

Statute of 1930 was to make lawful, subject to certain stringent safeguards, the use of human cadavers to teach anatomy.

It was not intended that the Act should apply in a case where the coroner had specific jurisdiction, nor was it intended to interfere with the performance of autopsies by doctors where permission has been given by the next-of-kin or person lawfully in possession of the body. A further factor was introduced with the passing of the Tissue Grafting and Processing Act in 1956. This provides for people to donate organs after death for use in corneal transplants and other medical applications.

The Bill provides that the position with relation to the Anatomy Act will be clear by stating that nothing in that Act shall extend to or prohibit the procedures to which I have referred.

The last sentence is, in fact, the entire Bill. I tried to ascertain whether there was a need for any further explanation to be given, but I cannot see that there is anything more I need to say to the House. I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. W. A. Manning.

House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 11th August, 1971

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

QUESTIONS (28): ON NOTICE

1. WATER SUPPLIES

West Swan and Herne Hill Schemes

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When is it anticipated that work will commence on the West Swan and Herne Hill high level water schemes?
- (2) What is the anticipated date of completion of the schemes?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Work is expected to start on the cast iron pipe sections of the Herne Hill scheme about the end of September, 1971, and on the West Swan scheme about mid-January, 1972. However, commencement of work on some sections of the schemes is dependent to some extent on the supply of steel plate from the Eastern States.

- (2) By the end of 1971 a large portion of the Herne Hill scheme will be laid but the construction of a concrete tank as part of the permanent supply, will not be complete until August, 1972. However, water at a low pressure will be available in the mains that are laid by the end of 1971. The West Swan scheme will be completed by the end of May, 1972, and water will be available progressively as the mains are laid.

2.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Traffic Charges

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) What were the total number of charges laid by local authorities under the Traffic Act and regulations for the years 1970-71 and 1969-70?
- (2) Which four local authorities laid the greatest number of charges, and what were the number laid respectively?
- (3) Which local authorities laid the least number of charges, and what were the number laid?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) to (3) No records are maintained in the Police Department concerning charges laid by local authorities under the Traffic Act.

Information regarding convictions is received from local authorities and police stations for the purpose of recording on record cards but these are not collated in a way which would show those resulting from charges laid by local authorities.

3.

KINDERGARTEN ASSOCIATION

Application for Financial Assistance

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he advise whether the application referred to in my question 21 on 5th August by the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia (Inc.) for financial help to give relief to parents was—
 - (a) approved; or
 - (b) declined?
- (2) If approved, will he indicate the terms?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) The application was declined.
- (2) Answered by (1).

4. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL AND SHENTON PARK ANNEXE

Expenditure 1969-71

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Would he show the allocation of expenditure between Royal Perth Hospital and Royal Perth Hospital Annexe (Shenton Park) for the years ended 30th June, 1969, 1970 and 1971?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The allocation of maintenance expenditure as between Royal Perth Hospital and Royal Perth (Rehabilitation) Hospital, Shenton Park, for the years ended 30th June, 1969, 1970 and 1971 respectively are as follows:—

	1969	1970	1971
	\$	\$	\$
R.P.H.	7,478,267	8,809,906	10,776,991*
R.P.(R.)H.	1,590,087	1,650,661	2,145,060*
	9,068,354	10,460,567	12,922,051

* Estimated. Costing incomplete.

5 ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Director of Radiology: Working Hours

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

What are the average hours worked each week by the Director of Radiology at Royal Perth Hospital on a part-time basis?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Records are not kept of the hours worked by senior officers of the hospital, including the head of the Department of Radiology.

6. HOSPITALS

Radiologists: Payments

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the formula for payment of radiologists in hospitals confidential?
- (2) If not, what is the formula for payment of radiologists in—
 - (a) Bunbury Regional Hospital;
 - (b) Northam Regional Hospital;
 - (c) Royal Perth Hospital;
 - (d) Princess Margaret Hospital for Children?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes—recognising that radiologists are private or semi-private practitioners.
- (2) (a) and (b) If the Member wishes to obtain further information in relation to these hospitals, he may contact the Director of Administration, Medical Department.

(c) As indicated in the answer to question 3 of 29th July, 1971, and question 37 of 4th August, 1971, the Member may obtain further information if he contacts the administrator direct.

(d) The Member should contact the administrator, Princess Margaret Hospital for Children, to obtain further information.

7.

WATER SUPPLIES

Dam: Murray River

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it intended to build a major dam on the Murray River?
- (2) If so, can he give details of the planning?
- (3) Has any study been made of the possible effect that such a dam would have on the Peel Inlet and its environs?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) It will be necessary at some fairly distant future date.
- (2) No detailed planning has been done.
- (3) No.

8.

CORRIDOR PLAN

Report by Mr. Ritter

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will the authority given to Mr. Ritter to study the corridor plan include the recommendations of the "Pert" report?
- (2) Will any proposed local authority schemes be held up during the period of Mr. Ritter's investigation?
- (3) On what date is the Ritter report expected?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) It would be for Mr. Ritter to decide the nature and extent of studies necessary to enable him to complete his analysis of the metropolitan region scheme.
- (2) No.
- (3) Prior to 31st January next.

9.

HOSPITALS

Electrocardiograph Machines

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many electrocardiograph machines are being used experimentally in Western Australia for the transmitting of heart patients heart rate from one hospital to another?

- (2) When is it intended to distribute these machines to hospitals in the country?
- (3) What hospitals will have these machines?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of each of these machines?
- (5) Is any other equipment required to operate these machines and, if "Yes" what is it?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5) what is the added cost?
- (7) Will the cost of these machines be the responsibility of the Government?
- (8) If (7) is "No" who will bear the cost?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) There are no electrocardiograph machines being used experimentally in this State for transmitting the heart rate of patients from one hospital to another.
 - (2) to (8) These questions appear to relate to electrocardiograph machines, but it seems possible that the Member is referring to something else. Almost all public hospitals in W.A. already have electrocardiograph machines and consequently the questions relating to the estimated cost and whether or not the Government would bear the cost, seem to lack significance.
- It appears likely that the Member has heard that thought is being given to the installation of equipment to make it possible to transmit the heart rate of patients between hospitals. It is true that this is being considered, but so far no installation has been made and it is much too early to consider the introduction of such a system into hospitals throughout the State.

10. EDUCATION

Achievement Certificate

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Considering his reply to part (1) of question 16 on 5th August, when will the periods of senior masters be allocated, and will there be enough administrative periods for them to successfully administer the achievement certificates?
- (2) Has there been a request for a committee of senior masters to investigate the achievement certificate and its introduction to high schools?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" has the request been granted?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) When the achievement certificate is extended to fourth and fifth year. Senior masters will be allowed sufficient non-teaching periods to enable them to supervise the work in their subject areas.
- (2) Yes. A request was received from an organisation named the Senior Masters and Mistresses Association.
- (3) The request was for nominated senior masters to be relieved of teaching duties in order to make a special investigation and report. This was refused.
- (4) The Senior Masters and Mistresses Association was invited to submit suggestions to the Education Department through either the principals of secondary schools or the Education Committee of the Teachers' Union.

11.

POLICE

Films of Demonstrations

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

In view of his answers to question 14 on 5th August, can he explain the unusual request of the Commissioner of Police in asking for a representative of the Minister's office to be present at the destruction of the moratorium demonstration and other films?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The Commissioner of Police advises that training film was found to be unsuitable. As the matter had been made public by the news media and to obviate further conjecture and speculation he instructed the film should be disposed of and chose that this should be done in the presence of an independent witness. A precedent for such action was established during the previous Government's term of office when records of fingerprints taken at the time before murderer Eric Cooke was apprehended were destroyed following strong protests.

12.

TEACHERS

Promotions: Preference

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that with respect to the appointments and promotions of teachers the regulations are to be amended to provide for preference to members of the teachers union?

(2) If "Yes" does this mean that if a union member had lesser qualifications he would be appointed in preference to one with higher qualifications and greater seniority but who was not a member of the union?

(3) If (2) is "No" what does it mean?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes, provided that the qualifications of the union member are adequate for the position to be filled.

(3) Answered by (2).

13. SWAN SHIRE DISTRICT

Zoning Scheme

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Town Planning:

When is it anticipated that the district zoning scheme for the Shire of Swan will be granted preliminary approval?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

About the middle of next month.

14. GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY

Mundaring Shire: Contribution to Upgrading

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Over the past ten years what amount has the Mundaring Shire contributed to the upgrading of the section of Great Eastern Highway which falls within its boundaries?

(2) What specific works were carried out with the shire's contribution?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) \$16,000.

(2) In 1962 agreement was reached with the Mundaring Shire Council that they would share with the Main Roads Department the cost of the following works:—Widen existing carriageway to 32 ft. and construct a second carriageway 32 ft. wide, plus ancillary works, between Gill Street and Fenton Street, to a total cost of \$50,000.

15. NATIVES

Purchase of Houses in Yokine and Dianella

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Is his department or any other department at present negotiating to purchase large houses in Yokine and Dianella for Aboriginal welfare purposes?

(2) How many houses have already been purchased for this purpose in these areas?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yokine two. Dianella nil.

16. HOUSING

Mt. Magnet: Upgrading Programme

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Was a decision made by the State Housing Commission to upgrade a number of commission homes in the town of Mt. Magnet?

(2) If so, is this programme to proceed?

(3) If not, why not?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Tenders will be called next week.

(3) Answered by (1).

17. SOIL CONSERVATION

Report of Australian Agricultural Council

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will he table the report assessing the problem of soil conservation throughout Australia as approved for publication at the last Australian Agricultural Council meeting?

(2) What is the estimated finance needed in Western Australia to implement the findings within the report in respect of the first five year programme?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) A copy of the *Study of Community Benefits of, and Finance for Soil Conservation* prepared by the Standing Committee on Soil Conservation is submitted for tabling.

(2) The report estimates that additional expenditure of \$1,900,000 would be desirable in the first five year programme.

The report was tabled.

18. *This question was postponed.*

19. RAILWAYS

Cost of Knox Plan, and Reduction of Wool Freight

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Railways:

Referring to the second paragraph of the answer to part (1) of question 38 on Thursday, 5th August—

(1) What is the relevance of this to the question originally asked?

- (2) Does this refer to wool consigned to and sold at Albany wool sales and subsequently railed to the port of Fremantle for shipment?
- (3) If the aim in getting more wool to Albany is to see that wool sold at Albany is shipped through Albany, does it not follow that there will be less wool railed from Albany to Fremantle and hence there will be the same loss of revenue to the Railway Department?

Mr. BERTRAM replied:

- (1) By easing the road transport restrictions Mr. Knox's plan could be expected to divert more wool to Albany and encourage direct shipping, thus reducing the amount available for railing Albany to Fremantle, the revenue for which last year was \$250,000.
- (2) Yes, so far as I am aware.
- (3) Yes, in such case there would be less wool railed to Fremantle with an equivalent loss of revenue.

20. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Additional Accommodation

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

In the scheme for adding wards and departments to the Royal Perth Hospital which is under way—

- (a) how many beds will be provided in the new wards;
- (b) what is the estimated date of completion of these wards;
- (c) what is the estimated total cost for these additions?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (a) 139 beds.
- (b) April 1974.
- (c) \$4.4 million.

21. TOURIST RESORTS

Shops: Trading Hours

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Tourism:

Can he give further details regarding his statement in Albany on 6th August that consideration would be given to—

- (a) staggered or extended shopping hours in tourist resorts; and
- (b) grants to private tourist developers?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

These two matters were not the subject of a statement given by me but were among items presented by the Albany Town Council, Albany Tourist Bureau and other interested organisations at a meeting I attended in Albany last Friday, as suggestions for consideration by the Government.

These suggestions, along with several others, will be examined by the appropriate departments to determine what action is considered desirable.

22.

PREMIER

Correspondence: Use of Official Letterhead

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Premier:

- (1) Further to my question 56 of Thursday, 22nd July, 1971, and subsequent questions without notice on the same day regarding the use of letterheads depicting the State crest and headed Premier's Department signed "J. T. Tonkin, Premier of Western Australia" inviting membership of the Australian Labor Party, has he had investigations made into this matter?
- (2) If so, with what results?
- (3) Who authorised the letter to be printed?
- (4) How many of the letters were—
(a) printed;
(b) distributed?
- (5) What has happened to those printed but not distributed?
- (6) What action has been taken to ensure that the practice will not occur again?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It was ascertained that a misunderstanding on the part of the printer was responsible for the mixup.
- (3) to (5) These questions are unrelated to Government administration and the information is not available.
- (6) In future specific directions will be given when it is not intended to have official letterheads from the Premier's Department reproduced.

