that he came to Australia to lobby the Government, the Opposition and the union movement to ensure a stable supply of uranium after 1982. He said he found it strange that the ALP would repudiate uranium contracts if it got into power and strange that a country would want to deny itself the riches of a natural resource.

It went on—

What Dr Mabon was telling the ALP and the ACTU, in effect, is that they have painted themselves into a corner. No decision made in Australia will change the policies of countries that find it necessary to generate nuclear power. There is already enough plutonium about, in weapon and stockpile form, to wipe out most of the world's population.

Beyond that is the point that Australia, as an energy-rich country, has an international responsibility to do as much as it can to improve living standards elsewhere.

The Bill spells out quite clearly the safeguards in relation to the mining and export of uranium from Western Australia. The Bill will provide an annual hardy for the Opposition, as a report will have to be presented each year which will give them the opportunity to explain the catastrophe facing the world.

The Minister's second reading speech spells out the benefits that will accrue to the State, and no-one can deny there will be great benefits. The only thing I find strange is something I read in a speech made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place in which he said the Swedish Government had lost office, because it had decided to go ahead with a nuclear energy programme.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is true.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is exactly the opposite. This information has appeared in many papers and many magazines, and I shall quote from a news article in *The West Australian* dated the 24th October, 1978. The article was headed, "Sweden's nuclear dilemma", and came from the *Economist* in London, which indicated the Government in Sweden had lost office, because it had decided not to go ahead with its nuclear energy programme.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Which Government?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It was the Government headed by Mr Falldin. The article indicated that the Social Democrat Party wanted to see Sweden equipped with more nuclear energy per head than any other nation. The collapse of the Falldin coalition was followed three days later by a related event in the West German State election in Hesse. The Opposition is obviously ill-informed.

I will not delay the House. If the Opposition is going to continue with this debate no doubt they will do so until they reach the same situation as they did with the bauxite debate. I will not be able to change their attitude; the attitude of the people of Western Australia and of the world generally will change it for them.

THE HON. F. E. McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [12.23 a.m.]: I also oppose the Bill. I believe there are some industries we can well do without and in my view this is one of them. If one looks at Press reports that have appeared in *The West Australian*, dated the 9th August, 1977, one would have seen an article indicating that 170 scientists had given a warning on the risk of mining uranium.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You could find another 170 that would agree with uranium mining.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is true. There are arguments as to whether or not there will be dangers in the future and no-one can refute some of the evidence already presented.

The Hon. T. Knight: That is why there are safeguards.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There are none. The fact is that uranium components can last for 500 000 years. If Mr Knight had seen the "Four Corners" programme that I saw and learnt of the dangers to agriculture in Canada, he being a representative of a farming community might well form a different opinion. The article read as follows—

"There is no doubt that ionising radiation can harm health by causing cancer or genetic damage.



"Though the extent of damage to human health at low levels of radiation is uncertain, the effects are known to increase with the amount of radiation and there is no conclusive evidence of a safe threshold below which radiation is not damaging.

"There are difficulties in obtaining precise estimates of the extent of radiation risk because:

- "Damage to health caused by radiation is difficult to distinguish from genetic damage or cancers due to other causes.

- "Cancers due to radiation do not develop for two to 20 or more years after exposure.

- "The effects of genetic damage may not be evident for several generations.

"We consider that the uncertainties in this area and unforeseen contingencies in the use of radioactive materials could commit future generations to a genetic hazard of unknown dimensions.

"We strongly urge that these principles should be given serious consideration before Australia undertakes long-term, large-scale mining of uranium."

The Hon. T. Knight: You find a different reason for cancer every day of every year.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Wittenoom is an example of that. Where is the Government's concern for Wittenoom; where is the company's concern?

The Hon. T. Knight: I have worked with asbestos as a building contractor.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: In that case I would be very worried. There was also an article in the *Daily News* of the 3rd August, 1977, headed, "Nuclear 'guinea pigs' are dying". It reads as follows—

In a pink dawn 20 years years ago army corporal Paul Cooper and 1100 other US soldiers watched the mushroom cloud of a nuclear explosion in Nevada.

Then they were marched to the spot in the desert where the bomb was detonated.

The remains of the 213-metre-high steel bomb towers were still glowing pink from the blast. After half-an-hour of fear the men were measured for radiation.

Now Paul Cooper is dying from leukaemia—and he is not alone.

Many other soldiers who were among 170,000 troops subjected to similar experiments between 1945 and 1964 have fatal

blood and skin diseases which doctors say were almost certainly contracted when they were used as unsuspecting nuclear guinea pigs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What has this to do with mining uranium?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Plenty.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is all about an atomic bomb.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Substances obtained from uranium are used to manufacture atomic bombs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It also allows you to run power stations.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You can do that with coal.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It is obvious that the Leader of the House did not see the programme I mentioned which showed the effects of uranium on agriculture in Canada.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The atomic bomb saved my life and the lives of my mates when we were in Japanese prison camps.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It shortened the war by nine days.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It gave me my life.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: To continue—

Their terminal illnesses have led to the most bitter fight ever known for compensation from the Pentagon and the army.

"Before they detonated the bomb they told us to turn round and put our hands over our eyes," he said. "When it went off we felt an unbearable heat, like backing up to a fire while wearing tight jeans.

"We could see the bones in our hands through our closed eyelids as if they were taking a big X-ray."

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The article continues—

Today the remnants of Corporal Cooper's hair are snow white and he looks 20 years older than he is.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I will not be sidetracked.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you might tell us about the Bill.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: As far as uranium is concerned this is a serious matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Tell us about the Bill.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Your own speeches are better than those you make out of newspapers.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: If we continue, there will be no trains to run. This takes precedence over trains.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would not want to live in a world without trains!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: To continue—

He has blotches all over his body and his vision is so impaired that snow looks brown to him.

An army spokesman said: "We look at this like a hairspray. At the time, who knew hairsprays would damage the ozone layers? At the time we thought the tests were OK. We didn't know we were endangering lives."

The Hon. N. F. Moore: No-one denies that exposure to massive doses of radiation is dangerous.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It hurts if you sit on top of dynamite and they let it off too!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: This debate has developed into a political argument.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Have you ever had an X-ray?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The only conclusion I can come to regarding the reasons members opposite have taken the view they have is the profit motive.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Nonsense!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It is not nonsense.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Of course, it is.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We think we can get some jobs.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It brings back to mind what happened in the early 1930s in the USA in respect of public transport. The profit motive was responsible for that.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The profit motive destroyed public transport in America—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: —but the profit motive on this occasion is likely to destroy humanity.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is not, you know.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is the Minister's opinion, but it is not shared by me and many others who know better than I do.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Even the Russians operate under the profit motive and they are the masters of socialism. Tell me one country which does not use it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The one heartening aspect is that there seems to be a changing opinion in countries.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: They are changing to uranium.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Mr Oliver referred to the Swedish Government. I prefer to say that the Swedish Government was defeated simply because the Leader of the Opposition said at the time that if he was elected to Government they would not continue the nuclear programme.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You are wrong.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: They lost simply because the Opposition said it would not go on with the programme, and that is my view. Recently a referendum was held in Austria and despite the fact the Labor Government was supporting a nuclear programme the referendum quite narrowly voted against the extension of the nuclear programme.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: What is in clause 5?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I do not have the Bill in front of me.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Obviously.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Mr Tozer can tell me when he makes his speech. No matter what the safeguards, there is no safe way to dispose of the waste. Look at the problems we have had recently in connection with the small amount of nuclear waste buried at Maralinga following tests carried out there by the British Government. An argument has raged between the Australian Government and the British Government as to who is responsible for that waste and the British want to have nothing to do with it. It has become our responsibility. Everyone recognises that it presents a problem and something must be done.

There is no need to embark on any nuclear activity programme. I acknowledge that vast sums have been spent on the programme, and

because of that it is likely that the nuclear activity will continue as those who have money at their disposal will launch a campaign to ensure that it is continued.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Your opposition to the Bill means you are not in favour of regulating nuclear activity. That is what the Bill is all about.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It does not. There would be no need to introduce the legislation if we did not have uranium mining.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: You are opposing the Bill?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Yes—

The Hon. Neil McNeill: What does the Bill do?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: —because I am opposed to uranium mining.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: What does the Bill do?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It does not go far enough.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There should not be any uranium mining and that is why we are opposed to the Bill. Our policy is quite clear. There should be a moratorium until means are found to dispose of the waste. That is the big problem. We do not know what the effects will be, so there should be a holding period until we know—

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: What does the railways union think about this?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Minister knows.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Yes. They say they want to cart yellow cake.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Which union told you that?

The Hon. R. G. Pike: They will get rapped over the knuckles for that.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That is what I was told by the joint railway unions.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Which one?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: A combined delegation came to see me, led by the shadow Minister for Transport, who was there.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There is not much point in my continuing, because other members have said all I wanted to say. I am opposed to the Bill. I will have nothing to do with uranium until my party's policy changes and that will not alter until we are assured that mankind has nothing

to fear from the effects of radiation. Until then I will be standing on my feet at every opportunity to oppose the mining of uranium, as I am opposed to the Bill.

**THE HON. V. J. FERRY** (South-West) [12.38 a.m.]: I will be very brief. I believe the subject has been well canvassed by members in the Chamber, and to prolong the debate would not change anyone's mind.

I wish to record my complete support for the Bill designed to set the guidelines for nuclear activity in this State. Naturally I take the opposite view to speakers from the Opposition benches who have said that nuclear elements may, in fact, bring about the doom and destruction of mankind. I take the opposite view to that. I believe the very survival of mankind may be dependent upon the agencies of nuclear elements, and I have sufficient faith in the future of the human race to harness the material for the benefit of mankind as it has been harnessed in the medical field and in many other ways.

Members have said that it will kill countless millions. What we do in Western Australia will not alter that factor. Today people are dying who have never died before! That has been said previously, but it is true. Some will die in motor accidents and others as the result of taking poison.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Tomorrow people will die who have not died today, so let us not worry about that aspect.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is that a reliable statement?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is inevitable. If the Opposition carries its viewpoint to the nth degree it means that, if the world does blow up, whether or not we have uranium activities in Western Australia will not matter because we will be blown up with the world.

The legislation before us sets the guidelines to control the activities in this State, and I fully support it.

**THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON** (East Metropolitan) [12.40 a.m.]: I oppose the Bill, but before I continue I want to tidy up one or two points so that people do not drag extraneous matters in by way of interjection. I point out to Mr Oliver that the social democratic Government in Sweden was defeated because it supported nuclear activity. Perhaps the subsequent Government has since been defeated, but the social democratic Government was defeated and I

should bring to the attention of the House that this is a question which from country to country cuts across party lines. The Labor Party in Australia on this issue is at loggerheads with its fraternal parties in Great Britain and Sweden, and at the same time in other countries there are conservative parties which are not supporting the development of nuclear energy and reactors.

I also want to point out that for the time being I do not want to argue about employment or profit, because it seems to me that if we were to grow and distribute heroin we could provide employment and we could make profits. However, no-one would seriously suggest we do this. In the same way, I am of the opinion that, despite the employment aspect and despite the economic well-being which might come to the country, we should not engage in nuclear activity, and because I do not think we should I do not want it regulated. If we support a Bill to regulate nuclear activity we say we believe it should go on. That is why we oppose the Bill. We do not believe we should engage in nuclear activity except in the field of research and medicine, and they are already covered.

It is quite interesting to hear some of the arguments raised. It is a matter of faith which comes into the subject right and left.

In various places at various times the Premier has said that we have not solved the problem of safeguards—and I will come back to that in a moment—but that science will find a way. When someone suggests that we should not have nuclear reactors, but should try solar energy because science will find a way, he says, "Oh no it will not. It would take 50 years."

Let us consider what has happened. As we know, we are approaching an energy crisis. As far as fossil fuels are concerned, there is a great debate as to when the crisis will come about. Some people put it in the 1980s, and some in the next century.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They agree on one thing—that it will eventually arrive.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: There is no doubt or disagreement about that. Eventually we must do something about it. Therefore people who are supporting the peaceful use of nuclear power and the development of nuclear reactors are arguing that, because a crisis is imminent and because nuclear power is here, this will save mankind. However, one of the things which is also generally—

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Did you travel through India or Pakistan and see just how much they need it?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would be glad if, for once, the honourable member would let me develop my argument, because the answers to his questions might be made clear as I go along. I will not be diverted again by interjection. I want to say what I want to say in my own way, because I am portraying my ideas.

Most people who write about nuclear power and uranium admit that supplies of uranium are finite. So the use of nuclear reactors has a limited life. We also know that the use of nuclear reactors produces radioactive wastes which we do not yet know how to control adequately. There is no doubt about that at all. There is also the possibility of accident.