23.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Location

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

With reference to his statement in Albany on Saturday, 7th August, and reported in *The West Australian* on Monday, 9th August,

1971, regarding the possible establishment of a steel industry, part of which read: "... other coastal centres had also been suggested", what other centres have been suggested to the company or by the company?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

It is deemed to be inadvisable to particularize in respect of localities owing to the damaging effect this could have on land prices in the vicinity.

24. STEEL INDUSTRY

Establishment: Factors

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) In a statement to the *South Western Times*, Bunbury on Tuesday, 10th August, 1971, on steelworks for Western Australia, is he correctly reported as saying: "That the company could not afford to be sentimental or sympathetic towards any particular area . . . will be a matter of hard cold economics"?
- (2) What are the main considerations and factors involved in establishing a steelworks in any area, particularly a coastal country town?
- (3) As in the same article was a portion: "There was nothing to stop any centre from putting its case to the company concerned." would he give the name and address of the company or companies concerned to enable centres to put their case?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Capital, labour, land, harbour facilities, water, power.
- (3) I do not see that anything can be gained by centres approaching the company concerned direct. However, information setting out the claims of particular towns can be prepared and forwarded to me and I will ensure that this is passed on to the company for consideration.

25. RAILWAY PARADE AND SEVENOAKS STREET

Warning Lights

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that a dangerous curve exists on both Railway Parade and Sevenoaks Street on opposite sides of the railway line in the vicinity of the Cannington railway station?
- (2) If "Yes" will he have warning lights installed forthwith?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No. However, the Main Roads Department will investigate the matter.
- (2) Answered by (1).

26.

QUARANTINE

Inspection Control Unit: Eyre Highway

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When was the decision made to re-introduce the inspection control unit on the Eyre Highway by the Agriculture Protection Board?
- (2) What were the reasons?
- (3) How many vehicles will be used?
- (4) How many officers will be involved?
- (5) Is it expected to patrol the highway for 24 hours a day?
- (6) If not, for how many hours a day and how many days a week?
- (7) Is the unit to be used permanently?
- (8) If not, for how many months is it expected the unit will operate?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Towards the end of July, 1971.
- (2) The decision was based on recommendation of a departmental committee that a hazard existed and that this could be met at a reasonable level of cost by a mobile checkpoint operating from Norseman.
- (3) It is anticipated that one vehicle with caravans for office and sleeping accommodation will suffice.
- (4) Staff from the inspection services of the Department will be used on a basis of rotation—two being in the area at the same time.
- (5) No.
- (6) The unit will operate 37½ hours per week with staggered shifts.
- (7) Yes, when commenced. This project has been given a high priority but its commencement will be subject to finance being available. The operation of the unit will be kept under review with respect to changing traffic patterns—changes in relative hazards and operational problems.
- (8) Answered by (7).

27.

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Funds for Construction

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What requests have been made to the Commonwealth Government for an increase in loan funds to

add to the allocation of \$300,000 now made available to the Country High Schools Hostels Authority?

- (2) As the cost for building hostels in the north of Western Australia is much higher than in the South West Land Division, has a request been made for a special allocation to be made to meet the requirements of the north?
- (3) If not, will he give consideration to this aspect of borrowing from the Commonwealth?
- (4) If a shire council is prepared to use its borrowing powers to meet the cost of building a hostel, will the Government give sympathetic consideration to the proposal?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Several approaches have been made at Loan Council meetings to increase the allocation but up to date these requests have not been successful.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Yes.

28. MORATORIUM MOVEMENT

Membership: Ministers

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

Is he aware whether any of the Ministers are members of the moratorium movement now that he has resigned from the movement?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:
No.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

*Entry Onto Property of J. E. and
M. M. Moir*

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Works:

I apologise to the Minister for not giving him prior notice of the question. I received a telephone call on this matter at 10 minutes past four. The question is as follows:—

Would the Minister ascertain whether it is correct that public water supply personnel have entered the unoccupied farm of J. E. and M. M. Moir of Shackleton whose cattle perished allegedly as a result of their drinking water being cut off?

If so, would the Minister ascertain whether permission was given to them by the owners or sharefarmer to proceed

through boundary gates marked "No Trespassing—Trespassers will be prosecuted"?

Would the Minister confirm or otherwise the report that these personnel were taking photographs, and if so, for what purpose?

Would the Minister table the water supply file dealing with J. E. and M. M. Moir of Shackleton?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

For the sake of accuracy I ask that the question be placed on the notice paper. I will certainly have the file tabled and I do not think the honourable member will relish it.

2. TOWN PLANNING

Corridor Plan: Report by Mr. Ritter

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Town Planning:

I would like to ask a question of the Minister for Town Planning further to his reply to my question 8 on today's notice paper. The second part of question 8 reads—

Will any proposed local authority schemes be held up during the period of Mr. Ritter's investigation?

The Minister replied, "No." I now ask whether any decisions of the town planning authority, the Town Planning Board, or any departments of the town planning authority will be held up until such time as a report has been received?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I do not think the situation arises. The proposed corridor plan for Perth was accepted by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority in October or November of last year.

Town planning decisions were made between that time and when it was announced in March, as they have been proceeding uninterruptedly from March until the present time in the absence of the adoption of that plan. Therefore, I do not see that it has any relevance to future decisions which might be made. Obviously any decision will be made within the framework of the existing region and the existing zoning within that region, subject, of course, to minor departures as are provided in the Act. But where there are major departures, naturally the matter must be brought to Parliament,

again in accordance with the terms of the Act. In other words, the further inquiries the Government is instituting will have an impact in the next six months which will be no different from the impact over the previous 12 months.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Establishment at Albany: Grievance

MR. JONES (Collie) [4.51 p.m.]: A statement appeared in last Monday's issue of *The West Australian* which is causing concern to many people throughout the south-west portion of this State. I refer to the statement attributed to the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation regarding the drive to be commenced at Albany, and his announcement to the effect that the Government had suggested Albany as a possible site for the establishment of a multi-million dollar iron and steel industry complex.

Mr. Graham: It is \$1,000,000,000.

MR. JONES: I do not know whether the Press report is correct, and no doubt the Minister will have an opportunity to correct the statement if it is incorrect. As a member representing one of the southern electorates of the State I am rather concerned about the announcement, because for some years rumours have been circulating to the effect that the proposed site for any such establishment would be in the south-west portion of this State.

It will be readily understood that people are thinking that way because the Premier of the day, The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, in September, 1957, attempted to erect a similar complex in the Collie-Bunbury area. However, as a result of restrictions imposed by the Commonwealth Government in relation to the export of iron ore from this State to Japan—and that country was the medium through which finance was to be obtained—the erection of the complex could not be proceeded with.

If members refer to page 1464 of the 1957 *Hansard* they will find a letter written by the then Acting Prime Minister, Sir Arthur Fadden, in reply to Mr. Hawke. At page 1465 of the same *Hansard* that letter indicates that the Federal Government opposed the establishment of an iron and steel industry for a number of reasons. The Acting Prime Minister went to great lengths in the letter to indicate that the Customs (Prohibited Exports) Regulations would have to be amended.

Members will be aware that the establishment of the complex in 1957 was not possible due to the embargo placed on the export of iron ore by the then Federal Government. It is interesting to note that in his reply to the Premier of the day the Acting Prime Minister referred to the size of Australia's known reserves of iron ore,

and indicated they were rather limited in this State. We all know, of course, that this has been disproved and members will be aware of the current situation with regard to the iron ore industry and the exports of iron ore from Western Australia.

Following the radio announcement of the Minister's statements, I received several calls from areas as far away as Bunbury—which is outside my electorate—and also from other parts of the south-west. People asked me what was my attitude to the statement attributed to the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation in relation to the possibility of establishing an iron and steel complex at Albany. I can, of course, readily appreciate the sentiments expressed to me by the various residents of the south-west, because they have been waiting for years for an announcement that an industrial enterprise of some magnitude would be established in the south-west of Western Australia.

Members will readily appreciate the population position in the south-west, and will understand the reaction of the people to the statement which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 9th of this month. If we consider the whole south-west portion of the State we find a vast erosion in the population has occurred. I have with me figures which indicate the erosion that has taken place in the last 11 years, and I am certain the Government of today cannot be blamed for this parlous situation. If members care to study these figures they will see why the people of the south-west are rather disappointed about the report attributed to the Minister—if, in fact, it is correct. For the sake of the record and in order that Parliament will be aware of the parlous situation in the southern portion of the State, I would like to quote the population figures of 13 shires for the year 1959, and also for the year ended the 30th June, 1970. The figures are as follows:—

Shire	POPULATION			
	1959	30/6/1970	Increase	Decrease
Augusta-Margaret River	4,099	3,000	1,099
Boypup Brook	2,719	2,150	569
Bridgetown-Greenbushes	4,383	3,250	1,133
Bunbury	12,234	17,600	5,366
Busselton	6,039	7,450	1,411
Capel	2,010	2,250	240
Collie	11,034	8,450	2,584
Dardanup	1,558	2,000	442
Donnybrook	3,977	3,150	827
Harvey	7,420	6,600	820
Manjimup	11,177	8,900	2,277
Murray	4,305	3,750	555
Nannup	1,655	1,100	555

The overall position of those 13 shires over the last 11 years is that four shires have increased their population by a total of 7,459 whereas nine shires have had their population reduced by a total of 10,479. That represents an overall decline of 3,020 in the population of the south-west in the period to which I refer.

Mr. Court: What is the date of those figures?

Mr. JONES: No doubt the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation will realise the concern being expressed by residents of the south-west portion of the State as a result of the adverse situation I mentioned earlier. They have been looking for the green light but unfortunately it has failed to appear. I would like to know whether the statement attributed to the Minister is correct, and ask that he explain the position to the House.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.00 p.m.]: I can well appreciate the concern so well expressed by the member for Collie. However, I think we must get the record straight. The fact of the matter is that under an agreement passed by this Parliament the prospects of a major iron and steel industry were to be investigated with a view to its establishment at Kwinana; which of course is in the metropolitan area. That situation was accepted by everybody, I feel, because of the satisfaction of having a tremendous industrial complex in Western Australia. In other words this was to be a major breakthrough for this State.

With the change of Government, however, and the decision to give whatever emphasis we could to decentralisation, at the first talks I had with representatives of the company which was the subject of the agreement, I asked whether consideration had been given to establishing these works outside the metropolitan area, to which question the answer was in the negative.

Mr. Court: That is not correct. It was the same company we were dealing with under contract, you know.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the interjector wants me to be precise, there was no serious consideration given to establishing the works outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Court: There was. There were objections from the district about the fact that we were going to establish it there.

Mr. GRAHAM: The request was that attention be given to areas in certain directions. As I indicated when speaking in Albany last Saturday, Albany was one of these areas and the company undertook to make inquiries there as it has undertaken to carry out feasibility studies elsewhere.

As I indicated earlier, because of the impact it has on people who seek to cash in on a situation, perhaps the least said about the locality the better for all concerned.

Mr. Williams: Why?

Mr. GRAHAM: Because under the regime of the previous Government, Albany had reached a low that had never been approached in the previous 40 years—

Opposition members: Oh!

Mr. GRAHAM: —and it was necessary for some action to be taken immediately. This Government has taken that action so that assurances could be given that this is what the Government intended to do; that is, it would do all it could to restore confidence in the locality and give some hope to the people established there. The statement was made for that purpose.

What I want to say now, before dealing specifically with matters relating to the Bunbury-Collie area, is that I was extremely interested to read recently that at a meeting of mayors of local authorities in New South Wales who were interested in decentralisation in their respective regions, one of them was most frank and apparently his viewpoint was accepted by those who attended the conference. His viewpoint was that the greatest enemies against decentralisation are the people in the respective country districts, because if a decision is made by a Government or at governmental level that an industry is to be sited at locality A, immediately there are protests and criticisms from localities B, C, D, right down to X, Y, and Z.

Mr. Williams: You are so right!

Mr. GRAHAM: As a result, the report of the conference was to the effect that governments preferred to let things take their own course, and, unfortunately, it is in the metropolitan areas of the various States of Australia that these industries are established. So there is the political fact. By allowing that to happen, we will see in Western Australia—if the industry is to come to Kwinana and to the Perth metropolitan area—a situation which apparently the country districts were happy to accept. On the other hand, when a Government seeks to encourage such a tremendous concern to have a serious look at our outer regions it can expect criticism, jealousy, and rivalry between the various areas involved.

I do not mind. Indeed, I have invited representatives of these various towns to submit their cases, evidence, and reasons why this important industry should go to their centres; but surely it should not be their part to decry some other area which may have certain advantages.