One of the arguments brought up last year—in fact I sat through the whole debate and listened with great interest to what was said—

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You were the only one who did.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I know I was the only one. One of the arguments raised was that there are accidents everywhere; there are more accidents in using coal for power than there are in using nuclear power. That is true. We know that. There is no argument about that. People are killed, maimed, and injured through coalmining.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is about as logical as your previous reference to the profit motive.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am dealing with arguments that have been raised.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You used the same sort of false syllogism in relation to the profit motive. It is wrong on both occasions.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It is not wrong, actually. All I was saying as far as the profit motive is concerned—and I was not arguing against the profit motive—is that one does not produce anything merely because it makes money. If in the production of something the evil is likely to be greater than the good, I think the honourable member would agree we should not produce it. What we are arguing about is whether the evil will be greater than the good, and I am arguing it will be.

If when people talk about nuclear power and nuclear reactors they equate the kind of accident which occurs in coal-produced power with the kind of accident which can occur with nuclear power, they are not comparing like with like. The problem of nuclear power is that if there is an accident it can be of cataclysmic proportions. If there is a melt-down in a nuclear power station, the release of radioactivity can have very

grave results, and it could be that one accident in nuclear power is greater than many accidents in coalmines or in the production of coal power.

The other point concerns the end result. The radioactive wastes that are produced do not just die out. They go on and some of them have a half life of 250 000 years.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Very similar to arsenic.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: So we must take them reasonably seriously. Even if there are no accidents we will still be producing wastes which we do not yet know how to control.

When I first started looking into this business of nuclear power I discussed it with a professor of physics at the University of Western Australia who was a nuclear physicist, and he assured me that it was okay—that now, with the use of glass, or vitrification, the problem has been solved. But, in fact, further reading has suggested the problem has not yet been solved. Even if nuclear wastes are vitrified or put in rocks or various other things, the things they are put in can still break and the wastes can still escape. They have to be stored very carefully for a long time in a geologically stable environment. There is no doubt about that; it is a fact we can all agree on.

The only trouble is we do not know whether any geological environment will be stable enough to outlast the half life, quarter life, or dangerous life of the nuclear wastes. In other words, we have not yet adequately solved the problem of nuclear wastes. We do not know whether we can adequately solve it. We are multiplying nuclear wastes on the face of this earth and we do not know when the multiplication of those nuclear wastes may become critical to the life of mankind.

We do know—and there is no doubt about this, either—that there is a statistical correlation between cancers, genetic mutations, sterility, and radioactive wastes. It may be argued we have not proved the connection. I think it has been proved that the correlation is certainly as strong as or stronger than that between lung cancer and smoking. Therefore we know enough to suggest that nuclear wastes are dangerous to men, women and children; to mankind.

What we do not know is what are the critical levels. We still have to find that out. We are still researching it, and while we are still researching it with blind faith that science will find a way, we are multiplying nuclear wastes and we in Western Australia, by accepting this Bill and accepting that we will go into nuclear activities, are helping the process. I do not believe

we should. Even if it makes no difference to the number of nuclear power stations in the rest of the world, I still do not think we should. I do not want to be a party to the process. I think this is a very serious and worrying problem for mankind. If we do find we have reached the critical stage, it will be too late.

On one occasion in this House I drew an analogy. I said when I was a growing child we thought we could get rid of all sorts of industrial wastes into the sea. We have now polluted the sea out of sight. We have rivers which are polluted and have become health hazards. In other words, we have reached a degree of pollution which we thought was impossible. But this pollution is reversible, as has been shown by what the British have managed to do with the Thames, which is now cleaner than it was previously and now has fish in it. Whether the Canadians and Americans can do the same with the Great Lakes remains to be seen.

That kind of pollution is reversible but if we reach the critical danger level from radioactive wastes we are not sure we will be able to reverse anything. It may be too late. Whether it is worth doing this for 30 or 40 years of nuclear power is highly debatable. Sooner or later—and this, too, is inevitable—we will have to find other forms of power, because the fossil fuels will run out and uranium will run out.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Solar energy from the year 2000 onwards.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have spoken to a civil engineer who is an expert in solar energy and who claims we could solve the problem in 10 years if we could find \$15 billion, which is a lot of money. That is his opinion.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: It is expensive energy.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Of course, it will be expensive energy.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Did he say how he would develop it?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Let me make it clear to the House I am not one who chants the slogan "Solar not nuclear" as if the problem of solar energy is a simple one. It is not. It will take a great deal of work and research and it will raise many problems. Of course, we are spending too much time, in my opinion, on the problem of heating water. Perhaps we should be using photo-electric cells. However, we will need great reflectors which will drop the temperature of the ground underneath and which could cause climatic changes.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Do you think the solution of these problems is any easier than the solution of the problems with nuclear wastes?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will get around to that. I am trying to demonstrate the problems are here. I do not think it is an easy thing and that one can say "Solar not nuclear" and "Solar tomorrow". I think it is important that we face this fact. I am facing it. I am not pretending there is anything easy in front of us. There is not. There are grave problems.

If we do what some people want to do with solar energy and convert sea water into hydrogen, burn the hydrogen, and have a hydrogen economy, we will then have hydrogen combining with oxygen and forming water, and we will have wet cities. I do not know what that will do to the climate, either. There are all sorts of fascinating possibilities.

Let me appeal to our Western Australian nationalism; I would be happy to do that. This is one area in the world which has unlimited quantities of sunlight and a great deal of water, and it would be a good thing if we could get into the forefront of solar energy and finish up manufacturing the hardware and being one of the leaders. If we could do that we would ride on a wave of energy prosperity for years to come.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: We would certainly be the leading State in solar energy.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not sure. This year we have increased the grants above those of South Australia, but South Australia got in first. I think we can do better.

Another point is we may solve the problems by the use of grain alcohol, and we need to do some work in that direction. We may solve the problems with methyl alcohol or in a number of other ways, but sooner or later the problems will have to be solved. The question is whether we can solve them quickly enough and whether, in fact, the use of nuclear energy as a temporary stopgap may produce something worse than the benefit it brings.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: The hot air turbine above this House would be far more efficient tonight.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It may, indeed; but this is one subject I take very seriously, and despite the lateness of the hour I will put my views on record. I will try not to be too long. I will try to make my speech reasonably

logical and to the point. I am saying why I am opposed to this Bill, and I am referring to our attempt to enter the nuclear age in Western Australia.

The safeguards are not proven. There is too much possibility of error. There are too many dangers attached to it. There is too much danger to the future of mankind. Therefore, in my opinion, this is not the time for us to start mining and processing uranium or developing our own nuclear power stations.

For these reasons I oppose this Bill, as I will oppose the next Bill on the notice paper; and I will continue to do so until nuclear safeguards are a proven fact, not something in the clouds that we can look forward to solving in the future—with luck.

**THE HON. I. G. PRATT** (Lower West) [12.59 a.m.]: I am disappointed that the Hon. Robert Hetherington did not actually come back to the question I asked him by interjection. When he was talking about the difficulties involved in solar energy I asked him whether those difficulties were as great or as close to being solved as were the problems associated with disposal of nuclear waste. I do not believe they are in the short term.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I do not believe they are not. I do not think either of us knows.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: We are solving small problems with solar energy. We can produce hot water systems and obtain small amounts of electric current through the use of cells.

However, in respect of becoming a major provider of energy, the problems of solar energy are very great. I believe we are really far closer to a final solution in respect of methods of storage of nuclear waste than we are to producing a viable large-scale solar energy production unit. I say that as an aside. I did interject on the honourable member, because I thought he had a responsibility to answer that question as he was promoting solar energy. I think the problems are very great; just as great as those of the disposal of nuclear waste.

That was not the reason I intended to speak tonight. I will move very quickly onto the topic in which I am interested. I refer to clause 2 which tells us the object of the Bill. When one considers the object of the measure one finds it very hard to establish any reason for the objections of the Opposition to it. The object of the Bill is to make provision for protecting the health and safety of the people of the State, and the environment, from harmful effects associated with nuclear activities.

So why has this Bill been put forward for discussion? It does not allow experimentation with nuclear energy; it provides only for the protection of health and safety of the people. How can the Opposition honestly get up and oppose a Bill put forward with that object? Regardless of what members opposite may feel about nuclear energy, how can they stand up and say they are opposed to a Bill which makes provision for the protection of the health and safety of the people of this State?

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Because we do not want to be seen to be condoning uranium mining.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: This Bill has nothing at all to do with the mining of uranium; it is to provide for the safety of the people, but it is being opposed by the Opposition.

Members opposite are drawing out all their red herrings as they do every time nuclear energy is discussed. Let them fight the matter as a mining issue. I wonder whether they will do that when the next Bill is debated. I am sure we will hear the same arguments over and over again when we are actually discussing mining.

However, on this Bill we are discussing the health and safety of people and I would have thought the Opposition would regard that as being of paramount importance. Obviously members opposite do not think that; they prefer to object to the measure rather than support something put forward for the protection of the health and safety of the people of the State.

Despite the doubt of the Opposition in respect of the Bill, I support it, because I think it is worth while. Let us discuss the mining issue as a separate issue.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [1.03 a.m.]: It is a pity the member who has just resumed his seat decided to cheapen the debate in the manner he did. Our concern is extremely real, and I would have thought members on this side who spoke previously made that quite apparent. Mr Hetherington gave a clear statement of the general lines on which we base our opposition to this Bill. Among other things, we have a real concern that the State has a serious intention to enter into the field of nuclear power. The Premier has made it quite clear on a number of occasions that he feels a nuclear power plant should be built in Western Australia.

Even quite recently, on the 21st October, an article appeared in the Press reporting on a visit of a West German consortium which was keen to build a nuclear power station in the Pilbara.

Therefore, we are not talking about something that is only a remote possibility, because there have been discussions in respect of making it an actuality.

I became very concerned about the extent to which this Government has seriously examined the drawbacks of nuclear power generation, and I will come to them in a moment. If this Bill dealt with only the mining side of the nuclear cycle, perhaps our opposition to it would not be quite so strong. However, in fact the Bill provides for the regulation of the whole nuclear cycle, and I would say that Mr Pratt is aware of that, as are all members of the Chamber. If the Bill is passed it would not be the first occasion that when a measure is on the Statute book the Government can say the Parliament has given its approval to it.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Have you read the Bill?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Bill gets onto the Statute book the Government can say Parliament has given approval to nuclear power generation, because the Bill passed both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Does this Bill give power for nuclear generation?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps Mr Pratt could answer this question: Does it require a Bill like this to construct a coal-fired power station or an oil-fired power station? Of course, it is not necessary to have an Act of Parliament before proceeding with the construction of such a power station.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You are talking a load of rubbish.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Pratt conveniently shuts his mind to consideration of this sort.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Tell me where the Bill provides for the authorisation of the construction of a nuclear power station?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have just been telling the honourable member, who was apparently so busy thinking of things to interject that he was unable to hear what I was saying, that it does not require an Act of Parliament to construct a nuclear power station.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: How can this Bill give permission? You said it would.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If Mr Pratt cared to listen—

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I was listening.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Well, the honourable member seems to have a great deal of trouble.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member direct his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It was in an endeavour to do that, that I raised the level of my voice, Mr President.

The passage of this Bill through the Parliament will be used by the Government to say Parliament has given its approval to nuclear activities.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: How can it be used in that way?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will repeat it again for Mr Pratt: The Bill, in the very clause to which Mr Pratt referred—clause 4—deals with nuclear activities and describes the meaning of it all.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I spoke about clause 2, which is the object of the Bill.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Well, clause 4 states the meaning of nuclear activities, as well as giving the meanings of all other things that pertain to the nuclear sector.

We very rightly have serious concern about this legislation. Following a report which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 12th September relating to the basic information the Government had to hand in respect of the generation of nuclear power, in which the State Energy Commission said that nuclear power would be reliable and cheap by 1995, I asked a question in this House requesting the basis of that information. I received the following reply—

The following are two of the numerous sources showing the actual operating costs of nuclear plants to be lower than fossil plants in the countries concerned—

- (1) United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's latest annual report.
- (2) IEEE Spectrum June 1978 (USA).

When I endeavoured to obtain a copy of the first-mentioned report, I received a reply from the State Energy Commission that, in fact, it did not have a copy of the report it mentioned in validation of its publicly stated opinion. That is a very revealing situation. Eventually I obtained a copy of the report. In the annual report of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority there appears an article written by Sir John Hill, the chairman of the authority. Upon reading the

article I found only one small reference to the costs of nuclear fuel compared with other fuels. That paragraph said—

The past year has, on the whole, been a good one for the development of nuclear power. Provisional figures recently released by the CEBG showed that the cost advantage of nuclear power over fossil fuels is increasing. The advantage, based on historic costs, is now 35 per cent against coal and 50 per cent against oil.

That is the article the State Energy Commission gave as an example of information to validate its opinion. It is simply a bald statement of supposed facts, because there is still a great deal of dispute raging over the sort of factors which should be included in the assessment of costs of nuclear power, and it is said all the costs are not being taken into account.

A much deeper examination of that issue is contained in House Report No. 95-1090 entitled, "Nuclear Power Costs". It is the 23rd report of the American Committee on Government Operations together with additional, minority, and dissenting views. Although that publication was not one given as a reference by the State Energy Commission, I would have thought it was a more relevant and up-to-date document than the other two that they supplied.

The other article that they referred to appeared in what turned out to be nothing more than a layman's journal giving brief excerpts and precise articles on items of technological interest. The publication was more concerned with computer technology than anything else. The articles in it dealt with AM stereo; new philosophies for portable digital instruments; diabetics—an electronic pancreas; and other articles. The publication is not really related to the nuclear question at all. However, there was a report which, in part, read as follows—

Last year set a record for nuclear power in the United States, with the nation's 65 nuclear plants producing approximately 250 billion kWh, or about 12 percent of all electricity generated. A recent report from the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) shows that nuclear plants achieved a capacity factor of 62.4 percent of designed maximum-output ratings, an improvement of 5 percent over 1976.

Dealing with costs, the article continued—

A nuclear kWh costs, on the average, a total of 1.5 cents, about the same as in 1976. In contrast, a coal kWh costs 2.0 cents, up from 1.8 cents in 1976, and an oil kWh costs 3.9 cents as compared with 3.5 cents in 1976.



A few more sentences follow that. That is the article recommended by the State Energy Commission as a source for the validation of the information given by the commissioner. Really, it staggers the imagination that a body making these sorts of claims should insult our intelligence by referring us to these articles. If this is the sort of information on which the commission is basing its decisions, it needs to be reviewed to see whether the people are competent to perform the tasks with which they are charged.

Such an attitude is not only an insult to our intelligence, but it demeans the very capable people who I believe are employed in the commission.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Does that take into account the cost of disposing of the waste?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I could refer to a lot more information than this report, but I do not intend to do that. That book is in the library.

Certainly that report of the United States Congress asserts very strongly that the basis for the costing of the nuclear power industry in the United States avoids all those other costs in arriving at the published figures. Certainly it does not take into account the decommissioning costs and, to a lesser degree, the research costs related with the development of the nuclear power.

I have never heard mention in discussion in this State of the fact that a nuclear power station has to have back-up plants. Once the station is closed down—and it has to be closed down for the removal and replacement of the fuel rods—there has to be a back-up station—

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Surely that is the same with any generating station.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —to keep the flow of power to the populace. That is not the same problem at all, because in an oil or coal-fired plant there are a number of generators that produce individual amounts of power. If more power is required, another generator is brought on stream. It is easy to cut out one generator for repairs and maintenance, as is happening now in the current industrial dispute.

This is a different sort of proposition altogether. If we were to install a nuclear power station, we would have to make sure that the back-up plants were available for the supply of the power when the nuclear plant is shut down. The report stresses that point strongly. In the United States, where the power is often generated by privately-owned companies, the customer is charged for the base

costs of the nuclear power, and then when the company has to shut down the nuclear station and has to buy the power from other sources, the cost of the other power is added to the cost of the supply from the nuclear station. However, that is not included in the average costs of the power from a nuclear reactor.

I have files of information on this subject. I could speak at some length on it. However, I do not intend to do that. I wanted to take the opportunity of expressing my opposition to this Bill.

I understand that if we are to have uranium mining, the Government has to be in a position to have regulations to cover the health and safety aspects of the industry. To do that, however, it is not necessary to legislate for the whole of the nuclear cycle as is being done in this particular Bill. That is why the Opposition takes very strong objection to the Bill before us.

Finally, I would like to draw the attention of the House to another of the consequences of the nuclear industry. That consequence relates to the powers that a State feels obliged to take to itself because of the possibilities that arise when dealing with this sort of material. I refer to clause 10 of the Bill which reads—

A person who discloses any information that has been furnished to him or obtained by him under this Act, or in connection with the execution of this Act, commits an offence unless the disclosure is made—

- (a) with the consent of the person carrying on or operating the business to which that information relates; or
- (b) for the purpose of giving effect to the objects of this Act and in the performance of a duty under this Act.

Penalty: A fine not exceeding \$2 000 or imprisonment for twelve months, or both such fine and imprisonment.

That sort of thing does not apply in a coal-fired plant or an oil-fired plant. It has not been found necessary to impose those sorts of conditions on the disclosure of information. However, it is far more important for that sort of information to be made available to the public because of the sorts of hazards which can arise.

This provision is not specific to the particular areas of the industry that other members have spoken about. It goes beyond covering the possibility of people gaining quantities of material for

the production of nuclear bombs, and the acts of terrorism that could occur. It is a blanket provision that covers everything connected with the nuclear cycle. It covers any information, no matter how unimportant it may be.

It is terrible that we are being forced to enter the nuclear industry. That is reason enough on its own for us to pause and think about all the consequences entailed in this question.

I oppose the legislation.

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [1.27 a.m.]: I wish to register my very clear and personal opposition to this Bill, in addition, of course, to the Labor Party's continuing opposition to the mining of uranium until safeguards have been effectively understood and introduced.

This Bill is a farce, because it has no content. It is simply a form which will be followed when the Minister has enough information to know what he has to do when he has to prescribe various procedures to be introduced for the safeguarding of persons working in the industry or connected with it in any way. It is a hollow Bill. It has no content.

The Minister is given the enormous responsibility set out in clause 9 of the Bill, which reads as follows—

(1) Where the Minister is satisfied that—

- (a) the health or safety of persons, or the environment, is likely to be harmed by a situation resulting from a nuclear activity;

The Minister is given the awesome responsibility of protecting the health and safety of the citizens without even knowing what he has to do. He will be limping from one body of opinion to the next. He will have this horrible responsibility shoved onto him.

In addition to those comments about the Bill, I would like to talk generally about the profit motive which some speakers have commented on already. I would like to read from the *New Statesman* of the 4th February in which it is said that this contentious matter of the absolute necessity of introducing nuclear energy breaks C. P. Snow's second law of thermodynamics. This second law provides a way to judge how to use different forms of energy, and which fuel to apply to which task. It reads—

... 'nuclear radiation for the relatively mild task of boiling water violates the familiar caution against attacking a fly with a cannon'.

In effect, because of the profit motive, we are being rushed into doing something which will only last for a short while, as Mr Hetherington pointed out. There is a limit on the life of the uranium deposits, as with fossil fuels. We will have to introduce some other source of limitless power in the very near future.

That is where we ought to be directing our energies and resources at the present moment, instead of being hoodwinked into racing after a source of energy which may last for approximately 30 years according to the various opinions given. That is said to be the period of time nuclear deposits will survive the hunger for energy in the world. We are chasing after something which may or may not be destructive. The very possibility that it may be destructive should make us stop and say, "Is it worth while chasing after this energy which may bring destruction to mankind?" The reason we are chasing after it is that once again we have been hoodwinked by profit motives.

In the *New Statesman* there is a comment on a book called *Poverty of Power* by Barry Commoner. It says—

Solar energy emerges from this book as the true hero, hard-working but ignored, which can yet rescue us all. I tend to believe this, and to agree that one reason why solar energy is so ignored, especially by the nuclear-drunks in our Department of Energy, is that no one owns it, no one "markets" it. Solar energy has no lobby. As Commoner puts it:

Unlike oil or uranium, sunlight is not a commodity to be bought and sold; it cannot be possessed; its value is not inherent, but derives from its use . . . Solar energy enjoins us attend to the task; to find the best way to link the task to resources; to cherish the resources that nature lends us, to find value in their social use, rather than profit in their private possession.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about the cost of manufacturing the equipment?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Those people are so concerned about chasing after profit they are being hoodwinked by the people who want them to follow along blindly and say, "Big business says it is all right, therefore, it must be good for the nation." Commodities such as the wind and the sun are not being investigated properly. When this State Government set up a solar energy fund a small amount of a quarter of a million dollars was allocated to it. What sort of an investigation will such a sum permit us to

carry out? The type of infrastructure the Government will provide for Yeelirrie and similar projects will cost millions of dollars. I believe this is a hollow and farcical attempt to make people think the Government is worried about the health and safety of its citizens. The Government does not know how to safeguard the health and safety of the citizens. It does not know the consequences of uranium mining. A piece of yellow cake could be brought in here and anyone who wanted to protect his gonads would have to run out of the room.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Mr Leeson has been taking it around all night. He has it in his pocket.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Leeson told us he offered it to some people to hold near their gonads and they ran like the frightened rabbits which scuttled behind the President's chair, because they would not take the risk.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It is not yellow cake anyway. It is uranium ore.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I shall get a piece of yellow cake for the honourable member who has just interjected.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I do not want a piece of yellow cake.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member does not want it because he wants to keep his gonads intact. Many myths exist about uranium and nuclear products. There are many as yet unforeseeable facts relating to uranium mining. We are still sufficiently worried about the matter not to be foolish enough to fiddle around with even a piece of yellow cake. I am sure members of this Chamber would not do that. As far as products produced by nuclear reactors and nuclear power stations are concerned, it is all right for Mr Hancock to want them in his back yard, but I do not think anyone here would.

Some rather alarming matters are contained in the Bill, apart from the overall objection to it. Perhaps the Minister may be able to clarify this, but in clause 7 the following appears—

(3) No proceedings for an offence against any regulation made under this Act shall be commenced without the consent of the Minister charged pursuant to subsection (1) with the administration of the particular regulation against which the offence is alleged to have been committed, otherwise proceedings for an offence against this Act shall be commenced only with the consent of the Minister charged with the administration of this Act.

That is qualified in subclause (4) by the following words—

(4) The Minister charged with the administration of any regulations made under this Act shall, before he gives his consent pursuant to subsection (3) to the commencement of any legal proceedings, consult with the Minister charged with the administration of this Act in respect of his intention to give such consent.

Does that mean that a person who, having consulted with the Minister responsible for this Act—who would probably be the Minister for Mines or the Minister for Health—wanted to proceed against somebody who was putting in jeopardy the safety and rights of people as a result of nuclear activity, and the Minister said, "You cannot go ahead with the legal proceeding", is in a position to say, "No"? Can the Minister concerned go ahead? It means that the Minister for Mines may be able to override any safeguards taken by other Ministers who have made regulations pursuant to nuclear activity.

These are matters to be worried about also. The Opposition wants to remain with general matters, because it sees the Bill as a hollow and pretentious one which says, "We will protect the people." However, it really does not know how to do that.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [1.38 a.m.]: This has been an interesting debate. I cannot call it anything but a debate, because I believe it has been a debate in the abstract sense that people have been putting forward philosophical points of view without having regard for the Bill before the House.

We have heard the story of the horrors of war and we all agree with that. I would be a hypocrite if I were to say, however, that I was not in favour of the bombs being dropped on Japan in 1945. I would be an abject hypocrite if I said that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I suppose you are saying they should probably have dropped 100 bombs on Japan.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I was in favour of the bomb.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Are you still in favour of it?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: It was an action which saved hundreds of thousands of lives.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you still favour it, knowing what it did?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I cannot change my view. What I believed was right then, I believe is right now. Had the Americans not dropped the bombs on the Japanese and had the Japanese found out how to make the bomb, they would have dropped it on us. Hundreds of thousands of men would have been killed and prised out of foxholes throughout the South Pacific, Burma, and many other countries, had that not occurred. It is all very well to say the war would have ended in nine days; but that is pure speculation. We heard that later.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They were already suing for peace. I was in Manila when they flew in in their planes.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The Leader of the Opposition may know more about it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not know more about it; but that is a fact.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The Leader of the Opposition may know more about it than some, but it is not a fact.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The nine days is speculation, but they had sued for peace.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I do not want to stay on this topic. I am just illustrating the fact that there are horrors in war and we know there are horrors in atom bombs. No-one is in favour of them. We know the Chinese, Indians, and French have atom bombs and a few other people besides. But that has nothing whatever to do with this Bill except in terms of a philosophical debate on whether or not we should have nuclear energy or whether we should mine uranium so that we have nuclear energy, or whether we should not. That is an abstract debate and it overlooks the fact that we live in a nuclear world. We came into a nuclear world when the first atom bomb was dropped in Japan and we have been in it ever since. It has spread and we are in a nuclear world. It is no good saying that we will have a nuclear-free zone in the southern hemisphere or a zone of peace in this area. We cannot ignore the facts of the outside world. We are being asked by the socialist Government of the United Kingdom and by Governments all over the world to supply our uranium. People are waiting on the Australian Government and they are asking for our uranium. This includes the West Germans, the French, and a number of other people.

Undoubtedly there is a world demand for uranium and people want it to replace their diminishing energy sources. We cannot put back the clock. We are in this situation and we have to play our part. It is no good saying that we

are not going to mine it or have anything to do with it. We are in the situation where we have to have something to do with it and we have to face the fact that we are in a nuclear age.

Put quite simply the object of the Bill is to provide a framework for codes of practice in relation to health and safety. It is only a framework. We have begun with two or three codes which are all we have at the moment, but the Bill provides specifically for variations in those codes to be adopted from time to time. The Bill provides specifically for new codes to be substituted for the ones which are there and for developments in health and safety. We cannot ignore it. It would be an ideal situation if there was no prospect of danger from nuclear fission; but we have the prospect of danger from a dozen other avenues. I daresay there was great agitation against high explosives when they were discovered. There is danger from petrol bowlers, from oil installations, from power stations, from aeroplanes, and from motorcars. There is danger in our technological age in everything we do and there is danger every time we participate in any activity.