Having said that, I come to the area referred to by the member for Collie. I suppose it is true that all of us have ideas, intentions, and wishes that a steel industry be established in the south-west portion of the State. Certainly a previous Labor Government had such intentions. As was pointed out before, that was prior to the tremendous resources of iron ore being known, and what was proposed to be established then was minute compared with what is envisaged at present. The quantity of iron ore available now exceeds the wildest hopes and dreams of that previous period.

So we come to Bunbury, where the depth of the water in the harbour is some 40 feet—having been dredged to that depth. I am informed that 42 feet is the maximum to which the harbour can be dredged because of a basalt rock formation underlying the general harbour area and the approaches. Once upon a time we thought of ships in terms of comparatively small tonnages. These days, for the transport of iron ore, they do not speak of ships in terms of 50,000; 100,000; or 200,000 tons, but in terms of ships that will carry 300,000 tons, and these ships require water to the depth of some 65 feet.

The **SPEAKER**: The Minister has two more minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, it will be seen that from a practical point of view it appears the company will have to carry out its investigations elsewhere. In other words, because of the magnitude of the undertaking it cannot be accommodated at Bunbury. I am saying that this would appear to be so. As I have said on many occasions, the company will make its own decision.

Mr. Williams: On the hard, cold facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. It will be encouraged by the Government to go to a place outside the metropolitan area, but with the tremendous investment envisaged, obviously there are so many factors to be taken into account. This company will have to stand up to rival companies in Australia. It will have to compete not only with large Australian concerns; but also with large international concerns on the international market. So, naturally enough, it must look at all aspects. However, I repeat that encouragement is being given to the company and if it decides that Bunbury is to be the place, the Government will be agreeable. However, if it decides on Albany, Geraldton, or Esperance, then any of those places could be the site for the proposed works.

Finally, it may so happen that the company will resolve to remain at Kwinana. I hope—and I think it would be the wish of all of us—it can go further afield; but, above all else, the important thing is that the State of Western Australia shall have a fully integrated iron and steel industry within its borders. The Government welcomes the move and encourages decentralisation, but the company will make the final decision as to where the best location shall be, having regard to all the circumstances.

INTERSTATE RAIL FARES: INCREASE

Minister's Decision: Grievance

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [5.10 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, my grievance concerns the recent increase in rail fares for interstate travel.

Mr. Bickerton: Thank goodness, I nearly had a heart attack!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the manner in which this decision to increase rail fares was handled was grossly unfair to the extent that the position is quite intolerable.

Members might recall that the Government decided to increase interstate rail fares at the end of last month. I do not think anyone would quarrel with the decision to make the increases. However, the decision was made known to the public through an announcement in the Press on the 31st July—a Saturday morning—that the increase would take place from the following day.

After reading this statement in the Press, many people immediately rang the Railways Department. They were told that if they went to the booking office by 11 a.m. they could obtain tickets at the old rate. Of course, many people flocked into the booking office. This led to a mix-up and many people who arrived before 11 o'clock could not obtain their tickets because of the numbers there. The station master announced that he would suspend booking fares for half an hour and then at 11.30 a.m. those who bought tickets would have to pay the new rate.

On the Monday morning the Minister for Railways, after examining the situation, made a decision which completely covered the situation for those people who had gone to the booking office on the Saturday morning. The Minister said that anyone who had been there by 11 o'clock would be able to obtain the tickets at the old rate. In doing this—

Mr. Bertram: The Minister said that, did he?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is the statement attributed to the Minister in the *Daily News* of Monday, the 2nd August. It reads as follows:—

People who applied for interstate rail tickets at the Perth booking office on Saturday morning and could not be attended to, will be issued tickets at the old fares.

This statement was made today by the Minister of Railways, Mr. Bertram.

There is no point in reading further. The Minister considered the situation and had taken immediate action to remedy it. However, for every person who was satisfied by that ministerial decision there were five or more who were dissatisfied.

When the Minister made that decision I think he overlooked a fundamental fact in respect of the booking of fares for interstate travel in Western Australia. The fact which was overlooked is that in Western Australia we have about eight banks. These eight banks have 300 or more branches throughout Western Australia, and all of these branches book for interstate travel. In addition to this, there are 45 travel agencies in Western Australia and all these

agencies take bookings for the Railways Department. In doing this, the banks and travel agencies are doing a service for the community, and they assist the Railways Department. People do not have to travel to a central spot to make a booking.

One can see what has inevitably happened: people who booked months before at any branch of the banks or at any travel agency paid their deposits but these people were denied the opportunity to obtain fares at the old rate. This is an incredible situation. People who made up their minds to go interstate after reading the announcement in the Press on the 31st July could go in and buy tickets at the old rate. However, people who had booked three months before and had actually paid their deposits were denied that opportunity.

The Minister may not know this, but the Railways Department should: every bank is required to have a railway account. I believe also that every travel agency has a railway account. When a person wants to book for interstate rail travel at any of these places a deposit of \$10 must be paid. The Railways Department requires this deposit because if the ticket is cancelled within two months of the date of departure the \$10 is forfeited.

So this was the situation: banks and travel agencies throughout Western Australia had taken bookings and deposits months in advance. In my opinion this constituted a firm contract with the Railways Department. These people were then specifically excluded from obtaining tickets at the old rate because the announcement regarding the rise in fares was made on a Saturday morning when the banks were closed. People who had booked through a bank were denied the opportunity to pay the fare in full. This applies to hundreds of people throughout Western Australia.

The banks would have protected the interests of their clients immediately had they been given any warning; but because the announcement was made on a Saturday morning their clients suffered, even though their bookings were made months before.

The situation was made worse because some firms in Western Australia actually received a tip-off. I am not suggesting this came from the Minister; I am not even suggesting it came from the Railways Department. There are all sorts of ways of obtaining this information. Somewhere, somehow, someone advised some firms, and those firms immediately rushed to the Railways Department on the Friday and paid the fares of their own clients. They paid them up to three months in advance. So that was the situation; some firms, because of advance information obtained by a leakage from the Railways Department—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —were able to protect the interests of their clients. However, other firms, because they did not have access to that information, were not able to do that.

The banks were closed on Saturday morning, so the banks' representatives were not able to go to the Railways Department and protect the interests of their clients. This meant that the banks' clients who had booked months before and had paid their deposits, were not in a position to purchase their tickets at the old rate.

I have received many letters in respect of the matter. One in particular is from a man who booked in May. He has received several letters from the National Bank confirming the booking. He paid a deposit of \$20 on two fares of \$173.50. The new fares will mean an increase of \$86.75 to this man, so it is a substantial difference. Even though he had booked and paid his deposit on the 7th May, he was not able to take advantage of the old rate.

In these circumstances I suggest to the Minister the only possible thing to do is to ensure that all those who booked in advance, and paid their deposits through any of the agencies I have mentioned, should have the opportunity to obtain their fares at the old rate. I think that is the thing to do in this situation. I would like to inform the Minister that there are many hundreds of these people.

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

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTEL, MERREDIN

Extension: Grievance

MR BROWN (Merredin-Yilgarn) [5.20 p.m.]: I wish to draw the attention of the Minister for Education to the situation which country children within the eastern wheatbelt generally face in regard to hostel accommodation. There is only one hostel east of Northam, and that is situated in the Shire of Merredin. It was established in 1962, and the reason for its establishment was that the Commonwealth had evicted the hostel authority from its property which was known as the 10 Stores Depot—formerly an R.A.A.F. depot at Merredin.

Subsequently, in 1969, after further representations the hostel was extended in accordance with the requirements of the district. In 1971 a further temporary extension was made by the addition of a transportable type of building. At present there are 128 children resident at this hostel which serves the surrounding areas of Beacon, Koorda, Bencubbin, and Mukinbudin through to Bruce Rock, Narembeen, Kondinin and further east towards Westonia and Southern Cross. It is proposed that the children might be provided with alternative hostel accommodation in Bunbury, and naturally the parents of the

children affected face a grave situation. It is particularly hazardous to families which are in a tight financial situation; because the proposal is that consideration will be given to the provision of accommodation for these children in the Bunbury area when the hostel in that town is open.

It is my earnest request that the Education Department gives serious consideration to the immediate extension of the hostel at Merredin which caters for children from the surrounding districts at the very reasonable tariff of some \$420 a year. This hostel is excellently managed, and at present there is a waiting list of about 78 children, 42 of whom will receive accommodation next year but the remaining 36 will be denied it.

I feel that in the interests of education, of expansion, and of decentralisation, these youngsters are entitled to the same opportunities that are available to people living in more favourable areas; and in this respect I refer to the distance involved in travelling.

It is also my contention that the Merredin High School should be upgraded in line with the expansion of the hostel. Therefore I make this request to the Minister for his urgent consideration: that with the extension of the Merredin hostel—known as St. Michael's House—in collaboration with other departments concerned with education, the extension of the Merredin High School should be proceeded with.

WOOL

Reduction in Rail Freight: Grievance

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [5.24 p.m.]: I have a grievance to put before the House, and in so doing I am really echoing the grievances of many farmer woolgrowers throughout the State. I refer, of course, to the 50 per cent. reduction in rail freights from towns 170 miles north of Albany to Albany itself.

We realise fully the necessity to assist Albany to survive, but we did not expect that discriminatory action would be taken, area to area, and farmer to farmer, in the reduction of the freight on wool, in view of the fact that a reduction in wool freights is urgently needed by all farmers in all country towns to enable those country towns, as well as Albany, to continue to exist. I spoke on this matter in the House only a week ago. I stated that the broad gauge railway line had, in fact, increased by 16½ per cent. the cost of getting the wool from the farm to the store.

For a long time we have been looking for means to reduce the cost of transporting and handling our wool. It would appear that it is the Commonwealth and the international attitude that the only way to enable farmers to retain some

money from the sale of their wool is by reducing the costs associated with production.

In the early 1950s a prosperity loading was placed on the freight on wool. At that time nobody argued about the imposition of this loading; but I suggest it is now equally important that that prosperity loading should be taken completely off, if the farmers, the storekeepers, and the country towns are to survive.

Mr. Graham: Are you sure there is still a prosperity loading?

Mr. GAYFER: I am positive this loading has not been altered since the early 1950s, and the Minister can ascertain that for himself outside of the 10 minutes I am allowed for this speech.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Bateman): Order! The member for Avon may continue.

Mr. GAYFER: I am much obliged. The action of the Government in applying a reduction of 50 per cent. in rail freights to one portion of the State is discriminatory. I understand that such reduction will be applied for 12 months; but as there is an indication that some farmers will gain while others will lose, the Labor Party if it is genuine in its desire to help the farmers should either reduce all rail freights on wool to a common level or allow the farmers to cart their wool to the stores by the cheapest possible means.

Mr. Graham: This is from a man who voted for the Knox plan which will benefit one area only.

Mr. GAYFER: The Minister should make his speech later.

Mr. Graham: My remark has hit the bull's eye!

Mr. GAYFER: Country towns are only as prosperous as the amount of spending money that is available in the pockets of farmers; and that fact is well known. Today we find many towns in this State in dire straits—in a position just as serious as that facing Albany.

I fully appreciate the motive of the Government in trying to help Albany, and to this I have no objection; but I would point out that the same motive should be extended to all users of the railway system for the transport of wool throughout Western Australia, thus enabling farmers to retain more money in their pockets to be spent in their home towns, so that those towns, as well as Albany, can survive.

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn—Minister for Railways) [5.28 p.m.]: I do not think this grievance justifies very much comment.

Mr. Gayfer: That will be very interesting when it appears in the Press.

Mr. BERTRAM: I am not talking to the Press in this instance, but to the Parliament.

Mr. Gayfer: I will have that put in the country Press.

Mr. BERTRAM: The honourable member can put it wherever he likes.

Mr. Gayfer: I will do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will continue.

Mr. BERTRAM: My complaint about this alleged grievance is that it is simply not genuine. Here we have somebody complaining about discrimination, when only recently he and other members beside him on the opposite side of the House were pressing for precisely that. Not only was concern expressed about rail freights but also about the cartage by road vehicles. Concern was expressed not only in regard to the cost of cartage of wool by road vehicles, but also the fact that in a very wide area defined in the Knox plan the cartage of wool could be undertaken by road transport whilst in no other part of the State would this method be permitted.

Mr. Graham: And backloading coupled with it.

Mr. BERTRAM: Yes; backloading and all the other consequences which flow from it.

Mr. Graham: For one area only.