We must accept that we have to move with the times. I believe it is a responsible action to introduce a Bill which provides that a framework be set up whereby we develop the best available codes for health and safety.

The Hon. Roy Cloughton referred to the fact that we had actually included in the Bill provisions relating to the disposal of waste. He said he would not have objected to it so strongly had such provisions not been included. However, I remind honourable members that, had we not included provisions about the disposal of waste, we would have been open to criticism, because that is supposed to be the most dangerous part of the whole process.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Have all the States adopted this one Bill?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No; but the States objected—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am asking you a real question.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: —to the Commonwealth doing just this and they said, "It is not your job to do that. It is a State power and the States will adopt as much of this as they want with such variations as they want." The States are entitled to adopt the whole or part of it, and they are entitled to vary it in any way they see fit. We propose to do just that. We do

not necessarily intend to adopt the whole of the codes. At the moment we have adopted the existing International Vienna codes. It may well be that we will want variations, and the Bill provides for variations and new codes to be substituted.

We are trying to get some framework to cater for the situation that we are in the nuclear age. We have allowed for public comment on the codes. We have to start somewhere and I ask members to support the second reading.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes 17

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. N. F. Moore	(Teller)

#### Noes 7

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
Hon. R. Hetherington	(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. M. McAleer	Hon. R. T. Leeson

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. T. Knight) in the Chair; the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: In case my interjection was missed, I want to answer the question posed by Mr Pratt. I do not know whether we will get solar energy working before nuclear safety. I am not relying on finding a safe disposal for waste quickly. Indeed, it may be something we never do. I hope we do, and we may get a breakthrough and have fusion power for nuclear energy which is safe.

I am certain that had we not found out how to start nuclear reaction we would have solved the energy problem without it. I know that if we put in adequate effort, and spend enormous sums of money on research, we could solve the solar energy power problem.

Apart from that, this clause sums up what I have against the Bill. It is a Bill for an Act to make provision for nuclear activities, and it is setting out that we will have nuclear activities. It is preparing us for nuclear activities and that is something I think we should not have.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Regulations—

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: One of the other dangers of nuclear proliferation, and it worries many of us in the nuclear world, is covered by this clause which states that the Governor may make regulations prescribing all matters, and there is provision for fines up to a maximum of \$50 000. That is rather heavy. I am not suggesting that under this clause we are about to develop an authoritarian State.

What worries many people is that as we develop nuclear power the regulations we have to have in order to make sure there is no intrusion, and in order to protect people, will multiply the necessity for bringing down increasingly stringent regulations. I am very much afraid the nuclear world may finish up as a George Orwell world of 1984.

I was accused of being a doomsday man when I gave my final lecture before I left the University of Western Australia. I said I expected to die when I am 94, so I have 39 years to go. I said I expected to die in an unfree society. I am aiming not to do this, but I am fearful of the tendencies in our society and I believe the proliferation and development of nuclear power will exacerbate and hasten development of the authoritarian society. A fine of \$50 000 today; what do we get tomorrow?

I am not asking the Attorney General to reply to my remarks; it is something I believe he will be aware of and worried about. He knows that in this nuclear world we have to try to protect the individual from himself. I think the Attorney General knows that will be difficult. Certainly he and I would work together to do that. I am not accusing him of being a potential Hitler, but we have a tendency towards authoritarianism with nuclear regulations to protect nuclear power stations from things that are likely to make us a police State, which we are not—I am glad to say.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

**URANIUM (YEELIRRIE) AGREEMENT  
BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

**THE HON. F. E. McKENZIE** (East Metropolitan) [1.57 a.m.]: The Opposition is opposed to this Bill and I think most of the reasons have been outlined by various members who have spoken from this side with respect to the Nuclear Activities Regulation Bill. In my view, it is incredible that we have a Bill before us containing an agreement which has been signed before the Environmental Protection Authority report has been handed down. The company has provided us with a report, but we do not have a report from the authority. I would have thought members should have the benefit of having considered that report before making a decision with respect to the ratification of an agreement, the purpose of this Bill.

The bulk of the Bill is contained in the schedule. An examination of the schedule shows that the Government has been incredibly generous to the company; more so than on any previous occasion. I have never known a company to have available to it alternatives, particularly with respect to the transporting of its commodity both during the construction of the site and the transporting of the yellow cake.

In his second reading speech the Attorney General had this to say—

The Minister must make his decision on the basis of which of the options is cheaper from the corporation viewpoint, taking into account full operating, maintenance, and capital costs.

It is significant that if the corporation chooses the Geraldton option, it will be required to contribute three-quarters of the cost of a sealed road from Mt. Magnet to Yeelirrie, which will cost about \$13 million at today's costs.

In the latter part of that statement, we see that the State will be required to meet one-quarter of the cost of a sealed road from Mt. Magnet to Yeelirrie and there is no mention at all that the corporation is required to meet any of the cost of the portion of the road between Mt. Magnet and Mullewa.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You know as well as I do that the old road will reach Mt. Magnet before this even starts.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That may be so, but that road has had to be upgraded, and it will need more attention because it is very narrow.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Have you travelled on it recently?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I have not travelled on it recently, but I understand it is very narrow. I have heard members from the other side of the House say that the big transports are using this road because of the closure of the Mullewa-Meekatharra line.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You have the wrong road.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am sorry if that is the case.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Certainly I would like this one to be wider.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a very narrow road.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I will accept what the Hon. Des Dans says.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The nature of the industry is such that more will be coming in than going out.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The road will need widening to carry these extra tonnages if that option is used. If that is so, all the benefits we have heard about will go to the Geraldton area. The company will receive a rake-off, because it will get out of its infrastructure costs rather cheaply.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It is paying \$13 million for the road.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Yes, and the State is paying one quarter.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Do you believe in decentralisation?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: If the Government wants to do something for the State it should endeavour to make our rail service viable and it could do this by providing extra traffic.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I will not argue one side or the other.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am prepared to argue one side.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: For the railway?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Yes, for the railway, and for the Kalgoorlie-Leonora railway line.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Support the Bill and you may end up with the railway.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The viability of a railway service depends on the quantity of traffic. The honourable member referred to this when speaking on the closure of the Mullewa-Meekatharra line. For the sake of the continuity of that line, the Government should write into the agreement that rail must be used. It should not be left open-ended; the State should not have to meet the additional costs of providing a road.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Why should not the State contribute to infrastructure costs?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I feel it ought not to, in view of the large profits involved.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Are you supporting the Bill?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: No, I am not.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It will support decentralisation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do not spark off a debate on decentralisation; the present Government would come off very badly.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: A viable railway system would reduce the cost of freight to the farmers. One way to do this is to see that the right type of traffic is channelled through the railway.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are criticising the State for part-subsidising an industry in the country and yet you tell us you believe in decentralisation.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The other provision of the schedule that causes concern relates to the provision of water. A number of the subclauses of clause 15 of the schedule place some responsibility on the State in regard to the provision of water. It may be necessary for the corporation to go outside the allocated area to provide sufficient water, and in doing so it may encroach on other areas where water may be required for other projects.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Big deal. We should not send water to Kalgoorlie because it is our water!

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Stand up and make a speech.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Clause 14 of the schedule provides that the corporation shall pay to the State a fair and reasonable proportion of the cost of investigating and developing such new and additional water sources as agreed between the corporation and the State.

I want to know what is a fair and reasonable proportion. Who makes that determination if an alternative water source is sought? If insufficient suitable underground water is available, the schedule provides for the investigation of surface water. Again the onus is on the State to a large degree. I feel that this places an unfair burden on the State.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Who provides the water for the metropolitan area?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The people pay for that.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: The people will pay for what the Government does at Yeelirrie.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Government is being called upon to provide that service.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: It was called upon to provide Canning Dam.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Our water supplies are not subsidised to any great degree.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They are not subsidised at all.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The people have to meet the costs.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Try to tell us the railways are not subsidised. We can subsidise railways, but not water; is that what you are telling us?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am not talking about the railways.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You told us earlier that you wanted a railway there.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The onus is being placed on the State to meet many of the costs involved.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Big deal! This is decentralisation. Let the country know where you stand.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There is no doubt that the State will have to meet many extra charges.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about our royalties?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: They will not be sufficient.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What is the figure? What royalty do we get?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: We will receive a royalty of 3½ per cent and this will amount, over the 22-year lifespan, to \$130 million. I would like to know what profit the company expects to make.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Capital shall not make a profit!

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: There is a very high risk factor. They do not know whether they can export it. There could be a strike; the unions may not handle it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: A very high risk to the people.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: A very high risk to the shareholders of the company.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: As members know, the mine is located on a flood plain. The company has indicated that it is not prepared to fill up the mine after the ore is extracted. It wants to put the waste into tailings dams and the like. If a flood comes through the area, all that dangerous overburden, or the deposit left after the ore has been taken out, can be transferred and it will represent a danger to people throughout the State. There is no provision for that eventuality. I have here a document prepared by the Friends of the Earth, and I would like to read the following recommendations—

Should mining occur, waste tailings be returned to the mine pit at the end of operations and covered by overburden at least as thick as that which existed over the undisturbed orebody.

Other recommendations are as follows—

Should mining occur, both smoking and ex-smoking employees be informed of their elevated levels of risk.

Should mining occur, townsite water be treated to reduce its radionuclide content.

Should mining occur, all items of working clothing and tools should be kept on the site.

Should mining occur, the proposed town be moved to a site further from the mine, both on radiation protection grounds and to provide protection for Aboriginal sacred sites.

The Hon. T. Knight: Who is suggesting that?

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: The Friends of the Earth. They all have stickers on their cars—“Don’t Kill the Whales.”

The Hon. T. Knight: They killed the whaling industry in Albany.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: It was not a viable industry. It has been stated by the company that that was the reason it got out.

The Hon. T. Knight: The Friends of the Earth have done a great deal of damage to this country.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: I thought your party learnt its mistakes last year in regard to the bauxite industry.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There is nothing in the Bill to provide for the setting up of a fund in case after-effects occur to those working in the mines.

The Hon. T. Knight: Since when has uranium ore been dangerous before treatment?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: We do not know that.

The Hon. T. Knight: The Friends of the Earth are overemotional and they stir up trouble on matters they know nothing about.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is the opinion of Mr Knight, but it is certainly not mine. I am thankful we have such people in the community. If we are to mine uranium, and we are prepared to bend over backwards to assist this company—

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: You do not want this industry at all?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: No, I do not.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Well, why bother to criticise the agreement?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Government will see that it happens by passing the legislation tonight.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: If you do not want the industry that is the end of it, isn’t it? Just say you do not want it.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The Government has the numbers, and we are going to have this agreement; there is no doubt about it. Mr Medcalf knows that as well as I.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Well, why worry about going through all the details?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I am just pointing out some of the faults in the Bill in the hope that they may be rectified.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Your mind was made up against the Bill before you started.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Of course, it was.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Then you are not giving a fair evaluation of the agreement.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Of course, I am.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: No, you were prejudiced against it from the start.



The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I was, but that does not prevent me from evaluating the agreement and the legislation in the hope the Government will amend it.

I refer now to the question of a trust fund to compensate employees. Mr Medcalf would know very well that the State Government Insurance Office has been complaining that the cost of pneumoconiosis claims is far in excess of the premiums received. The same situation will apply here as applied at Wittenoom. When they were working in the blue asbestos mines, nobody had the faintest idea then that such problems would exist today. Therefore, it is incumbent upon this Government to set up a trust fund to ensure that the people who work in these mines and their families are fully protected. Certainly, this is not happening in respect of Wittenoom. Very heavy profits will be made from the mining of uranium, and I would like to see this trust fund established.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The company is not sure of that, you know. It has not accepted the agreement yet.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: No, but there is a provision in the Bill which makes sure that the ore is sold on a profitable basis, otherwise the mining will not proceed.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The company does not even have to go on with it if it does not want to.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Is Mr Medcalf telling me it will not? Does he have some doubts?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: No, I am simply saying that the agreement states that the company does not have to do anything until it decides what it is going to do by the 31st December next year.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Probably, the Government is making it so attractive to the company to ensure it will go ahead.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: That is why I am saying it is not terribly attractive.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: In my view, it is terribly attractive to the company. This Government, through this agreement, is giving more opportunities to this company than it has ever given to any other company.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: That is a pleasant change, in my view.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Mr Moore is a champion of private enterprise and he will give private enterprise any help he can, regardless of at whose expense. If Mr Moore really were trying to do something for the State he would be endeavouring to ensure the agreement provided that the Kalgoorlie-Leonora line be made more

viable to handle the additional traffic, so that the taxpayers would not be required to spend additional money on roads. Some of this additional expenditure for the provision of roads will be met by me, through the payment of my driver's licence and motor vehicle licence fees and the like. It would be far better if the company were asked to spend \$13 million on upgrading the railway to ensure the cost would not be carried by the State.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Your argument revolves around the railway, does it not?

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: That is one of the points I am making, because the Government has given the company so many options, and the company will go for whichever is the cheapest. Never mind the development of the State—that does not matter. The Government will be bound by whichever option the company decides to take. It is an incredible situation.

I do not intend to labour the point. The Opposition is opposed to uranium mining, and there is not much point in my simply reiterating what has already been said by my colleagues during this debate. The Opposition opposes the Bill and feels that many of the provisions contained in the schedule have been developed so that the company is given a significant advantage.

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [2.20 a.m.]: I have listened with interest to Mr McKenzie's argument and I agree with him on one point; namely, if it is possible, rail transport should be used. This adds to my argument that the greater the throughput, and the more people using it, the more efficient our railways become.

However, I did not agree with his argument about freight rates. Possibly, the Minister—having this Bill at his fingertips—would be able to explain to me exactly what the freight rate will be. I am not sure of the distance involved. However, from my own deduction of 420 kilometres, and taking as an example the transport of grain, if grain was carried the cost would be \$13.30 a tonne. From what I can see in the schedule, the rate for caustic soda and fuel oil will be 2.5c per tonne. So if the distance is 430 kilometres, this would amount to \$10.50 per tonne over the entire distance, or a saving over the 420-kilometre trip of just under \$3 when compared with bulk grain freights. If we take it up to the highest figure of 4c, which will be the rate per tonne-kilometre for all other bulk commodities carried in general purpose freight trains from Kewdale to Leonora, the total cost per tonne will be \$16.80, as compared with the grain freight rate of \$13.30. Why is there a difference?

I refer members to the formula set out on page 51 of the Bill. Frankly, if one tried to work that out at this stage of the night, one would go around the bend. The Attorney General attended the same school as I, so perhaps he would be able to advise the House what it means.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I will leave that to you.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I cannot work it out at this moment except by simple multiplication, taking a set distance; to me, the freight rates do not seem to be too bad—in fact, they are a little higher in one instance than the grain freight rate which applies at the moment. Where is the incentive? If I were acting on behalf of the company, I would grab the grain freight rate.

Certainly, the rail must be upgraded for this specific purpose, and some work must take place, which the Government has agreed to carry out.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Although they are expressed in the schedule, there is a certain amount of flexibility about them. In other words, the Government will do its best to try to get the rail used.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is right. It is rather interesting to examine the road freights. The contract road freights applying at present have come down as low as 4.66c. That is the contract carrying rate for grain, and is very competitive with long distance rail haulage.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Westrail will be allowed to compete.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, but I am wondering whether Westrail should have lowered the figure even more.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Those figures must be taken to be flexible.

**THE HON. T. KNIGHT (South) [2.25 a.m.]:** I wish to raise some matters the Opposition obviously has missed during this debate. I refer in particular to the jobs which will be created by this project. During the construction stage, between 800 and 1 000 workers will be employed on the site, and when construction has been completed 650 employees will be required by the company, with 200 permanent contractors to provide service back-up.

Earlier this afternoon I referred to the necessity to create jobs to ease our unemployment situation. Some of the comments from the Opposition led me to believe members opposite supported my point of view. Here is one way in which this State will benefit by the employment of

thousands of people. A township of 2 500 people will require extensive back-up services which will create more jobs throughout the area.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Jobs at any price?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Jobs at no price, just jobs for the people of this country—that is what I am interested in providing. I have nothing against uranium. When gunpowder was invented, people probably complained that it was dangerous. Gunpowder is dangerous, too; members should swallow some and see. Many fine inventions have come forward over the years, and there have always been people to oppose them, and many have subsequently proved to be of benefit to mankind. Here is another one; treat it properly and it will benefit Western Australia, Australia, and even the world.

If the mining of uranium creates jobs in Western Australia I support it. Here is an opportunity to create many jobs for Western Australians, and I for one am going to back the project to the fullest. We cannot fly in the face of world energy policies. If we start looking backwards, we will go backwards. I support progress.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: No doubt that would have been your argument about Wittenoom. You would have said, "Here is a project which will provide many jobs."

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: That was not the argument when Wittenoom commenced operations, and the honourable member knows it. It is true that, since creation, things have been done through ignorance, and tragedies have occurred. However, we are aware of the shortfalls of uranium, and these shortfalls will be catered for. The Government is doing all that is possible to ensure stringent safety requirements are followed. In addition, research is continuing throughout the world on improving the standards of safety in industry.

A metallurgical plant is to be established near the Kalgoorlie townsite. I am sure the Hon. R. T. Leeson—if he were present—would not oppose this Bill when he considered the number of jobs to be provided in and around his electorate. These are the things we must consider. We must keep going forward.

Uranium is a relatively new idea; it has been used as a fuel for only a short period. The world is rapidly running out of fuel oil, and is experiencing problems with the oil supplying nations. We must look for alternatives and make sure that similar problems do not occur with uranium, and that safeguards are implemented.

The Minister made the following statement in his second reading speech—

In considering the transport requirements of the project, there were three possible solutions—

through Geraldton by road;

through Esperance by rail to Leonora and then road;

through Fremantle by rail to Leonora and then by road.

I hope it goes through Esperance by rail to Leonora and then by road. Mr Cooley asked me earlier tonight whether I would like to see this project in Albany. If Albany were one of the suggested ports I would say, "Yes." However, I also represent Esperance, and as Esperance is one of the suggested ports, I support the concept. Mr McKenzie should also support it, because the material will go through Esperance by rail to Leonora. There is another point: The railway is to be used.

I would like these goods to come through my electorate, and I would like Esperance to be the port. I support the Bill.

**THE HON. N. F. MOORE** (Lower North) (2.30 a.m.): Naturally enough I support this Bill, having said on several occasions in the House in previous speeches that I hoped Yeelirrie would eventually get off the ground. This is a step in that direction.

I was astounded at Mr McKenzie's statement in regard to infrastructure costs. He seemed to think that in any development in the country areas the people there must pay of it themselves; that the companies must pay for it all. This has happened in the Pilbara where the iron ore companies have provided everything. All the Government has supplied are the people to operate the public services. The companies have provided hospitals, schools, sporting facilities, and shopping facilities; they have supplied the whole works. The Government paid for nothing and this includes water and electricity.

Here we have a situation where the Government may be about to contribute to development in a remote area for the first time in a long time. This is a step in the right direction. If we get development in the city or a large country town the Government provides the infrastructure costs, not the company. In remote areas the companies have always been expected to provide the infrastructure costs. On many occasions the reason development in remote areas has not been achieved is because the companies concerned have not been able to afford infrastructure costs.

I applaud the Premier for convincing the Loan Council to allow the States to go outside that council to borrow money for development purposes. It was a great step forward.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: What about the manufacturing industry?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: If the member looked around the city he would see that the manufacturing industry is provided for; the infrastructure is provided by the Government.

I am very pleased this legislation has now reached the House. Looking through the Minister's second reading speech we get a very clear outline of what the proposal is all about. The company's first intention is to build a pilot plant at Kalgoorlie beginning early next year. This will be of great benefit to the region and I would like to relate this to something which members may not consider it is related to, and that is the School of Mines.

The School of Mines is well known throughout the world as an excellent tertiary institution. Combined with it now will be the pilot plant and the metallurgical laboratory, established for the initial purpose of treating uranium ore. It will later be available for use in the treatment of other ores and to establish the best method of utilisation. This could mean the School of Mines would provide the State with a tertiary institution of world-wide importance in relation to mining.

Last week I visited Kalgoorlie to look at a number of things and happened to inspect the School of Mines with Dr Jones, the dean of the school. I was appalled at the facilities available there. Dr Jones has great visions for the School of Mines; he believes that with the right guidance, the spending of sufficient money, and the right attitudes the school could be developed into something of great world-wide importance. It is interesting to think of where the money in Western Australia comes from—our export earnings—and, of course, it comes from agriculture and mining. What do our tertiary institutions do? They turn out doctors, teachers, social workers, and the rest. We do not see very much emphasis placed on the training of people for the mining and agricultural industries. I urge the Government to look very seriously at spending lots of money on the School of Mines, particularly in association with this new metallurgical laboratory.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think the people at WAIT will win.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I hope they do not.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope your comments will be successful.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I think the State Government will adopt some initiatives in the near future. A lot of money is needed quickly and I hope Dr Jones reconsiders his decision not to return after his leave.

The development of Yeelirrie will take place hopefully after 1982. As I have said on several occasions, a new town of Yeelirrie of 2 500 people in the middle of my province will be of great benefit to the Murchison area. The Murchison area is suffering from an economic depression and is in need of economic rejuvenation. Yeelirrie is just what is needed. I believe other mineral deposits will be developed as well and it is great to see one company is making a start in the area.

The transport matter Mr McKenzie spoke about provides interesting problems. I suggest we first of all ignore the Fremantle option if we wish to assist in decentralising port operations. We should consider either the Geraldton or Esperance options. I think Geraldton or Esperance should be developed in preference to Fremantle. As far as I am concerned, in terms of the roads I drive on and the people I represent, the people in my area will benefit from either option.

If we look at the Geraldton option it will mean the completion of the sealing of the bitumen road from Geraldton to Sandstone and then finally to Yeelirrie. That will be of benefit to the people of Sandstone and Mt Magnet because it will bring the towns of the hinterland much closer to the centre of Geraldton.

With the Esperance option it will mean a bitumen road from Leonora, through to Leinster and Yeelirrie. This will be of great benefit to the people of Leonora, Leinster, and Kalgoorlie. There is a problem because the transport distances are a little greater towards Esperance and it would involve a double handling problem from road to rail.

One of the things in favour of the Esperance option is that the goldfields people would like a rail link from Kalgoorlie to the Pilbara eventually, and a road link to Yeelirrie would be a good start.

I am pleased this project looks like it will get off the ground and I hope this will be just the beginning of further such mineral development in the Murchison.

**THE HON. D. W. COOLEY** (North-East Metropolitan) [2.37 a.m.]: I am opposed to the Bill and the agreement under which the industry will be established. I am concerned when I hear people say that we need to have industry for industry's sake and that we have to create indus-

try, because it will create jobs. This is said by some people who at the same time are prepared to stand idly by and see technological change taking place, thus forcing thousands of people out of jobs.

The Premier often says that any overseas company or even a local company is welcome to establish an industry in this State as long as it creates jobs. There are no ifs or buts to his welcome. He says we have to have industry because it will create jobs. Some conditions and thought should be given to what we are allowing to be introduced.

My main concern is the way agreements have been brought to Parliament since I have been here. I believe there was a different policy when the Labor Party was in office. In those days the agreements were drawn up in the company of the people who were establishing the industry and, when the Parliament approved the agreements, they were signed. These days the agreements are a *fait accompli*. They have already been signed, sealed, and delivered. The Parliament has no opportunity to amend them; it can only reject them completely. There is no way to amend this agreement as it has already been signed by the Government. In this case the agreement has been signed by the Premier and a representative of Western Mining Corporation Limited, and that is that.

I am not completely opposed to the mining of uranium. I have mixed feelings about whether or not it should be mined and exported. I feel I must be frank about this. Nuclear power is already here and eventually we will have to be part of it. However, we should be more prudent in our approach to it.

There is a great controversy surrounding this subject and I wonder what our attitude would have been to the use of dynamite when it was discovered by Alfred Nobel. I wonder if we would have weighed up the pros and cons of its use and considered what its benefits would be to man. I wonder if we would have considered how it would be used in the great wars we have had. I have a feeling that if we had had a crystal ball we would have gone along with its use, because of the benefits it has brought to mankind.

I am concerned at the unenlightened attitude shown by some of the young members in this Chamber who have a responsibility in this matter; they will be here when these things come to fruition. They have a responsibility to the nuclear generation. We older members will not be active in public life when these things come

into being. These young members give this industry unqualified support. We have heard Mr Knight and Mr Moore give the Bill their full support because they feel it will bring jobs to the people and assist the School of Mines. They do this without giving thought to the consequences which might flow from the actions they are taking in respect of the damage this sort of commodity could do to future generations. I do not think they have given the subject sufficient thought. They are merely going along with the Bill on party lines, which we all do on occasions. They should not do so on this occasion. We should all be very circumspect.

Mr Knight denigrates the Friends of the Earth organisation and other conservation groups. He has probably done the same with the people who protested against whaling. But we have become more aware today as a consequence of these people. Many of us are now worried about our rubbish and when we have rubbish in our car we usually put it in a little bag we carry without dreaming of throwing it out the window. This is because of actions taken by minority groups who have given us a lead in such things. We should not brush such people off lightly, because sometimes the things they are in favour of are for the good of the people. We should be more circumspect in what we are doing.

I am not satisfied with the safeguards contained in the Bill and I am sure members opposite are not sure the safeguards are sufficient to control the industry. They cannot give any assurance that nothing will happen to the uranium once it is out of the country and the nation we have supplied wants to use it for other than peaceful purposes. We do not have an ultimate control. Imagine if we sent uranium to Germany and then in a year or so a madman like Hitler took over. One could imagine what might happen in those circumstances. This is one of the questionmarks against the export of uranium.