Mr. BERTRAM: On the question of genuineness let us consider another aspect. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat and those sitting with him in the Opposition were wanting something done in a great hurry to assist Albany. The Government took a step to provide this assistance and the people of Albany are, I understand, rejoicing in the step which though slightly different from the one requested, is far more efficient than that proposed by the previous Government which wanted to support the Knox plan.

Having done the job more efficiently we find ourselves with an allegation—and that is all it is because it has no substance—that we are discriminating. There has been discrimination in rail and other services for many years; certainly since 1959 until the 20th February, 1971. Why then do they raise the question of discrimination now if they are really sincerely genuine in what they are saying? The answer is that they are not genuine. The present action is being taken to meet a desperate situation and those who know anything know that desperate situations require desperate remedies. These are wanted forthwith, not at some distant future time or, worse still, not at all. The Deputy Premier has already indicated instances where no action was taken. He has also pointed out that Albany is in a far worse position today—or was last week or

thereabouts—than it has been for 40 years. What are we supposed to do about it? Nothing!

This Government was not prepared to sit around and do nothing. It was prepared to take some action, and when a Government is prepared to take action it is criticised. We do not mind constructive, fair, and genuine criticism—and I hope this will also go into the country newspaper.

Mr. Gayfer: It will.

Mr. BERTRAM: We expect criticism to have real substance and to be constructive rather than defeatist or in the no-hoper category, as was the grievance just expressed by the member for Avon. He does not have a grievance at all and the House should treat his remarks on that basis.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Construction of Kwinana-Balga Power Line: Personal Explanation

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [5.33 p.m.]: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is there any dissentient voice? Leave is granted.

Mr. THOMPSON: As a result of a question I asked on Wednesday, the 4th August, and subsequent publicity given to it in the Press, it may appear that I have misled the House, and I would like to clarify the position. The following is the question I directed to the Minister for Electricity:—

I preface this question by saying that at a public meeting held at Kalamunda on the 7th June, this year, the General Manager of the State Electricity Commission announced that a decision would be made, within two months from that night in regard to which of two routes under survey by the commission would be adopted for the construction of the 330,000 volt power line from Kwinana to Balga. Will the Minister say whether the decision is to be announced by the 7th of this month? If not, when will it be announced?

The Minister replied—

I cannot give very much additional information. Mr. Gillies still has three days to contact me. As soon as I have any information it will be made available.

On the 7th August an article appeared in *The West Australian*, portion of which reads as follows:—

Mr. Jamieson said yesterday that he had answered Mr. Thompson's question off-the-cuff.

On checking with Mr. Gillies, he had found that the facts were not as Mr. Thompson had stated.

It appeared from that article that I had lied to the House. I would like to say there was no question in my mind that Mr. Gillies had in fact said the decision would be made within two months, and this has been confirmed by a number of people who have contacted me as a result of the Press article. I would like to quote from the transcript of the meeting held in Kalamunda on the 7th June.

The SPEAKER: Is it a long quotation?

Mr. THOMPSON: No. It is related to a statement made by Mr. Gillies and I will read just the last part of that statement as reported in the minutes of the meeting to which I have referred. It is as follows:—

He also reiterated the point made by the President in that the decision would have to be made within two months.

I hope the Minister will acknowledge that what I said was, in fact, true.

Mr. Jamieson: It is a pity the academy awards have already been given this year.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

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

SNOWY MOUNTAINS ENGINEERING CORPORATION ENABLING BILL

Third Reading

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.39 p.m.]: I rise firstly to ask the Minister whether he will ensure that when the Bill is introduced in another place more information is given to the members of that Chamber about the background of the corporation and its legislation, because I think it is obvious that this House did not receive very much information. It would have been much better for the whole proposition, including the interests of the corporation, if more information had been given.

The second point on which I would like an assurance from the Minister is this: when he is requested by the corporation or

by a potential client to approve its operations in this State, will he ensure that such approval is not given if there is a local firm which has the capacity and expertise to undertake the work and it is, in fact, willing to do it on a reasonable basis?

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.40 p.m.]: If I might deal with the last-mentioned point first. I am not prepared to make a categorical statement in reply to a supposititious case. I think a Minister would need to have regard for all the facts and circumstances. I would think, somewhat naturally, that any Minister, irrespective of personal feelings or party, would make use of the local talent in preference to that from overseas if it could be demonstrated that the local talent was in every way capable of measuring up to the task.

With respect to the information to be made available to the other House, I will give consideration to that request. I did not for one moment anticipate that any questions would be raised. To my mind the Bill is simple and straightforward. It is nothing in itself, but it makes it possible for certain things to take place if the State Minister of the Crown feels so disposed. I repeat: I will give consideration to the request by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I will submit notes to my colleague in another place for his use when he introduces the Bill there.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BULK HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

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

GARDEN ISLAND

Public Access: Motion

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.43 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House there should be a joint study by appropriate Commonwealth and State officials to report and recommend on the practicability of public access to parts of Garden Island for recreational purposes without security risk or inhibiting the development of the Stirling naval facilities.

I move this motion with the intention of emphasising the necessity for Garden Island to be developed in the best interests of all the people, having full regard for the security of the naval commitment; the recreational and holiday resort which exists; the important need for the future preservation of flora and fauna; the long

and fully recorded history of the island; and the relief which the present development can bring to Mangles Bay.

I am asking all members of the House to support my motion because it is not an attack on the Government, and does not confront anybody. The motion seeks only to emphasise the objectives and future of Garden Island. I am asking for the unanimous support of this House to emphasise the fact that future development of Garden Island should receive the full attention of the State and Commonwealth Governments, having regard for all the interests involved.

I wish to acknowledge the contributions made by so many who are interested in this subject. Many people have telephoned and informed me of their points of view, and others have provided me with relevant information. I have been supplied with a wealth of information on Garden Island, and also information relating to the naval facilities. Of course, the necessity for considering the future of Rockingham is also involved and this, I suppose, is a very good reason for my moving the motion in the House. I am indeed grateful to all those who have been in touch with me and who have expressed their points of view.

I intend to present the motion in four parts: The need to provide recreational facilities for our people; the part Garden Island has played in the past, and the part it will play in the future; the Government naval commitment—which is very real—and then to summarise my comments and finally ask all members of the House to support me.

We are all aware that our population is increasing at a dramatic rate. Also, the mobility of our population is increasing, and the situation is far more prevalent than it was some years ago. Personal incomes have risen sharply, and the hours available for leisure have increased. These facts combine to make it imperative that we keep ahead of the human demand for recreational parks. I think most people accept this need, and I hope to develop this theme so that more people will agree with me.

National parks fulfil the human need for recreation in a natural environment just as nature reserves provide a natural environment for plants and animals. The psychic needs of our people can be advanced as an argument to support the idea of setting aside reserves for recreation. As the question of reserves is considered further it will become obvious that for a long time they have played an important part in providing natural environment.

There has been a growing conviction among doctors, psychiatrists, social workers, and others who are in close association with the ills of our people, that

urban life in an industrial society is taking a heavy toll by causing physical and mental illnesses. One form of therapy which has proved successful for many people is the practice of getting away to the country or the beach and leaving the stress behind. This habit has become very popular.

Another popular habit is to spend annual holidays either camping or fishing, and this has proved a successful form of therapy. Weekend bush-walking is another. The point is that many avenues are open to a person who wants to get away from the worries of work. Present indications are that the people are participating more and more in these pursuits, and the increase in numbers is approximately 10 per cent. each year. The figure of 10 per cent. is not from my own observation; I have seen it quoted.

The increase I have quoted highlights the need for constantly increasing the number of reserves available for public use. I encourage members to think back to their childhood associations because, in my opinion, such reflection is the best way to highlight the need for parks and reserves.

I often think back and remember my childhood, and my home town of Denmark. Some of my happiest memories are of the Saturdays when we went out with the fishermen. The fishermen threw the undersized fish overboard and we would dive into the water and pick up the fish before they regained their senses. I can remember playing cowboys and Indians on Sundays. Our sisters were the squaws, and our cousins and brothers, and their friends, would be the Indians.

We would raid grandfather's orchard and, possibly, his vegetable patch, and then have a real feast and tear around the large bush paddocks. Such memories bring back the very pleasant times I have enjoyed. I am sure every member retains similar experiences in his mind. I remember when I was at Geraldton, at the age of 17 or thereabouts, we used to go to Greenough Flats and visit the crayfish grounds. If the Premier cares to ask his wife I am sure she could endorse these remarks. In those happy days in 1939 and the early 1940s we were not worried about licenses. A party could go out, have a pleasant day, pick up a few crayfish, boil a kerosene tin of tea, and have a sing-song. So the time went by.

I would think that every member in the House has been on camping trips when young and possibly when not so young. Most people thoroughly enjoy such outings. I know that there are some who go on caravan trips who do not enjoy them to the same extent as others who might eulogise about them. My experiences of caravanning in the remote parts of the State have been extremely pleasant. A great deal

of the happiness and benefit from these trips comes from the natural environment and surroundings.

At this time it is relevant to refer to Yanchep. Initially I have established the need man has for recreation; the need to get away from everything. I was interested to see the section in the report, *National Parks and Native Reserves in Western Australia*, relating to Yanchep. The book was published in 1963. Remarks relating to Garden Island are also contained in the book. This helps us understand the case which exists at present in connection with Garden Island. If I may, I would like to quote the remarks to which I have referred so that members may understand how our parks are developing and what the public response to them is. The report says—

Yanchep Park, an area of 6,000 acres, is placed in the Coastal Plain 32 miles north of Perth. It is a leading tourist attraction within easy reach of the city and lies in scenery typical of the dune systems of the Quaternary aeolianite.

Situated in the northern part of the range of Tuart Forest (Tuart occurs sporadically for nearly another hundred miles to the north), the vegetation is in marked contrast to that of the southern Tuart as exemplified in the Ludlow State Forest near Capel. In the north, the Tuart trees do not form a pure stand . . .

That gives members some understanding of the position, but I will not proceed to quote further from this section. I want to refer to the part which deals with people. As has been said, Yanchep is a large area, 6,000 acres in extent, 32 miles from Perth, and it contains a good stand of timber. It is all part of the natural reserve. The report continues—

The Park contains some good tourist facilities in the form of a hotel, swimming pool, tearooms, etc.; there is a small zoo of Australian animals and a natural lake which has been developed for boating. There is also a golf course.

Recommendations relating to the future of the park are contained in the report, which says—

The Sub-committee is of the opinion that:

- (1) An expert committee should be set up to make recommendations on the subdivision of the Park into areas to be classified by legislation as either Class A Reserves for the preservation of flora and fauna or Class A Reserves for public recreation;
- (2) The part of the whole area set aside for the preservation of flora and fauna should be classified as a National Nature-Reserve (of Northern Tuart).

I have mentioned this, because it is relevant to what is said about Garden Island. It shows what the needs are in relation to the activities in Yanchep. In recent times I have read reports on many occasions to the effect that Yanchep has reached saturation point, so far as visitors are concerned. The report says—

On Monday, 12th October, 1970, 1771 cars and 3 buses entered Yanchep Park. There simply is not room for that many people in the Park but it is expected that the 2000 mark will be passed soon.

This gives some understanding of the need for parks and reserves which are near to the city and easily accessible to the people. Recently I attempted to obtain more detail, but the report in question has obviously not been completed. Mr. Hillary of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has been preparing a report on the use of coastal land. I understand he remarked to a group to whom he was speaking that we need handy reserves of at least one square mile within 20 miles of the city. Of course we need all sorts of reserves, but this is an indication of Mr. Hillary's thinking on this item. I attempted to obtain some more detail to further support my argument, but to date it has not been available.

This same report, *National Parks and Nature Reserves in Western Australia*, also comments on Garden Island. The comments are relevant to the motion under discussion. The report says—

Garden Island is part of the same drowned dune landscape as Rottnest Island.

The vegetation of this Island is remarkable for three reasons: Firstly, certain important families of the mainland are either absent (Proteaceae), or present in restricted numbers (Myrtaceae and Papilionaceae). Secondly, the dominant species present show an unusually high frequency, five-sixths of the area of the Island being covered by dense scrub . . .

The report goes on to explain what the scrub is, and then states—

The fauna of Garden Island is of particular interest because it, like Rottnest, also harbours a wallaby but in this case a very different species. The species on Garden Island is the Tammar *Protemnodon eugenii*, a wallaby which is now sparsely distributed on the mainland but occurs as a very dense population on this Island. This species is the same as that which occurs on some of the islands of the Abrolhos and the Recherche, but each of the populations appears to be slightly different from the other and a close study of these populations is expected to yield important information on the evolution of wallaby species on small islands.