Even though we have these agreements coming before Parliament, there can be no assurance given that the ore will leave the site. The unions will play a big part in this. The Transport Workers' Union is opposed to the handling of uranium, and this is a problem that will have to be faced. Why should we rush ahead? Why does not the Government wait until the people are convinced that there is nothing wrong with the mining of the ore and that it should be accepted? The people are opposed to this, and day by day the people in opposition to uranium mining are growing in number.

The same situation is developing now as occurred with the Vietnam controversy. Everyone decried the minority groups who were protesting against the Vietnam war, but eventually the majority of the people were opposed to it. It was only the action of the minority group which put them in that frame of mind not only in this country, but in the great seat of democracy—America.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: And they were criticised for doing so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right. They were denigrated, abused, and sometimes physically attacked over the action they took. But how right they were proved to be. Mr Oliver can laugh but no-one is infallible.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No. If Mr Lewis had been in the Chamber earlier he would know that I am not completely opposed to the subject. I have mixed feelings.

We are still not sure whether, if the material is transported from the mine to the wharf, it will leave the wharf. Furthermore we are not sure whether there will be a change of Government and the agreements will be cancelled if the safeguards are not given. That is the policy which has been espoused by the alternative Government in this country.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Do you support it?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Of course. The position has been made clear. We would not be reneging on contracts at all, because the agreement will be entered into with the full knowledge of our policy.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Many people will be put out of work.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is not the whole situation. I lived through a time when a man believed that peace should be obtained at any price, and he went to no ends to get it. He had a sincere belief in what he was doing, but he was completely wrong and he was responsible for a great deal of misery as a result of his dogmatic attitude. The same dogmatic attitude is being adopted in this case. It is believed we must have this mining operation at any price, because it will create jobs.

However, that is not the be-all and end-all of everything. It is only a political policy to say that we are creating jobs. What about the consequences? No-one is sure about them and the consequences could affect future generations. If

the consequences are as serious as that and some of the things we hear which can occur as a result of leakages of this material produced from uranium are true, I say "To hell with jobs". Do not let us have any jobs in this industry if it will bring about such disastrous results.

We are not sure about these things and we ought to think a bit more about them before we go into the project. But it is no good. No matter what we say tonight, an agreement has been signed, sealed, and almost delivered. It requires only ratification by Parliament. There is no way in the world we will be able to amend it.

Despite all that has been said and all the criticism which has been directed at the Labor Party and its policy in respect of being a little cautious, I still say the Government should not rush into this project until it is sure of the consequences. On those grounds we should not totally oppose the mining and export of uranium, but should go along with the ALP and put a moratorium on it.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [12.49 a.m.]: I rise to oppose the legislation. I have listened with some interest to the few remarks made by Government members in support of the legislation, and their grounds for supporting it turned out to be pitifully small and narrow, based on an optimistic belief in the rightness of their view rather than on any reality of the situation.

It is pertinent to emphasise that it costs roughly \$500 000 to employ one person in uranium mining as against \$20 000 to employ one person in a manufacturing industry. If we are considering value for money, and the Government considers itself to be an expert on the matters of finance, it should realise it is not making a very good investment in terms of employment opportunities, which is a matter members opposite have stressed so strongly. To spend \$500 000 for one job in uranium mining as against \$20 000 in a manufacturing industry is not a particularly good bargain.

The industry is one in regard to which from the beginning undue optimism has been expressed in regard to the billions of dollars spent in the industrially advantaged countries on the development of uranium and industry. I venture to suggest that if only a small portion of those funds had been directed into research into alternative energies, then the world would have been in a much healthier position and job opportunities would have been far greater than what they are.

Members opposite by interjection—I wonder whether they intend to make their speeches from their seats instead of on their feet—made great play about decentralisation, but nuclear power is a highly centralised form of energy.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: We are talking about the mining of uranium.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Australian Government could take one legislative action which would create far more jobs throughout Australia than would the whole of the uranium mining reserves. Far less cost to the community would be involved, too. I will not develop that theme, and I will not even tell the honourable member what that single legislative action would be.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: He probably would not understand anyway.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I wish you would speak up when you interject so that I can hear.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: He was talking to me, not to the honourable member.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I bet it is in *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sure that if he wanted the honourable member to hear he would have spoken loud enough.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is not polite to talk amongst yourselves when we are all so eager to listen to you!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If my colleague had spoken any louder I am sure that you, Sir, would have objected to the audible conversation in the Chamber!

The Hon. R. Hetherington: If the honourable member opposite is not careful I will get up and make a speech!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Threats!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The fact of the matter is that this is a first step into the nuclear cycle and it is one which is based more on a degree of optimism than on proof that the project is possible. In his speech the Minister indicated that the development of the mine itself is a number of years off. We are not providing a great deal of employment at this time and if we are talking about the construction force, that will be for a limited period only. We are more interested in the permanent jobs.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: A total of 800 is being provided.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: For a limited period.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: No. There will be 800 on a permanent basis.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think the honourable member had better read the Minister's speech.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: You have a very careful look at it, because there are 1 000 construction workers and 800 permanent workers.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: There are 600.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Plus the ancillary workers.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: For the honourable member's benefit there will be 650 in the permanent work force and 800 to 1 000 on construction.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: There will be 650 in its operation together with 200 permanents. That makes 850.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Plus the people at Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: Yes. Mr Claughton cannot add up.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member direct his comments to the Chair?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The mine itself will provide work for 650 people.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: For 850.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The mine itself will provide work for 650. If we adopted the other option of encouraging more manufacturing industry, far more people would be involved than will be in this project, and far greater value would be derived from the investment made. If the Government took those initiatives instead of advocating, as it does in the Budget figures, a decline in the manufacturing industry, it would be able to boast with some sort of justification.

From a reading of what is happening around the world in regard to the uranium industry I would say that the project here is based on optimism and I am not sure that the optimism is soundly based. We could find that an investment is made in this industry and the State is committed to the cost of the services outlined by Mr McKenzie, and then the money could be down the drain, because the demand for uranium has not eventuated in the way the super optimists feel it will. I could have quoted figures earlier about the projections made in places like the USA where there were to be so many nuclear power

stations operating by the year 2 000. The programme has been greatly scaled down—so much so that it is almost unbelievable that the original predictions could have been made at all.

We know we have a number of uranium deposits in Australia. The Ranger and the Jabiluka are in the process of development of some stage or another and these will be coming on-stream probably before we know what plant will be required to treat the Yeelirrie uranium.

The first thing to be done, as other members have indicated, is to set up the pilot plant, because the ore is quite a different type from that in which the other deposits are found. This is created by a leaching of the deposit. The process of extraction is also different. In fact, it has yet to be developed and shown that it can be developed on a commercial basis.

I hope the safeguards which should be applied will be applied. References are made in the Bill and the Minister's speech to the codes. No such codes have been tabled in this Parliament for our information. We do not know what the detail of them will be. All we have is a Bill which was introduced into Parliament at the same time as this agreement. It says only that these codes will be adopted. They have not been worked out at this stage, so we do not know what the safeguards will be. It is a proposition based on hope, and I think it needs a bit of charity as well.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The codes of practice have been tabled. They are all laid down.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: We had them in the last Bill. In the interim stage those codes will apply under this agreement. They are international codes.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I must confess I was not aware that had been done. Therefore I have not examined them. So I withdraw those remarks.

I again express my opposition to the Bill.

**THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT** (North-East Metropolitan) [3.02 a.m.]: I will not canvass all the arguments I presented during the debate on the previous Bill. I just rise to record my very strong opposition to this Bill. I think we will live to regret the day this sort of legislation is passed. Nuclear technology will lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I hope your party says that the next time there is an election.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Our policy on uranium has been widely circulated.

**THE HON. O. N. B. OLIVER** (West) [3.03 a.m.]: I would like to congratulate the Government on being responsible in bringing this legislation forward, because there is a delay when one enters a project of this nature and major construction will not commence until 1982. So, in fact, it is giving the company the opportunity to arrange its finances, including the possibility of a joint venture arrangement.

Having listened to the previous speakers who opposed the Bill, and having examined their policies, I quickly listed the points for and against. We are already aware major research has to be carried out and, in fact, an incredible amount of money has already been spent on research into the safety and the disposal of nuclear wastes. That is an ongoing programme and I am certain the problems will be resolved.

In respect of Mr Cooley's remarks directed to the younger members of the House—and I trust I come into that category—I can assure him I examined my stand on this matter some 18 months ago, if not well before that. I have had the opportunity to visit emerging nations—countries with very low standards of living—and see the benefits of the generation of electricity with the use of nuclear plants. Naturally, I am also concerned for the future of my own children, and having looked at, travelled in, and lived in disadvantaged nations of the world, I have made my decision. Mr Cooley has some doubts, and I appreciate his viewpoint.

In drawing up my list of the points for and against, I had in mind the arguments I thought would come forward from the Opposition. The first is the fact that we have quite a lead time, as Mr Hetherington pointed out. He feels there is a possibility that there will be more than adequate safeguards for the disposal of wastes.

The next point is that in clause 41 there is a requirement for constant monitoring, environmental reports, and management statements. That is in accordance with the Labor Party's philosophy.

The next point is the Opposition has always complained about selling off the farm. In this instance we have a very high equity. Subsequent to the other partners joining in the agreement, we will have a 75 per cent equity, which is again in accordance with the philosophy of the Labor Party.

The next point in favour of it is the fact that it accords with the Labor Party's policy on decentralisation.

The next item is that it provides job opportunities. We have already heard many times in various debates that we are not providing job opportunities and we are not concerned about unemployment. I have weighed all that up; also I find the project offers the opportunity of revenue to our rail network which I know will meet with the approval of Mr McKenzie.

In conclusion, the one matter which is of extreme concern to me is that it has been mentioned that, irrespective of the fact that we may pass this legislation tonight, it may not reach fruition, and there is the possibility that the Transport Workers' Union will decide whether the product of this project is exported.

I would like to clarify that for members present. It was not the Transport Workers' Union which made that decision. The Transport Workers' Union executive made it. In no way have the rank and file members of the Transport Workers' Union made a decision on the matter. Major public statements have been made by the union executive as to what will occur.

On the basis of the points for and against the project, I find great difficulty in understanding why the Opposition does not support this agreement. In the course of time, possibly in the very near future, perhaps members of the Opposition will change their minds.

**THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF** (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [3.09 a.m.]: I intend to speak very briefly in view of the lateness of the hour, and I trust any member all of whose questions I do not answer will not feel he has been treated discourteously.

This debate has reminded me somewhat of the old-fashioned country show where there was a tent with a stand in front of it and a fellow standing on it saying, "Have a round or two for a pound or two." Members go out for refreshments, return and make a short antagonistic speech and go away again for more refreshments.

Mr McKenzie, of all the Opposition speakers, did in fact advert to the agreement. He had obviously read the agreement and he made some comments on it which I believe I should answer.

He said the agreement had been signed before the EPA had made its report, and that was a bad thing. This has been done on other occasions for one good reason, particularly in this case. A company has to arrange its finance and it has to have something in its hand so that it can say "We have an agreement with the Government of Western Australia", and produce a document.



Nobody will listen to a company which is trying to arrange its finance, negotiate its deal with other partners, and so on, unless that company has an agreement in its hand.

The company has 12 months to make up its mind. It is not committed at all. The agreement specifically says that unless the company decides to go on with the project in 12 months, by the 31st December, 1979, it can walk out and there is no accounting on either side. No claim for compensation can be made by the Government against the company or by the company against the Government.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: What if the EPA is against it?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The company may walk out.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: You said the company has to have an agreement.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: So it can start its negotiations. It is still subject to the EPA report. Everything is subject to the EPA report. The EPA report is given to the Government and the Government decides what it will do. But the company has to have an agreement.

Mr McKenzie said the Government was being very generous to the company. That was highly suppositious. Mr Cloughton did not agree; he was inclined to think the deal might fall down because it was over-capitalised. Unless one had the facts and figures one could not make the comment that the Government was being generous to the company. There is nothing generous about the alternative transport arrangements.

In fact, the Government would like the company to use the rail. In the provision for flexibility in this arrangement, Westrail will be given the opportunity to quote competitively with the road transport people, and to try to help the rail there is a \$13 million penalty if the company decides to use the road.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: It is not a penalty because the road has to be provided.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No. The Government does not have to provide a road from Mt. Magnet via Sandstone to Yeelirrie. The Government makes a contribution to it only if the company decides it will use the Geraldton outlet. If it decides to go that way instead of to Esperance, the company has to pay the penalty of three-quarters of the cost of that road, which is three-quarters of \$13 million as I see it, and I think it might be a little more than that. So it is an open question; no decision has been made on that.

The Government was negotiating in a very hard field, and I may say the Government negotiators included Westrail and the transport people. They have all had a word in this. They have been consulted and have taken part in the discussions. It has not just been done by the Minister and his department; it has been an overall effort and a lot of hard bargaining has taken place to get the agreement to this stage.

I do not believe the Government could have insisted on the railway. It would have if it could, and the railway is still in it because the Government has fought for the railway. The Government would like the railway to be used. It wants the rail link to be used.