There is a regular launch service to and from Rockingham Jetty and Palm Beach. The Island has 44 cottages for hire and two large accommodation blocks in addition to camping areas.

These remarks are relevant to the settlement. The report continues—

Electricity is available, and there is a store and tearooms. A telephone service also extends to the Island. It is a popular holiday resort with swimming, boating and fishing the main attractions.

The Island is at present held freehold by the Commonwealth but is under lease from the Commonwealth to the Garden Island Development Company.

Because the Island is small, and tourist development is bound to occur haphazardly to the detriment of the bushland unless rigidly controlled, the time will come when the area available to the population of wallabies is so small that it can no longer support both the natural bush and the fauna. Biologists and nature lovers agree that this would be a tragedy. There are thus excellent reasons for providing for the legal separation, preservation and management, of natural bush areas on the Island while there is yet time.

Members will appreciate that this was written in former times before the present involvements, but I think it is important to record the past and look realistically to the present and the future. The opinion expressed in the report is—

The sub-committee is of the opinion that an expert committee should be set up to select areas on the Island which should be gazetted Class A Reserves for the preservation of fauna and flora and vested in an authority competent to provide adequate biological management in order to ensure the continuation of the natural fauna and flora.

The Sub-committee notes that the natural bushland setting forms an important part of the charm of this Island.

Those are comments by people who are directly interested in promoting reserves. These are just two reserves of a very large number. In expressing my thoughts on the need for reserves, I think it is interesting to look at the position of Wal-yunga National Park, which was purchased in 1966 for \$100,000. Figures indicate that something like 900 cars visit the park on certain days and this gives some idea of the activity and interest in that park.

Who knows what the future holds? I believe that emphasises the great need for having reserves in areas which are conveniently located for the city people to visit them. This matter is emphasised in

the report entitled *The Corridor Plan for Perth*, on page 22 of which there is a reference to the population growth of this State which seals any argument to the effect that an increasing number of reserves must be provided for our people. I now read the section of the report which deals with population growth as estimated by the planners who wrote the booklet—

The basis of any forward planning must spring from an estimation of the future population that will live in the Corridor Plan area. At the 1966 Census the Metropolitan Region population was about 559,000. The remaining centres had much smaller numbers: Bunbury 15,500, Mandurah 2,700, and Pinjarra just under 1,000.

The Metropolitan Region population had increased to 650,000 by the end of 1969.

Between 1970 and 1989 the total population of the Region is expected to grow at an average annually compounded rate of 4.2 per cent. With this growth rate there will be 1,436,000 people in the Region by 1989. The population of the State at that time is expected to be 2,009,000, which means that 71.5 per cent of the State population will be living in the Perth Region.

Despite the facts I mentioned previously, that quotation emphasises what is needed in the way of reserves to cope with the growth in population.

Mr. Jamieson: It is a pity you did not think of that when you let some of the beaches go.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not wish to join in any controversies. Tonight, I will not attempt to answer any attacks that might be made on me or any points of view. If the Minister wishes to interject, he may do so. I will not comment because the motion I have placed before the House is not intended to provoke antagonism. All I ask is that it be received in the spirit in which I am moving it; that is, in an endeavour to have a full investigation made.

Mr. Jamieson: What does the member for the district think of it?

Mr. RUSHTON: He supports the thoughts I am putting forward.

Mr. Jamieson: Have you checked with him?

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes.

Sir David Brand: He might not be allowed to, of course.

Mr. RUSHTON: Naturally enough, I have thought about this subject for a considerable time, and I think the member for the district has done likewise. His electorate has now been joined to mine by the causeway, so we have very close interests.

It is interesting to look at the figures of estimated population growth in the various sectors. Once again, I do not wish to be controversial about the corridors. The expected growth in population in the developed sections of the urban core is from 275,000 in 1966 to 396,000 in 1989. In the intermediate sections of the urban core the expected growth is from 184,000 in 1966 to 371,000 in 1989.

In the outer areas of the corridors a very dramatic growth is expected in the north, which includes the Balga district—from 6,000 in 1966 to 185,000 in 1989. In the east, going up through Midland and Greenmount, the estimated growth is from 38,000 in 1966 to 105,000 in 1989. In the south-east, through Armadale and down towards Pinjarra, the population is expected to increase from 26,000 in 1966 to 131,000 in 1989. In the south-west—which includes the area I am concerned with in this motion—the expected growth is from 30,000 people in 1966 to 249,000 in 1989.

Those are very dramatic movements in population, which confirm in my mind—and, I hope, in the minds of all members present—the importance of providing recreational facilities in the future, quite apart from the issue concerning Garden Island. Far greater facilities will be required than Garden Island can be expected to provide. We must therefore take the opportunity to ensure to the best of our ability that recreational facilities are provided for our people.

It is interesting to consider Garden Island itself. I received a report from the Lands Department in answer to my queries as to the past history of Garden Island. However, the latest reports prepared by the Commonwealth Department of Works give an acreage of Garden Island which differs slightly from the acreage given to me by the Lands Department. I will settle for Garden Island being somewhere around 3,000 acres.

The report from the Lands Department states that Garden Island, which contains an area of 3,026 acres, is held in fee simple in the name of the Commonwealth of Australia, having been compulsorily acquired for defence purposes in the years 1915 and 1916. With the exception of several small reserves and the strip of foreshore between high and low water marks, Garden Island, at the time of acquisition, was already freehold and was the subject of 53 certificates of title.

This prompted me to consider other matters such as the early settlement of the State. One tends to believe that when Captain Stirling set foot in this State nobody had been here before him. We tend not to look far enough back; but obviously sailing ships entered Cockburn Sound away back in the 1600s. I am aware of a French navigator entering Cockburn Sound at about that time.

According to old records Garden Island, comprising Cockburn Sound Location 9, was granted to Sir James Stirling, but the grant is not enrolled in the Registry of Deeds. When the land was brought under the operation of the Transfer of Land Act in 1886, the registered proprietor was Alexander William Thorold Grant Thorold of Lincolnshire, England. It was transferred on various occasions between 1886 and 1896 after which it became the property of Stephen Henry Parker, a barrister, who subsequently transferred various portions and interests. A subdivision was made of some 411 acres of the southern portion of the island, but all interests were compulsorily acquired by the Commonwealth.

There is no dispute as to who owns Garden Island. Obviously the Commonwealth has jurisdiction over it; and this motion purely seeks to arrange negotiations. The State cannot take action to demand or require the Commonwealth to do anything.

However, many people are interested in Garden Island and I think we should consider their interests. The island is settled in various parts. My understanding is that 150 or more cottages have been built on the island; some in the north, some in the south, and some in the middle settlement. Something like 65 cottages have been built in the northern portion of the island.

I would say that the people who frequent these cottages would come from Fremantle, Hilton Park, and the surrounding areas. I know some of these people, because they have acquainted me with their circumstances. Their families have been visiting Garden Island for at least 70 years. They use the island for camping and recreational purposes.

I have been told that cottages have been established on Garden Island for something like 40 years. Those who built the cottages have installed septic systems and reticulated water supplies. In fact, the island is an ideal holiday resort of the type for which most of us yearn. Members will therefore appreciate why the people are not happy to relinquish their cottages. There is another settlement at the southern end of the island which will be directly in the path of the intended Naval developments. I have received requests from the people concerned that they should be allowed to remain on the island for as long as possible.

Garden Island has many other features, one of which is its historical value. The Western Australian Historical Society (Inc.) desires to erect on the island a monument to its past history. Most of us would, of course be aware that the Z-force—a renowned and highly regarded body of men who did so much in wartime—was based on the island. This is particularly

significant to me, because a very good friend of mine was a member of that Z-force. He lost his life overseas; and probably his last look at Australia would have been Garden Island. So that would be another factor to be considered.

I have listened to arguments regarding what should be done with Garden Island, and I have read the reports of the various inquiries which have considered the future of the island, but nothing definite has been submitted as to what should be established on the island. That encourages me to ask the Government—in due course, when I can place the proper emphasis upon it—to arrange for further negotiations. I have heard the argument that other naval bases throughout the world are sited on far smaller pieces of land. One such example is Garden Island in Sydney. There are two points of view in connection with this submission. Some bases have been established on small areas of land, but those bases do not provide complete facilities, they provide only a few facilities. However, I feel I am not competent to develop this argument, because I would need to know all the factors involved.

Submissions have been made to me, on a friendly basis, that the causeway could provide some excellent fishing spots in the future; because it would be possible for people to wander along the causeway and throw in a line. When I visited the scene on Sunday I found that I could not proceed past the beginning of the causeway. I think the authorities have had some unhappy experiences of people racing along the long corridor of earth—which is now sealed—and, apparently, causing damage. So I suppose that until the project is completed, people will not be permitted to get too close to the construction.

One most important aspect relating to this motion—and it is one of the reasons that prompted me to submit the motion to the House for its approval—is that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works investigates projects such as this and makes recommendations to the Federal Parliament. I am aware that the committee intends to investigate the future development and use of Garden Island either in December of this year or early next year.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. RUSHTON: Before the tea suspension I presented to the House the basis on which I moved this motion. Briefly I have given reasons for believing that public recreation reserves are so important to our people. I have presented supporting evidence of what the population will be and how this confirms the need for constant additions to be made to those reserves. I mentioned past associations and some of the interests that have been established on Garden Island.

I did omit to mention another two or three interests that have been established on the island. For example, the C.S.I.R.O. has a research project at the north-west corner of Garden Island which also needs to be considered, and I think our own State department was interested in establishing an ocean museum on the north of the island. I then travelled from north to south by mentioning the various interests that people have in their own holiday resort, because it has been an ideal holiday resort for quite a long time.

On the island there are items of historical interest. There is a wish to retain historical monuments and to establish others to commemorate the early part of the State's history. I mentioned that Z-Force had been there and it was important that its past associations should be remembered. I mentioned also that various fishermen who visited the island had established their interests. It was also interesting to note the observation that had been made that over 100 craft visited the area on a holiday, and figures have been quoted to me to show that over 1,000 people had visited the island over a holiday period.

So there should be no doubt in our minds that Garden Island has long had an attraction to the many people who use that holiday resort and those people wish it remain a place they can visit for a long time in the future.

Mr. Jamieson: Have you talked this over with the member for the district?

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes; I talked to the member for Cottesloe before he went away and he was agreeable to my raising the issue.

I now wish to refer to the influence of the commitment the Navy has in establishing itself on Garden Island, and this has to be considered in balance with the whole question before I sum up and make suggestions at the end of my speech. I am grateful for the fact that a copy of the report of the Commonwealth Department of Works on a "Naval Support Facility, Western Australia, Point Peron-Garden Island Causeway," has been made available to me. This, of course, is just the beginning of the whole project, but the fact that \$9,000,000 is involved gives some idea of the immensity of the whole project. I understand that these facts have been circularised by publication in the Eastern States' Press. This report was obtained, I believe, by a Commonwealth member in answer to a question of mine to enable me to gain a better understanding of this project.

To recapitulate, and to place on record some of the past history related to the establishment of this naval support facility project, we go back to May, 1967, when the Department of the Navy requested the Commonwealth Director-General of Works to commission Maunsell and Partners to

report on the feasibility of establishing a naval base at Cockburn Sound. When the report was submitted in 1968 it confirmed that the facility should be situated on Garden Island, and a connecting causeway was included in the initial development. The report stated that the facility should be located on Garden Island, centred at Port Royal.

As we know, the Prime Minister of the day announced in 1969 that naval facilities would be built in Cockburn Sound. A description of the project gives some idea of its magnitude and at this point of time I must state that I have not had an opportunity to read the whole of the report that deals with Garden Island and what part the State authorities played in bringing this project into being. However, I can imagine that this has been the desire of State Governments for a long time.

The people of Western Australia have always shown a great deal of interest in the establishment of naval facilities in Western Australia and this report, of course, is the result of all this interest. The report continues by giving a description of the project. As many members would know now, the causeway will be approximately 13,500 feet long. The report reads as follows:—

The Works brought before the Committee in this reference comprise:

- (a) Southern Approach Rockfill Mole (approximately 2,100 ft.)
- (b) 1,000 feet of low-level trestle bridging.

Any member who has been in that location recently will realise that this work has been done. I made a close inspection on Sunday last but I found a gentleman sitting at the beginning of the works who prevented my inspecting them any further. However, the causeway has certainly been completed to a length of 3,100 feet. The report continues—

- (c) A Central Section of Armoured Rockfill Mole (approximately 6,200 feet).

I think a contract has been let for this work. Continuing—

- (d) A 2,020 foot Bridge Section incorporating a high-level bridge giving 40 ft. clearance over the Boat Channel.
- (e) Northern Approach Rockfill Mole (approximately 2,400 feet); and
- (f) A dredged Boat Channel of 100 ft. navigable width and 12 ft. depth below Low Water Ordinary Spring Tide.

These items, of course, are of tremendous interest to all people who boat and fish in this area, and I am sure it is of very

great interest to the people of Western Australia generally. The report continues—

The design of the causeway will provide for:

- (a) A two-lane roadway of 24 ft. pavement width.
- (b) A 5 ft. footway.

This may be something which will inspire quite a few people. That is, the fact that in due course they will be able to fish from this footway. It will be particularly attractive to line fishermen. I hope that, with negotiation, this matter will be clarified and some final decision will be arrived at between the State and the Commonwealth.

The report goes on—

- (c) Accommodation for water, power and communication services, (to be constructed underground in mole sections).
- (d) Road lighting.

Further on in the report a description of the site is given, which reads—

The causeway will be constructed across an area known as the Southern Flats—between Rockingham and Garden Island.

As we know, this water is within the Port of Fremantle and control is vested in the Fremantle Port Authority. In the past the authority has played a very big part in the negotiations that have taken place. In fact, I have with me a copy of the authority's past wishes in regard to other developments at this location. This has changed somewhat and it would be interesting if the Minister, in due course, could mention what stage the present negotiations have reached; that is, if he is to present a better understanding of some of the points I have made tonight. For instance, we do know that this causeway is swinging somewhat north of the original site and from my interpretation of the plan there was no 1,000 ft. low-level bridge in the earlier conception of the development—

Mr. Jamieson: The Commonwealth has never altered its plans but the original plan of the harbour board was never followed.

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes, but there would need to be further negotiations based on that original plan. Do I now understand the Fremantle Port Authority is not unhappy with what is going on so far as its projected works are concerned?

Mr. Jamieson: They are getting it for nothing.

Mr. RUSHTON: That may be one opinion. However, if it is now so close to very deep water that it cannot fit in with the State's project, it will not be completely acceptable. That is not the subject of my submission tonight.

The summary of the original report reads as follows:—

Site investigations to date indicate a generally consistent geological formation in the area of the Causeway, consisting of a deep bed of variable sand overlaying a strata of limestone of varying thickness at 60 to 70 feet below mean sea level. The problems of exposure to the open sea are greatly reduced by the protection from heavy wave action provided primarily from the Five Fathom Bank some 4 to 5 miles off-shore—

If any members have fished down there they would have a vivid memory of that five fathom bank. It continues—

—and by the inshore reefs and shoaling to seaward of the Causeway alignment.

The site selected for the Causeway therefore presents no abnormal engineering problems for works of this nature and is considered generally satisfactory.

Another interesting point is that the two-bridge opening is considered to be sufficient to allow for an exchange of water. The current movements are such that the biologists and other professional people who have been called in to give advice and pass comment feel that the project is realistic regarding the protection of the environment in the future. I am not aware of the details in the report, but I do know there was considerable investigation and that people who attended this open hearing were somewhat surprised at the detail presented. However, I feel it is not for me to deal with these points in any great depth.

I would just like to mention the boat and small ships channel. This is of great interest, not only in regard to the project on Garden Island; it is something the local people and the visitors to this very attractive holiday resort are watching carefully. The channel was provided to meet the Navy's stipulated requirements which are as follows:—

A channel of 100 ft. navigable width.

A clearance under any structure of 40 ft. above Mean High Water Springs.

A navigable depth of 12 feet below Low Water Ordinary Spring Tide.

I understand more details will be given of the dredging of channels in due course.

The site investigation goes into great detail and I do not intend to elaborate on this point. This is just a side issue but it does show the involvement of the Navy and the commitment it has in this project.

That is briefly the substance of the report, and the standard of the evidence before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. In addition, of course, there is a report in the Federal House on the Point Peron-Garden Island

Causeway. It is an interesting comment that this facility could be in operation towards the end of 1975.

From our point of view in Western Australia the committee's report had these very pertinent and interesting things to say regarding this naval facility. It reads as follows:—

The Committee received written submissions and drawings from the Departments of the Navy and Works and took evidence from their representatives at public hearings in Canberra and Perth. We also heard evidence from witnesses representing State and local authorities and other interested organizations and from a number of individuals. The Committee inspected the Cockburn Sound area including the proposed causeway alignment and Garden Island.

At the public hearings we took a considerable amount of sometimes conflicting evidence from witnesses expressing reservations about the proposed development from a number of viewpoints.

This is highlighting the fact that people have had an opportunity to present their different viewpoints. An endeavour was made to make the scope of the inquiry very wide and to give some consideration to the points raised. I wish to emphasise the necessity for the State to take part in this investigation. To continue—

Some of the evidence suggested that insufficient investigations had been made for an unequivocal assurance to be given that the proposed work would not have harmful long term effects on the natural environment of Cockburn Sound and Garden Island. More positive assertions on these lines were made by some witnesses.

That indicates that these questions were given a great deal of consideration. The report continues—

Contrary evidence on these aspects was given by departmental and supporting witnesses and we were told of the various investigations which had been taken into account when the project was being developed.

It was also submitted that Garden Island should continue to be available for recreational use and that the survival of the Island's flora and fauna would be prejudiced by the proposed development.

During our final consideration of the proposal, we closely studied the evidence given by all witnesses and the result of our study is reflected in the extract from the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October which is quoted in paragraph 37 below. Clearly

we could not reach a decision acceptable to all witnesses or other people interested in the Cockburn Sound area but it was the view of the majority of the Committee that the proposed development on Garden Island is essential and that the construction of a causeway for access purposes is appropriate having regard to all the circumstances.

So we can see that this committee, meeting as a Commonwealth parliamentary committee, has thoroughly investigated the causeway project. The next duty will be to investigate the project at Garden Island. It is my hope that our State Government will appoint certain officers to work with the Commonwealth officers to supply greater detail before this next inquiry is held. I understand it is to be held somewhere around December, or early next year.

The plan outlining the intentions for Garden Island shows many naval facilities to be established there. It appears to me one of the very important items is the maintenance of ships and shipbuilding. This brings up the situation at Mangles Bay where a feasibility study was undertaken for such purpose. From my research it still seems possible that maintenance and shipbuilding facilities could be established in Port Royal or in Careening Bay as part of a civil and naval establishment. This is something which needs to be looked at and given every consideration as it will bring real advantages for Mangles Bay.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works made this comment on Garden Island in its report—

Garden Island is some six miles long and maximum of a mile wide. It is Commonwealth-owned, and has an area of 2,928 acres.

There seems to be a difference of 100 acres in the area, between the figures appearing in the file of the department and those appearing in the Commonwealth review. The report states further—

Its western side has scrub-covered irregular sand dunes up to a height of 150 feet,

My belief is that the height is up to 200 feet. To continue—

whilst the eastern side is relatively flat up to a group of hills around Mt. Moke, about two miles from the northern end. On the south-eastern side of the island is Careening Bay, a sheltered semi-circular bay open to the east and some 4,000 feet across with depths of 40 feet to 50 feet close inshore.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will not read the whole of that report.

Mr. RUSHTON: No. I am reading very brief extracts from it.

The SPEAKER: When the honourable member lowers his head and reads from the report, I am sure that *Hansard* has difficulty in getting his words down, because his voice seems to lower.

Mr. RUSHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the last quotation I wish to read out.

The SPEAKER: I can hardly hear the honourable member, and I think *Hansard* has the same difficulty.

Mr. RUSHTON: The cold I am suffering from may be restricting my voice production somewhat. Turning to the site of the naval support facility, the following appears in the report:—

A naval support facility requires a sheltered anchorage with a deep water berth and easy access to the open sea. The berth must be secure and have the facilities needed for ships to maintain their equipment and machinery alongside. Such facilities include fuel, water, power, air, steam and communications. Stores and workshops and accommodation and recreation facilities are also required. A good service for supplies by sea, road, rail and air is essential and the locality should be reasonably close to suitable industrial resources including heavy engineering and electrical industry. It should, of course, be as near as possible to the likely operational area.

We noted that before deciding to establish this facility in Cockburn Sound, several other ports in Western Australia were considered, namely Albany, Geraldton and ports north of Geraldton including those used for the export of bulk ores.

Those who are interested in what is happening, can see from this report that a great deal of consideration was given to other ports where this facility might be established. The report continues—

Albany was discarded as it is too far to the south and east of the possible operational area and because it does not have the desirable industrial resources and support.

I see that the member for Fremantle is particularly interested, because he is fully aware of the support which his electorate gives to this type of naval support facility. To continue with the report—

Geraldton lacks space for harbour expansion and is limited in water depth in the approaches and likewise is not suitably equipped industrially. The other ports were considered unsuitable due to their specific wharf use, lack of engineering support and problems caused by the high tidal range.

Within Cockburn Sound, Mangles Bay, Woodman Point and Garden Island were considered. Mangles Bay was rejected as the land backing is zoned and developed for urban use necessitating large scale reclamation from the sea for the establishment of the facility.

Earlier I was referring to the locality where feasibility studies have been carried out for the establishment of facilities for ship building and maintenance of ships. To continue with the report—

In addition, the area is exposed to northerly gales and seas entering the southern channel.

A comparison between Garden Island and Woodman Point showed the former to be superior regarding wind and swell shelter, natural water depth, lack of siltation and weed growth, adjacent buoy mooring sites, security and space for expansion.

It is also relevant that Garden Island is Commonwealth property and is immediately available. Also most significant is the fact that even allowing for the cost of providing a causeway, it would be less costly to develop Garden Island than Woodman Point.

We concluded therefore that Garden Island is a suitable location for the establishment of a naval support facility in Western Australia.

I have spoken at length about the establishment of this naval support facility, but I wish to impress in the minds of members the point that we all have a very great interest in what is being established at Garden Island. The project will involve considerable ancillary facilities, but it is not my intention to elaborate on what could be established or what should be established. All I want to submit is that an opportunity to be heard be given to all the interests that are involved, and because of this I would like the Government to give an undertaking that it will negotiate with the Commonwealth to see what can be done.

To summarise what I have said, I have established the necessity to continually establish a variety of additional recreational reserves, readily accessible from the metropolitan area, for use by the people. Whilst Garden Island is just a small part in the whole concept, it is very relevant to my submission.

I have shown that the Navy is committed to establishing a service facility on Garden Island; I have indicated the magnitude of the project; and I have highlighted the interests of the Navy, of the tenants of Garden Island, and of the Historical Society, which has a commitment. I have outlined the deep involvement of the conservationists in every avenue of

the project; and I have mentioned the interests of the fishermen and the future of Rockingham.

I am requesting the State Government, and I hope that all members will join with me, to initiate a joint study with the Commonwealth Government in plenty of time, prior to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Standing Committee of Works meeting to conduct its public inquiry into the development and use of Garden Island in December next or early in the next year. Of course, we all realise that before then a tremendous amount of work has to be done, and this inquiry will give the public some say in the matter.

I seek an assurance that every consideration will be given to the tenants of Garden Island; phasing out those who have to move, while authorising the use of portion of the island for public purposes. In so doing I ask that regard be had for the interests of conservation, for the protection of the Historical Society's valuable sites, and for the Z Force memorial.

I also ask that this inquiry integrates the State's need as it relates to docking, ship maintenance and building, with full regard for the interests of the people in the south-west corridor and, in particular, the residents of Rockingham and the adjacent areas.

Mr. Taylor: And the residents of Kwinana.

Mr. RUSHTON: I should say the residents of Rockingham, Kwinana, and the adjacent areas. I was speaking of the whole of the south-west corridor.

I request the Government to call on the services of any member of Parliament, including myself, if it considers that in so doing it will gain an advantage in negotiating a satisfactory result with the Commonwealth Government.

Furthermore, I request the Government to report to this Assembly in due course its endeavours and results as these relate to the motion before us. I commend the motion to the House, and ask for the support of all members. I ask the Government to accept and act upon the motion in a spirit similar to that in which it has been moved.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture).

WARDEN'S COURT

Prospecting Areas 1237 to 1240: Motion

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [8.00 p.m.]: I move—

That this House considers applications made in respect of Prospecting Areas 1237, 1238, 1239 and 1240 situated near the junction of the Susetta and Fitzgerald Rivers should be listed for hearing in the Warden's Court as soon as possible, and regrets the action

of the Premier in withdrawing the hearing listed for the period 21st July to 25th July, 1971.