However it cannot ignore the economic factors, and those options must remain. As the honourable member will appreciate, Yeelirrie is just about at the turning point between Geraldton and Esperance as far as distance is concerned.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: But there are other factors to be taken into consideration. If you develop the Mt. Keith nickel deposit surely that would be a consideration and would tend to favour the railway line.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The honourable member is quite right. The show is not yet over; we are only in the early stages.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It will all be shipped through Fremantle, because that is where the ship owners will send ships.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The Fremantle option is open; however, the Government wants to encourage the use of Geraldton or Esperance.

On the question of water, it is true that the company might have to go outside the area, but it will not do that if it can get water within the area. The full potential of water is not yet known. However, if the company has to go out of the area the Government will assist it, and the Government will expect water to be made available to other potential users. If other people want to use the water, it will be made available and charges will be made by the Government for it.

A point was raised about the tailings being dumped on the flood plain, with floods washing them down. That is only in the ERMP; it is what the company has proposed. It is not a final decision. The matter has to be considered by the EPA and the Government. It is not a firm statement at all and is not in the agreement.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: There is nothing in the agreement to say they have to fill it in.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The company must comply with the Government's environmental requirements, whatever they may be. The best thing may not be to put the tailings down the mineshaft. From the notes I have received, there are two or three prospects in respect of the disposal of the tailings.

I do not think there is really any other comment I need make, except to say that I appreciate the points made by Mr Cooley. He has indicated he is loyal to the policy of the Australian Labor Party. On the other hand, he has the doubts of an honest man, because he knows uranium is here to stay. He believes that we must face up to this situation. He has put his point well, and it is well understood.

I commend the second reading.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

**Ayes 17**

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. N. F. Moore	(Teller)

**Noes 7**

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
Hon. R. Hetherington	(Teller)

**Pairs**

**Ayes**

**Noes**

Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. M. McAleer	Hon. R. T. Leeson

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

**METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY,  
SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

**THE HON. D. W. COOLEY** (North-East Metropolitan) [3.25 a.m.]: The Opposition has no alternative but to support this Bill, because it rectifies a mistake made by the Government in respect of the calculation of consumers' allowances under the new pay-for-use system. Upon reading the Minister's second reading speech I find he is begrudgingly allowing consumers to have a rebate on their consumption between the months of January and June of this year.

The Opposition supported the pay-for-use principle established by the Government in the very firm belief—shared by many other people in the community—that it would have very little effect on the water bill of the average consumer. However, that has not been the case and numerous complaints have been received by members of the Opposition. I am sure such complaints have been received also by members of the Government and by the Minister. The system just is not working out in the way it was explained to us when the previous Bill was introduced.

I would have thought in the light of all the criticism levelled at the Government since the commencement of the new scheme something would have been done in this Bill to rectify the situation. The Labor Party went to a great deal of trouble to publicise an alternative scheme which would have brought about the situation we thought would be brought about under the Government's scheme.

The present scheme is certainly not encouraging the conservation of water. It gives benefits to the people who use the most water. A scale is applied, the principle of which is the more water used, the less one has to pay in terms of cents per kilolitre.

The system is creating a good deal of hardship to many consumers with large families in the metropolitan area. They find they are using their maximum allowance very quickly. It seems to me and my party that the purpose of this pay-for-use scheme is twofold: Firstly, there is the principle of endeavouring to save water, which is very doubtful; secondly, there is the principle of boosting the revenue of the Metropolitan Water Board.

I think the Government was very remiss in not introducing in this Bill a system which would give some relief to the people to whom

the Government made a promise that their bills would not be altered very much. I believe that could have been done easily by increasing the annual allowance from 150 to 200 kilolitres. There are average consumers, and it is not hard to find them. Taking into account the water rate and excess water charge the average consumers have paid under the old scheme, a rate could have been struck to accommodate the average householder to enable him to pay somewhere near the same amount as he paid previously for his water. Under this scheme he must either cut down—and I suppose that is one of the purposes—or pay more.

We support the Bill, because it does give some rights to the people who were aggrieved by the introduction of the pay-for-use system. However, I repeat that we feel the Government should have done more than it is doing.

**THE HON. R. G. PIKE** (North Metropolitan) [3.30 a.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. I will do so briefly.

This Bill is the hallmark of the honesty of the present Liberal-National Country Party Government in Western Australia. It is axiomatic in politics that the party which provides the best administration remains the Government, and that has been evidenced by the balanced Budgets of the Liberal-National Country Party coalition in this State. However, even the best Governments make an occasional mistake or oversight.

In this case, as was pointed out by the member who spoke last, those consumers who had their meter read from January of this year were penalised. The Government, with straightforward honesty, has moved to introduce validating legislation so that those people will not now be paying excess for the water used. That indicates the degree of honesty and straightforwardness which are the hallmarks of the present Government.

It is known throughout the State that the Liberal-National Country Party Governments are better managers than the Opposition. That has been proved over many years. They have been better managers, and they will continue to be.

I will deal briefly with the final point made by the member who has just spoken. There is an infinitesimal difference in the amount to be paid. It is obvious that if one uses, for example 400 kilolitres, and one adds the cost of that water at 17c a kilolitre to the base rate of \$36, and if one divides the total cost by the total consumption, one finds that the water payment per kilolitre is slightly smaller. With this slender difference, the Labor Party has the temerity or the cheek to present to the public of Western Australia

a claim that the more one uses, the cheaper it is although large differences in the overall kilolitre rate exist. What a big deal!

The fact remains, of course, that in most enterprises discounts are allowed for commodities used in quantity. That is not unreasonable. If Mr Cooley had been honest and actually quoted the figures, the amount involved would be seen to be infinitesimal. His comments were an exercise in straw splitting.

I support the Bill.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [3.33 a.m.]: I thank members for their support of this legislation. The remarkable thing about it is that, when the Binnie report was first presented, the spokesman for the ALP was Mr Brian Burke, who is on record as saying what a wonderful system the pay-for-use system was.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is right.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: We can make mistakes too, of course.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: When it is politically unpopular, they reverse their views.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: It depends how you look at it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: At this time of the morning, I can do without all this help.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Nobody asked you to stay. It was your idea.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In fact, Mr Burke's initial reaction was right. When he realised there were a few gremlins in the pay-for-use system, he took off so quickly he met himself coming out of the door!

Nevertheless, this is a fairer system. In the country—

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Not the way you have put it in the schedule.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The country people have been on the pay-for-use basis for some time. That system gives people the opportunity of determining, to some extent, how much they will pay. The only mistake at the present time which ought to be rectified is that no allowance should have been given at all. That would have been infinitely fairer and infinitely better. The average person is obliged literally to use 150 kilolitres. Therefore, it was decided there was not any point in continuing with that.

This point has been explained over and over again. Anyone who does not understand it now just does not want to understand it.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), and passed.

### **WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 22nd November.

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [3.38 a.m.]: As this House has been sitting now for 13 or 14 hours, as it is twenty-two minutes to four in the morning, as this is the last Bill on the notice paper, and as there is a long and complex story attached to the Bill which would require the Minister to give a long and careful summation of my remarks in respect of the Bill, I will try to keep to the bare essentials. I will try to be as brief as I can.

I apologise to the people in the industry if I gloss over one or two points in connection with the Bill. I suggest that if any person in the industry should think this, I would be happy to discuss it with him outside the Chamber at any time. One tends to lose a little enthusiasm when it comes to supporting this Bill at this hour of the morning.

This Bill is important to Western Australia, because it breaks away from the traditional type of agreement which has existed between the States for many years. I know that the industry supports this break with tradition with the introduction of State accounting. However, the company which handles the grain, CBH Limited, supports the measure reluctantly.

Having established that fact, I will refer to the objects of the Bill. The primary aim is to provide for the introduction of State accounting. Every State in the Commonwealth will be responsible to its growers for expenses in that State in relation to the handling of grain.

The second point is that the Bill makes provision for accruing to Western Australian growers, to the maximum extent, the lower freight charges in respect of the export of wheat from this State as opposed to other States.

The amendment to section 15 of the Act removes the 92c limit for freight advantages accruing to Western Australian growers. As the freight advantage has been averaged over the total deliveries by Western Australian wheatgrowers we have not previously exceeded the 92c limit. Members should understand that Western Australia is closer to many of Australia's markets than the other States. This should ensure increased freight savings.

Currently, ships are chartered on the basis of west coast loading. Therefore, all Western Australian ports are taken into consideration in establishing freight rates. CBH has been assured by the Australian Wheat Board that what is not gained in freight savings by loading at Kwinana is offset by the huge amount of despatch money earned at that port. In future, those amounts will accrue to Western Australian growers.

The third part of the Bill deals with the introduction of varietal control in States other than Western Australia and Victoria. This machinery is incorporated within the Bill so that if and when Western Australia decides to adopt varietal control—that is, the growing of certain specified varieties of grain in certain sections of the State, and I understand the decision will be taken at the March conference of the Farmers' Union—it will be simple to alter the law and, presumably, delete Western Australia from this clause. That would leave Victoria. If Victoria decided to adopt varietal control, both Western Australia and Victoria would be deleted. This provision will provide the machinery for the easy introduction of varietal control within the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act.

The fourth point is that the amendment to section 40 of the Commonwealth Act will remove the requirement for the agreement between the bulk handling authorities of Australia and the Australian Wheat Board to be approved of by State and Federal Ministers. This has been a safeguard for Western Australia in the past. Now it would appear that with State accounting coming to the fore, and with no Ministerial control—"control" is not the word I want to use—with no State or Commonwealth Minister to refer to for protection, and with the agreements now being made between the bulk handling authorities in each State and the Australian Wheat Board, the bulk handling companies will have to be vigilant.

In relation to the conditions discussed at the Australian Agricultural Council, we understand that the exchange of relevant information and arbitration, where costs cannot be agreed upon between the Australian Wheat Board and the bulk handling authorities, is to be a very important factor. It must be included in the agreement that will eventually be signed by the bulk handling authorities and the Australian Wheat Board.

Another provision is that there will have to be a new definition of a licensed receiver within the Wheat Stabilization Act. It will have to name each of the licensing authorities in each of the States as the States become now individual parties under the Act.

Looking at the Bill broadly, I want to place on record that Western Australia originally, at the request of the bulk handling authorities of the other States of the Commonwealth, entered into a discussion in an endeavour to reach an agreement as to the costing of the charges pertaining to the sale of grain in general. One of the factors which has helped the grain industry in Australia through the last three decades is the fact that all costs in each State were joined together and the overall divisor figure of wheat exported from Australia and sold within Australia was used as the figure to establish the cost which went back to each State.

The other States have not been particularly happy in recent years with this setup, especially as I believe some States were constructing facilities in their desire to upgrade them to the best possible standard. Western Australia, for example, is at present installing a second system, the first system having been worn out over the years. On the other hand, Victoria constructed a system some years ago which, in my opinion, was paid for by Western Australians as well as Victorians, but certainly the rate was a lot cheaper than the rate for which the facility in Western Australia is being constructed at the present time.

It was not without a certain degree of trauma that Western Australia watched the negotiations conducted and agreed to sit in on the meetings in Melbourne without prejudice to assist where possible in bringing to fruition an agreement. Western Australia was definitely not present in a voting capacity at those particular meetings. It was there rather to refer matters back to the board of directors of Co-operative Bulk Handling. Out of all that has come the desire by the States, and agreed to by the Ministers for Agriculture and by the Australian Agricultural Council, that a new agreement will in fact exist; hence the need for the legislation.

That agreement, however, which is beyond the capacity of the Ministers now, has yet to be agreed on and signed by the bulk handling authorities. I hope when the agreement is signed, it is signed jointly by all States and is not an agreement between each individual State and the Australian Wheat Board. I hope the Minister for Agriculture will ensure this occurs.

My reason for saying this is that Western Australia is very worried that sweetheart deals could occur in the Eastern States with the Australian Wheat Board which might make a difference to an agreement in that particular area compared to an agreement with Western Australia. If the agreement was signed jointly by all States no alteration could be made to it unless it was sighted by all States involved.

With the advent of State accounting we in Western Australia will have a few debits and a few credits; but the aim at all times in negotiating with the Australian Wheat Board is to ensure that all debits and all credits are referred back to the State from whence they came. To give members an example, in the matter of export loading, demurrage and despatch moneys so earned will, in fact, be debited or credited—whatever the case may be—in their entirety to the particular State concerned. In this instance, of course, Western Australia is in the happier position of having the port setup at Kwinana.

The Port of Kwinana has an outloading rate of 5 000 tonnes an hour, therefore, it is unlikely that demurrage charges will ever be attracted to a vessel outloading there. Instead that port will attract despatch money. The despatch money which is being attracted currently at the Port of Kwinana is being shared by all growers in Australia. In the future when the agreement is signed, it will be paid directly to Western Australia.

The demurrage charges often incurred in the Eastern States and which are shared currently by all growers in Western Australia, will be a pigeon for the particular State which incurs them. I am not saying that at no time do we incur demurrage charges in Western Australia; but the despatch money earned out of all ports in Western Australia certainly exceeds the demurrage charges which we incur.