At the outset I want to make it perfectly clear that my interest in the Fitzgerald River Reserve is taken in an endeavour to prove the prospects of the area and to ascertain whether it would be a viable and economic proposition to mine the brown coal for the extraction of montan wax. I have in my hand a small map which members may be able to see. It indicates the position of the reserve and the square marked in red in the middle is the area where the wax is situated at the junction of the Susetta and Fitzgerald Rivers.

Four prospecting areas are involved covering a total of 6,000 acres. The people interested in the area have pegged a far greater acreage than this—that is, 48,000—but the company which is acting as their agent has assured me that provided they had the right to explore the 6,000 acres they would be prepared to forgo a major portion of the area. As I have said, the total area the people want to explore is 6,000 acres but the reserve represents 945 square miles; and I am told that that is approximately the size of Luxembourg. This information will give members some idea of the extent of the reserve.

Recently, in company with a couple of my colleagues, I made a trip to the area to have a look at the Fitzgerald River Reserve which can be defined as containing two particular areas; the first being the south coastal area which would make a very pleasing tourist attraction. It contains a fairly good display of wildflowers and would be ideal for a flora and fauna reserve.

The other area—the northern section, in which the coal deposit is situated—is basically mallee country which is very similar to vast tracts of unopened country in Western Australia. In the mallee section vast areas have been subject to fires in the past. Some people say the fires have been caused deliberately by people visiting the area. This could be so, and I certainly do not intend to argue the point. However, recently when I was in Kalbarrie I saw the national park there and some 100,000 acres of it had been burnt out. The rangers assured me the fires were due to lightning strikes. Therefore we have no guarantee that the reserve referred to in my motion will not be burnt out in a similar fashion.

Actually, when travelling through it we saw that already vast areas had been burnt and if fires were allowed to spread through the area nothing would be left; any farmer would consider it an ideal burn because it would be easy to plough.

The reason the people are becoming rather impatient to have this reserve thrown open is that so much time has elapsed since the first application was

made. That was on the 1st July, 1970, which is just over 12 months ago. At that time the Crown objected on behalf of various objectors and an adjournment was granted. On the 26th August the warden decided that the case would be reheard, and it was listed for rehearing on the 11th September, 1970. One of the objectors then commenced Supreme Court proceedings and a further delay occurred. The date for a rehearing was set for the 13th November. A further adjournment was granted until the 25th or 26th January of this year.

Mr. Graham: Do you know the reason for the postponements?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes. In the first place a stay of proceedings was granted by the warden for the Crown on behalf of certain objectors, and then further adjournments were granted later on. Now, some 12 months later, there appears to be no immediate prospect of the case being heard.

The people are naturally concerned because they are not asking to be allowed to enter the reserve and holus-bolus rip the place about; and this seems to be the greatest concern. They are prepared to study the area to prove whether or not an economic substance can be extracted. To do this they will not require very big plant or equipment. Having proved the area they will, of necessity, go before the Environmental Protection Board in order to establish that they can carry out mining, subject to the control of the board.

The coal-bearing sections are confined mainly to two of the prospecting areas I have mentioned—that is, areas 1237 and 1238—and cover 6,000 acres. The coal is in seam form, approximately 8 feet deep with overburden in the vicinity of 8 feet to 20 feet. The process of mining would be open cut which would be done in the first instance by shifting the first layer of topsoil, and placing it in reserve, and then taking out the seam of coal and gradually moving forward step by step, replacing the overburden. This would, of course, mean that the first heap of topsoil taken out would be there to be placed in the last area to be mined; or the last area could be left and one of the natural streams could be converted to form a lake for a wildlife habitat.

The time involved in exploring the area would be only one month. This is all the time which would be required by the team which would consist of two operators in a four-wheel drive mounted drill boring 5 inch or 6 inch holes. As I understand the position it would not be a big mining project. The depth is 30 feet so they would not have to drill thousands of feet; the operation will be relatively simple. Two operators would do the work, accompanied by a geologist who would choose

the site. About 40 holes would be required to prove the area and then they would be able to move out.

The four-wheel drive vehicle would not do a great deal of harm in the area. As I mentioned when dealing with a similar subject, plenty of tracks already exist throughout the area. Most of the deposit is situated in the old river valley some 20 feet or 30 feet lower than the surrounding terrain, and it would be possible to move through the area fairly freely without doing a great deal of harm. Although we do not profess to be experts we inspected the site and actually saw the coal in a surface area.

As I have said, it would be possible when proving the brown coal deposit to move through the area without upsetting nature. I have already indicated that the object of this exercise is to allow the people to move in and just prove what is there. Of course, once having proved the area the project could develop into an industry which, depending on overseas markets, would benefit the State. No overseas markets have been obtained at the moment, of course. Only tentative inquiries have been made as it is not possible to guarantee the delivery of a product which up to this time has not been proved to be available in commercial quantities.

If the venture proves feasible and becomes a business the export of the wax would, of course, be through the port of Albany. We have already heard the Minister for Industrial Development stress the need for some additional exports through the port of Albany. Although the export of wax would not be of the same magnitude as a steel industry, it would still help the port of Albany. Of course, my concern is not entirely for the port of Albany, but for the community situated in the area: those suffering from the rural depression.

The coal would be transported through towns such as Jerramungup. We understand that some 30 or 40 families would be involved in the project and they would live in Jerramungup. The workers would be transported to the treatment plant which could be situated to the north of the actual coal site. The people concerned would prefer, of course, to have the treatment plant on the site, but this is something which would need to be determined and agreed to by the Minister for Environmental Protection and Dr. O'Brien, so that the flora and fauna in the area could be completely and adequately protected.

So that members might better understand the situation, I intend to quote a few figures to show what the mining operations will mean to the area. Mining, of course, is purely dependent on the result of prospecting. Once the area was proved, Australia would have one of the four known deposits of montan wax in the world. One

deposit is in Czechoslovakia, one in East Germany behind the iron curtain, and another is in Canada.

The deposit in the Fitzgerald River area could produce up to 10,000 tons of wax a year—if a market could be found for that quantity. As I said previously, there is no guarantee of sales as yet, but the world market could stand an additional 10,000 tons of wax per year. The area mined to extract this amount of coal would be about 46 acres each year. Approximately 180,000 tons of dry material would be taken, from which would be extracted six per cent. montan wax.

That six per cent. would represent \$3,000,000 in income to Western Australia each year, so it could be a relatively profitable enterprise for this State. It would also be beneficial to the area in the southern region which has had two very bad seasons and which is suffering a rural recession.

I have in my possession a letter from the agents acting on behalf of the interested persons who hold the prospecting areas. The agents have assured me, and I have it in writing over the signature of the director, that the material would be transported out through the north of the reserve on to the existing Jerramungup-Ravensthorpe Road, and then back along the main road to Albany. The decision to cart the material the long way round was not a philanthropic gesture towards the town of Jerramungup.

Those who know the area will realise that the southern section of the area gets very wet and swampy, and becomes virtually impassable during the winter. Also, the distance from the seam site to a treatment plant, which would be situated off the reserve area, would be some seven miles to the north, but some 20 miles to the south. We must appreciate the fact that most of the material taken out would be waste product, and would be returned to the site. The wax would be extracted from the bulk ore.

It is known that the wax has some trace elements which could be useful as fertiliser. The coal has some benefit as a heating unit, but is relatively low in B.T.U.s and the possibility of using it in the treatment plant as a means of generating heat would be rather remote. This would mean that not only would the coal be transported through the port of Albany, but there would be a substantial increase in the amount of fuel brought in to extract the wax. The wax is extracted by a solvent bath type of process, and the wax is floated off.

To get back to the statistics I was quoting. The area mined each month would be 3.8 acres, giving a total area of approximately 46 acres a year. Taking into account the amount of wax extracted, and the back fill of the overburden, the terrain would be lowered some six to eight feet. The whole plateau would be lowered, and

be subject to any rules and regulations specified by the Minister for Environmental Protection. The area would be restored and regenerated at the rate of approximately 46 acres a year. An area of 46 acres a year, out of an area of 6,000 acres, will give some idea of the length of time which would be involved in the operation. It is possible that after a few years only the initial scars would show and the whole process would move forward. The ore would be removed and the overburden replaced so that at no time would more than 45 or 46 acres be uncovered.

As I have already said, the area is subject to severe bushfires. Vast acreages have been burnt out and if the area is left in its virgin state, I can see the possibility of very severe fires starting in the not very distant future. Habitation exists on two sides of the reserve, and quite a number of fishermen visit the southern area. It is also possible for lightning to strike and cause fires. Once a fire gets a hold in such an area it is virtually impossible to control. It will burn in all directions because of the variable nature of the wind.

We already know that until fire-fighting equipment is made available in our national parks the fire hazard will be ever-present. If a project is undertaken to bring reasonable roads to such areas, these can be utilised as firebreaks, and the necessary equipment used to control the fires.

People will say, of course, that it has stood in its natural state for billions of years. This is quite true. Unfortunately, it is now surrounded by a most unnatural state—that is, a farming community. It is from here that the danger of burning the place out comes.

Mr. Lapham: What would the employment opportunities be?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: As I have said, there is no definite or firm order for shipment of the wax overseas. At the moment it is anticipated that the equipment and plant operators at the mine and treatment sites would number 30 or 40 men. This would mean 30 or 40 families in the Jeramungup area. Whether the people are already domiciled in the area or would come to it would depend on the amount of labour available.

While on the subject of employment, when the site is proven and the mine is shown to be a viable concern, it could happen that the operation would not be large enough to require a road transport operation to function continuously. Possibly the material would be stockpiled until a vessel came into Albany to load. This means there may possibly be work for farmers in the area who could cart the coal in bulk containers. It could possibly be shifted in the same way as bulk grain or super. This would be a source of employment to farmers in need, but if the

operation grew larger the company would have to install its own equipment and do its own carting.

There is a manganese deposit, held by Bell Bros., in the area. The member for Albany mentioned this some time ago. He was interested in inquiring into the reasons for the delay in granting permission to Bell Bros. to make a road through to the Fitzgerald River Reserve to serve the manganese deposit. An article appeared in *The Albany Advertiser* on Wednesday, the 14th July. It said—

The only holdup to its exploitation and subsequent shipment through the Port of Albany was the delay in receiving permission to construct a 22-mile road.

I have placed a small dot on the map before me to the east of the area marked red which indicates the deposits of montan wax. This is the approximate area where Bell Bros. are currently seeking to commence a mining operation. The application to do this was granted prior to the restrictions.

Mr. May: In 1952.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I think 1952 was the year. Bell Bros. are now seeking permission to put in the access road so that they may operate the manganese mine. They have signified they will come in on the Fitzgerald-Ravensthorpe road. In consequence of the position of the two sites, there is every possibility that one road could service the two operations. This would mean there would be less chance of upsetting flora and fauna which might be in the northern section.

While on the subject of fauna, I might mention in passing that we saw two kangaroos and two birds on the drive of 130 miles through the area the other day. This seems to indicate that it is not overrun by the animals which are to be found in the electorate of the member for Avon.

Mr. Gayfer: Did you say "Two birds"?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, the feathered variety. We are not botanists but as we travelled through the reserve we kept our eyes open for plants we knew and could recognise. We noticed that most of the brilliant wildflowers seemed to be in the southern section. On two or three occasions mention has been made of the Royal Hakea and the Qualup bell. We saw the Qualup bell in the area, but the plants were very small when growing in their native state. My colleague, the member for Narrogin, is a keen photographer. However, the best plant we could find in the reserve for him to photograph had two bells. In a ploughed paddock on a farm a few miles down the road we saw a magnificent plant with up to 60 bells. Disturbing the Qualup bell is probably the best thing that can happen to it. I know another site near the aerodrome at Ravensthorpe

where a paddock was ploughed five or six years ago. I have seen in that paddock bushes with hundreds of blooms. The argument that they are lost forever if disturbed does not hold water, because I have seen them growing on burnt and fallowed ground, and growing much better than they do in their natural state.

Mr. Gayfer: They grow on the side of the road.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, we find good stands along the gutters, because of the extra water from the run-off. Quite a deal has been said by various groups of people in the area, some for and some against the project. Most of the people arguing against it have looked at it in the light of a vast-scale operation which will ruin the area, tear the countryside open, and leave 6,000 acres of bare ground. Of course, this could happen only after the area has been proven. Until such time as somebody moves in and proves the deposits, no operation can take place.

Environmental protection legislation will be brought forward and, in addition, people concerned with the conservation of flora and fauna are watching the area closely. Anything that is done by the mining companies will be done under their complete control. Consequently the fears expressed regarding possible extinction of various forms of animal life and flora are, I think, a little precipitant. Once the situation reaches the stage of a mining lease being granted, conditions will be laid down; people will be told exactly where they can go and what they can do. I have pointed out previously that I personally believe there is no great danger of anything being disturbed to any great extent by the investigation work which, as I have indicated, will take only one month and will require only one vehicle. In fact, only three people would be working on it.