Again we must look at the possibility of cheaper freights out of our ports. All freight on all wheat was shared equally by all the growers in Australia and now Western Australia will be responsible for the payment of the shipping costs involved. CBH knows from Lloyds of London that with the Kwinana setup it is possible we in Western Australia can attract very competitive

freight rates, because of the outloading speed. The same will apply to Albany where the new out-loading gantry is being installed, as the Minister is fully aware. Vessels on charter by private parties will be attracted to come into that port.

As the Leader of the Opposition knows, it is usually the country to whom the wheat is sold which arranges the shipping. It is not arranged out of Australia. Nevertheless a great deal of shipping is arranged from our ports and in time we will gain more by being able to do this.

We will save on the fumigation costs within Western Australia. It is well known that as a result of the husbandry and housekeeping carried out by CBH over many years weevils are less prevalent in Western Australia than in any other State. This is a very important factor, because whilst members may not realise it, it cost this State \$1.25 million last year in fumigants for the protection of grain. For the same size harvest in New South Wales the cost was \$5.5 million. This has occurred simply because our husbandry was a great deal better than that in New South Wales.

The ironical part of that exercise under the old agreement was that the Western Australian growers had to share the extra cost and the Eastern States received the advantage of our lower costs because all costs were pooled and applied equally to every tonne of grain exported. We expect to gain considerably there.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: What about the problem at Northam? Have you overcome that?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Through you, Sir, I should like to ask the member what is the problem?

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Was there not a weevil outbreak at Northam?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Does the honourable member mean it is CBH's problem?

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: No, on the farms. There was some fear of it spreading.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I believe the honourable member is referring to the super bug. We can have the super bug in almost any area which has not been treated properly. It is a danger and we are extremely worried about it; but I believe the Agriculture Protection Board and the Department of Agriculture are doing all they can to prevent an outbreak of the super bug. We are very vigilant about this type of problem in Western Australian grain facilities.

We are the only State which carries out farm inspections. A total of 90 per cent of all farms were inspected this year prior to harvest, so our

policies are helping the matter. This is why I believe the weevil became such a menace and was rife in the Eastern States before it could be brought under close surveillance. Nevertheless, looking at the total costs of fumigation, they have been kept down to a very low level over the years. However, it must be watched closely, because the next steps in guarding against weevil are very expensive. We may need to use mechanical refrigeration of all silos or cells. All the silos may need to be made completely airtight for the introduction of hydrogen, carbon monoxide, or even carbides. There are many avenues; but each time a weevil becomes resistant to a particular protective, that is the end of that protective until another is found. It is maybe easy to find something else; but once the grain is protected and we try to sell it overseas it must be acceptable to what is known as the CODEX international standard. We must make sure the people are prepared to buy the grain with the particular fumigant on it. It may take seven or eight years to prove a particular fumigant before it is accepted by the world at large. The weevil is a particular problem.

When comparing the costs in Western Australia with those in the Eastern States, we must look to CBH and the standard services it provides to growers against what is happening in a number of the Eastern States, and that is when the silo is full the grain is stored on the farm. They have to have more farm storage so that is a saving in effect to the growers in Western Australia.

But against all these matters there is the cost incurred with the Kwinana and Albany installations and the country building programme which is proceeding. Many more millions of dollars will need to be spent by farmers who are required to up-date unloading facilities at their sidings.

These expenses are very real, but in future they will have to be shared by the growers equally per tonne of production in Western Australia. The result of the exercise at this stage depends entirely on the throughput of the grain in the Co-operative Bulk Handling installations. This will establish the divisor figure and it is proposed that this figure, which will represent the cost to the grower, will have to be set some time prior to harvest. Indeed, the Minister may realise this will present quite a difficult challenge to the company to forecast the initial cost of handling the grain, and accurately forecast the grain which will be received and which will then be divided into the costs to give a figure per tonne on which to establish the charge.

In a year such as this, which is the first year we are trying State accounting, Western Australia will not fare too badly as far as costs are concerned, because we expect a large harvest and as the large harvest is the divisor figure used, it will lessen the cost as a result of the throughput of approximately five million tonnes.

If it turns out to be a low throughput as we experienced in 1969, the costs accordingly will be so much higher, because the total cost now cannot be shared between the other States. Usually it is only one State at a time which has a setback. The insurance against that type of cost was the fact that many States were involved. Western Australia has a point going for it, however, in that it services a large State. In length and breadth, taking the area from Geraldton to Esperance, in the Eastern States that would cover from Brisbane almost to Adelaide. Whilst the climatic conditions on the eastern seaboard are shared by four States, we have all the changes in climate operating in our one State and we can, in fact, have a bad year in the north and a good year in the south, and pick up the tonnages for divisor figures there.

All in all, whilst I intend to support the Bill, I do so very reluctantly. I do not think it will be as clear-cut as those involved in the wheat industry in Western Australia think it will be. There will be a few gremlins for a while. Certainly now the agreement will have to be drawn up and examined by Co-operative Bulk Handling of Western Australia; and certainly the agreement will be examined to see that no sweetheart deals will exist in the other States. However, it will have to be an agreement which is lasting and enduring because we know, particularly in Western Australia, that if one of the Eastern States suddenly decides it cannot afford to live with the new system, we will make that State live up to it. So, it has to be lasting and enduring.

The previous agreement was signed only four years ago whereby all costs were shared. That was to be the position, and it was on that agreement that Western Australia built the Kwinana terminal at a cost of \$76 million. It was to be supported by all growers.

I know that Co-operative Bulk Handling is not particularly worried about this arrangement. Certainly, we have not ever stated what the Minister said in his second reading speech. He said that Co-operative Bulk Handling was quite convinced there might be other facilities similar to those at Kwinana built in the Eastern States. We do not believe that is so. We do not believe that any State, at present-day prices, could afford to build a Kwinana-type complex. CBH completed

the project at a cost of \$76 million. However, if the building was commenced at the time it was actually completed, it would have cost approximately \$120 million, and if it took four years to construct, as was the actual case, the final cost would be closer to \$220 million. The Kwinana terminal was commissioned only two years ago. So, the savings are there.

I reluctantly support the Bill. I wish it well but its success will depend on many factors. I only hope the growers in Western Australia fully realise what it will mean. The industries associated with wheatgrowing have virtually pushed for it, and I hope they know exactly what they are letting themselves in for.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.04 a.m.]: I just want to place on record the Labor Opposition view to this Bill. We support it in principle and detail.

**THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South—Minister for Lands) [4.05 a.m.]: I thank the two speakers for their support of the Bill. I would be reluctant to argue with Mr Mick Gayfer at any time, let alone after 4 o'clock in the morning. I think he has pointed out the relevant matters, particularly the difficulty which might arise in the negotiations. Apparently it may not be as easy as many farmer organisations think it will be.

It does appear the State will benefit from the many facilities that have been provided by CBH, both in the ports and at railway sidings. We will receive some benefit from those installations which CBH has built up over the years. It gives me very much pleasure to commend the second reading.

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.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and passed.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

*House adjourned at 4.17 a.m. (Friday).*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### CULTURAL AFFAIRS

*Art Gallery: Mrs Berkman's Paintings*

457. The Hon. R. Hetherington (for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON), to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Further to my question No. 444 of the 21st November, 1978—

- (a) will the Minister advise what was the advice the board received from its professional staff and other galleries; and
- (b) will he table the relative documents?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Minister for Cultural Affairs advises that he has full confidence in the Board of the Art Gallery of Western Australia, and, having satisfied himself that the board acted properly and exercised its functions in a responsible manner, is not intending to pursue this matter any further.

### TELEVISION

*"Against the Wind"*

458. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister ascertain whether the educational television series "Against the Wind" will be shown on Western Australian television and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

I am advised that this is a commercial programme. I have no knowledge of its probable screening in this State.

### CULTURAL AFFAIRS

*Art Gallery: Mrs Berkman's Paintings*

459. The Hon. R. Hetherington (for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON), to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Further to my question No. 442 of the 21st November, 1978, to which the Minister advised that the Art Gallery Board member, Mr Mark Saunders, did not maintain a business address in New York—

- (1) Is the Minister aware that—

(a) the letterhead of Carrolls' Pty. Ltd. indicates that the business is also located at Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and New York; and

(b) Mr Saunders owns and controls Carrolls' Pty. Ltd.?

- (2) In the light of the above information, is the Minister satisfied that Mr Saunders, or alternatively his business interests, does not maintain a New York business address?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Minister for Cultural Affairs refers the member to the answer given to question 457 on today's notice paper.

## MEDICAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENTS.

*Curtin House: Accommodation*

460. The Hon. R. G. PIKE to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the total area rented by the West Australian Government's Medical and Health Service Departments from the Australian Labor Party in the building known as Curtin House in Beaufort Street, Perth, at the present time?
- (2) What is the total amount of rental paid to date by the West Australian government to the Australian Labor Party for these premises?
- (3) What further period has the lease to run?
- (4) What escalation of payment provisions, if any, exists in the lease document?
- (5) What is the estimated, or known, total payment to be made by the State Government to the Australian Labor Party from the date that the previous State Labor Government implemented the lease agreement to the finish of the term of the lease?
- (6) If known, what was the capital cost of the Australian Labor Party building known as Curtin House?
- (7) What percentage of the capital cost of this building is represented by the total lease payment to be made by the State Government?



The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) 84 099 square feet leased from Perth Trades Hall Incorporated.
- (2) \$1 493 993.56 (includes outgoings).
- (3) 16 years from 15th August, 1978.
- (4) Rent is reviewed three-yearly, with provision made for payment of increases in outgoings in the intervening years.
- (5) Approximately \$13.6 million (inclusive of outgoings). Payments made to Perth Trades Hall Incorporated.
- (6) Not known.
- (7) Not known.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

##### *Accommodation*

1. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:
  - (1) In which buildings in the metropolitan area are State Government departments or instrumentalities located?
  - (2) Who owns each of the buildings?
  - (3) What is the rent per square foot being paid for each?
  - (4) What is the average length of lease?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (4) To answer this question would require a considerable amount of detailed preparation. However, if the honourable member has any specific query, I will have the matter investigated and advise her, bearing in mind that all these transactions are subject to both internal audit and the overriding audit of the Auditor General.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

##### *Accommodation*

2. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

As the Government has seen fit to answer the question asked by the Hon. R. G. Pike, I again ask the Leader of the House whether he will answer my question, or has he got something to hide?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

There is nothing to hide. The question asked by the Hon. R. G. Pike simply involved referring it to the Public Health Department because it was in the same building.

To answer the query raised by the honourable member, the question would have to be circularised to each department and each instrumentality. We would then have to wait for the answers, and collate the information. There are hospital boards, and the like, and the number could run into dozens.

If the member has any specific query—such as the price of an office in Allendale Square—that would be no trouble. It is a matter of the time it takes to send the question to every department and instrumentality and then collate the information.

- The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I realise that it may take time to obtain the information I require. I have a very good reason for asking the question. I asked it seriously, and I seriously ask the Leader of the House to provide the information when it is available.

### COMMUNITY WELFARE

#### *International Year of the Child: State Participation*

3. The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Leader of the House:
  - (1) What arrangements have been made by the State Government to mark the United Nations International Year of the Child in 1979?
  - (2) Will the Government give an assurance that there will be resources and funds available to give emphasis to this event during 1979 when much of the Government's attention will be given to celebrating Western Australia's 150th Anniversary?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) An interdepartmental committee chaired by the Minister for Community Welfare was set up in June this year to co-ordinate State Government involvement in IYC events. Non-government organizations concerned with IYC are represented on this committee.

A full time organizing secretary to the committee was appointed for a period of two years from July 1978.

- (2) The Department for Community Welfare has been allocated \$50 000 in this year's budget to assist in the development of a Youth Centre at Broome as a special IYC event.

In addition to the salary of the IYC secretary the Government has set aside \$10 000 this financial year for State involvement in IYC and a further \$10 000 for the next financial year.

Also \$2 500 has been allocated to the non-government sector this year and a further \$2 500 after June, 1979.

State Government departments have also been encouraged to make provision in their normal budget for programmes that will emphasise the importance of The International Year of the Child Celebrations.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

##### *Accommodation*

4. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

I again ask the Leader of the House to please answer the last question I asked.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:  
No.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Is the Leader of the House admitting that the Government has something to hide?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No I am not.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I think you have, and that is why you will not answer the question.

#### HEALTH

##### *Graylands Rubbish Dump*

5. The Hon LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Further to my question 446 concerning the very unpleasant and unhygienic conditions created by the rubbish tip at Brockway Road, Graylands, for the patients of the Swanbourne Hospital, is the Minister aware of the article on page 24 of yesterday's *Daily News* headed, "Tip of discontent"?

(2) As a *Daily News* team toured the hospital adjacent to the tip and found a medically untenable and unacceptable situation there, which confirms the information contained in my previous question, will the Minister for Health visit the site to investigate ways and means of overcoming the problem?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(1) and (2) Not being the Minister for Health, I am unable to answer the details in the question. If the member will place the question on the notice paper, it will be answered when we meet next week.