I consider this matter should be brought into the Warden's Court as soon as possible to allow the people concerned to receive a definite answer one way or the other; namely, whether they are to be allowed to go ahead or not. Some few weeks back, on the 7th July, a mining claim was granted in that same reserve. This was some three days prior to the Premier withdrawing the application for the Fitzgerald coal claims to be heard. The claim was granted on the 7th July, Executive Council confirmed it, and it was gazetted on the 16th July. Ravensthorpe Copper Mines will be allowed to prospect for copper, silver, cobalt, molybdenum, arsenic, platinum, chromium, and nickel. The mineral claim was granted subject to certain conditions which, if I may, I will read out for the purpose of accuracy. They are not very long. The conditions are—

No timber being cut on the claim except by way of clearing for *bona fide* surface workings.

The provisions of the Bush Fires Act, 1954 and the regulations thereunder.

The provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act, 1954—1969 and the Regulations thereunder.

All surface excavations other than shafts and open cuts being completely filled in and levelled with earth after the excavations have been sampled, and all shafts and open cuts being securely fenced with cyclone mesh to a height of six feet.

The disturbance of the soil within Reserve 24048 to be confined to *bona fide* mining operations, and no person to be allowed to reside within Reserve 24048.

All surface structures on Reserve 24048 and no longer required for future use to be removed progressively during mining operations, and the area left in a state which will best allow regeneration to take place.

Mining on the road being confined to below a depth of fifty feet from the natural surface.

Lodgment of a satisfactory Bond in the sum of \$2,000 to ensure that the area is utilised by means of the best conservation practices for the protection and conservation of wild life and vegetation and is rehabilitated upon completion of mining.

The complete excision of any portion encroaching on Mineral Claim 271, with rights of ingress to and egress from the ground comprised therein being at all times preserved to the holders thereof.

Those are the conditions that were laid down to a mining company in connection with entering the Fitzgerald River Reserve, and I entirely agree with them. The copper mine at Ravensthorpe is having difficulty and mining for copper has temporarily ceased there. I think that was the right thing to do. It has been proved that copper is there and it is now intended to explore the deposits.

The point I am making is that those actions were taken when the claim for coal-mining leases in the other sections of the reserve had been withdrawn from the Warden's Court, which was during the time that the Minister for Industrial Development and the Minister for Mines were overseas. I do not know whether or not they were consulted but I should imagine they would have liked to be consulted, because we have heard of the concern of the Minister for Industrial Development about the difficulties of the people in the southern areas of the State. I think if he had been consulted, and knowing the situation in the Albany area and the areas east of Albany, he would at least have agreed that the feasibility study should go

forward so that another decentralised industry could have been established in the country at a time when it was most needed.

It would have taken only one month to prove whether it was a viable operation. If the claim had been heard and agreed to on the 21st July, there is every possibility that within the next week or two we would have known whether or not an industry would be established there, and it would have been handy for the Minister to be able to say in Albany, "We have at last been able to establish one industry in the Fitzgerald River Reserve."

I think the Minister for Mines will agree that the situation should be investigated. In the event of any mineral of commercial value being found and it proves to be a viable proposition—one which can be exploited in safety and under the protection which I am sure the new environmental protection Bill will provide—when the green light is given to go ahead controls will be placed upon the mining company or the people who hold the prospecting areas so that the State can benefit from the flora and fauna and from the reserve in general.

I think the reserve will be a better place when it is opened up and fire protection can be exercised to the maximum. At the moment nobody can get in to see what is there. Some people hope it will be made an "A"-class reserve or a national park. My idea of a national park is the one at Kalbarri and the one that is close to the city, where roads are put through so that people can go in and enjoy the park. There is some magnificent scenery on the coastline looking back across the Fitzgerald River Reserve and I do not think anything should be done to disturb it.

All we are asking for in this motion is that the exploratory work that will prove this concern should be allowed to be carried out, and that we should be informed whether it will be of any value to the State. Let us have the matter proved once and for all. At the moment we are arguing in the dark. We have had reams of paper on the subject and it has taken up a considerable amount of the time of this House. There have also been letters to the Press. Nobody knows what is there—whether it is a goer or not.

The motion requests that the matter be relisted in the Warden's Court for hearing as soon as possible, and if it is proved to be a goer we will ensure that nothing is disturbed once the environmental protection Bill is passed. We will have the satisfaction of knowing that a decentralised industry will be established which will help the people in Jerramungup and the farmers in other districts; and we will ensure that the project goes forward for the betterment of the people in the area and the State as a whole.

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) [8.36 p.m.]: The motion now before the House relates to the relisting for hearing in the Warden's Court of certain reserves or prospecting areas in the Fitzgerald River area. The motion moved by the member for Roe reads—

That this House considers applications made in respect of Prospecting Areas 1237, 1238, 1239 and 1240 situated near the junction of the Susetta and Fitzgerald Rivers should be listed for hearing in the Warden's Court as soon as possible, and regrets the action of the Premier in withdrawing the hearing listed for the period 21st July to 25th July, 1971.

Firstly, I would like to pay tribute to the member for Roe for the manner in which he put his case forward. I have mixed feelings in regard to this motion. I think the honourable member has made out a good case for the relisting. Up to the time I went to Japan, I thought that there was a good case for the relisting of this matter before the Warden's Court.

If I could trace some of the events which took place, I think I might be able to put this matter in its right perspective, and possibly the member for Roe will consider, as I did, that the matter rightly should be heard by the Department of Environmental Protection.

On the 7th January of this year the previous Minister for Mines decided to refuse to allow this application to go to a Warden's Court on the ground that this particular matter, as it affected ecology and environmental protection, was being dealt with by the mining inquiry, and he thought it would be best for him to study the recommendations of the mining inquiry so that he would be better able to assess what action should be taken in regard to this reserve. The recommendation of the mining inquiry was that the matter should be heard by the environmental protection authority. The matter was delayed and inquiries were protracted until such time as there was a change of Government. I then became interested in the project.

Early in March or April I was approached on several occasions in regard to the relisting of this matter. Representations were made to all the organisations that were interested in the Fitzgerald River Reserve—both pro and anti—to ascertain their views and to endeavour to get them to the conference table. We wrote to a number of the organisations and suggested that they sit together and endeavour to resolve the matter, and possibly reach a state of mutual consent by the time it went to the Warden's Court.

Time went by, and we were unable to get everybody around a table, so I finally issued an ultimatum that unless something was done very quickly I would list the

matter for hearing in the warden's court. Nothing was done, so it was listed for hearing. This was subsequently advertised in the normal way and objections were received. At that point of time Dr. O'Brien had arrived here from overseas and was endeavouring to set up the environmental protection authority. I was quite convinced in my own mind that it would be better for all the information in relation to this matter to be revealed in a warden's court where everybody was under oath. The warden would be in a position to obtain all the information and would then be able to make a recommendation.

I should say at the outset that the warden does not make a decision. He makes a recommendation which goes to the Minister for Mines for his approval or rejection; according to the manner in which he views the situation as presented to him. One of the reasons—and this will be brought out when mining legislation is introduced at a later stage—for the warden making only a recommendation is that he is not fully aware of the policies of a particular Government. He may only assess the situation from the evidence that comes forward from both sides, and then make a recommendation. The Minister and Cabinet have information available to them which is considered before a decision is made.

At the time I left for Japan this case was listed for hearing on the 19th July and I believe some of the companies had arranged for witnesses to travel here from the Eastern States. Whilst I was in Japan Dr. O'Brien finally reached an understanding with his department as to what should be done in connection with any reserve of this nature. I might add that the reserve in question is a "C"-class reserve, and the points mentioned by the member for Roe are quite valid inasmuch as there are already people on mining tenements in the reserve. But they were there prior to the reserve being declared "C"-class and we could do nothing about the situation. They are still perfectly entitled to be there.

Dr. O'Brien forwarded a screed to Cabinet while the Deputy Premier and I were away, and I think it is incumbent on me to divulge what was contained in that submission. I am sure as we go along the member for Roe will appreciate the difficult situation in which I was placed, because the more I considered the position the more it became obvious to me that the best thing to do was to withdraw the case from the Warden's Court and list it for an inquiry by the environmental protection body. If you would bear with me a little, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the minute presented to Cabinet by the Director of Environmental Protection recorded in *Hansard*. It is as follows:—

Prior to and since taking up my position officially on April 19, I have sought to familiarise myself with pro-

blems or potential problems in environmental protection in Western Australia. The status of the Fitzgerald River Reserve was one such topic and this Department had a file of information in the public domain at the date of my receipt of the above Cabinet Minute.

At the date of receipt of this Minute, the subject of mining in the Fitzgerald River Reserve had been referred to the Mining Warden's Court. As a consequence, in order to respond to the above Minute, it appeared to me that there were three relevant courses of action open to me as Director of Environmental Protection:

- (i) set up an extensive personal expedition to inspect the area in question, accompanied by personnel expert in botany, microbiology, geology, hydrology, fauna, tourism and the like,
- (ii) seek for and analyse all new and hitherto unpublished, updated information on the matter, and
- (iii) examine the files of the Department of Environmental Protection at this date, plus relevant public documents, and thereupon submit a report.

I would like to interpolate here that this minute can be tabled. It is available to any member who wishes to peruse it, and I might mention it was not produced prior to my departure for Japan. It was brought up in my absence by the director. To continue—

The first choice I have decided as impracticable on the grounds of shortage of time, funds and personnel, and since any detailed study would detract considerably from my present urgent efforts to draft legislation on Environmental Protection, as directed by the Hon. Premier and Minister for Environmental Protection.

The second choice I also discarded because it would presuppose that the Department of Environmental Protection has the authority to call in relevant submissions in a manner which it might do if the legislation on Environmental Protection and the Authority were established. This is not the case. The matter has been referred to a Warden's Court, not to an Environmental Protection Authority.

The third course I have adopted as being within my present cognisance, and taking due account of the lack of proclaimed Environmental Protection Legislation. A report is therefore submitted to you as a matter of urgency, as directed.

Summary:

To summarise, the report recommends that this matter be held in abeyance until:

- (a) legislative machinery to establish an Environmental Protection Authority is approved by Parliament, and
- (b) due consideration has been given to the revision of the Mining Act and the relevant recommendations of the Committee of Enquiry.

The matter could then be reviewed and a decision reached in accordance with the Environmental Protection principles implicit in the legislation.

It should be added that to minimize delay, no attempt has been made in this report, to determine authoritatively the economic viability of the proposed project of Jupiter Minerals.

That is the minute produced to Cabinet in my absence. I would like to indicate to the house some of the organisations which were opposed to the granting of mining tenements in the Fitzgerald River Reserve. Objections were lodged by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, the West Australian Wild Life Authority, the National Parks Board, the W.A. Museum, the National Trust, the Australian Conservation Foundation, the Nature Conservation Council of W.A., and the Tree Society.

From the time those bodies became interested in the Fitzgerald River Reserve, a considerable amount of inquiry was conducted by scientists and experts who were looking into ecological matters. Most of the research was conducted by the University of Western Australia, the W.A. Museum, the Department of Agriculture, the National Parks Board, and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna. I think, in the opinion of most members, those organisations would represent a fair cross-section of the community who might be interested in conservation. In the case of the Museum, the sub-department of Curator of Vertebrates, the Curator of Fish and Crustacea, the Department of Palaeontology, and the Curator of Insects were involved, and in the case of the university, the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Zoology were involved. The botanists of the State Herbarium, and the Soils Conservation Section were involved in the case of the Department of Agriculture.

When Cabinet considered the proposition it decided that more factors were evident in the question of conservation than was originally thought to be the case when the matter was listed for hearing on the 19th July. It decided that a meeting of Cabinet should be held—and I think it was held on the 7th July—because witnesses were to come from the Eastern States to attend the hearing on the 19th July. With

a view to obviating the necessity for, and the expense involved in, those people having to travel from the Eastern States, a meeting of Cabinet was held and subsequently letters were sent to advise those concerned that the case had been withdrawn from the court and would be held in abeyance until some future action was taken.

As I said to the member for Roe when I first rose to my feet, until that point in time I was quite prepared to allow the case to go forward; but after reading the volume of evidence produced on my return to Western Australia—and subsequently—I was quite convinced that Cabinet had made the right decision. I think we must be conscious of the fact that the mineral resources of Western Australia are going to play a most important part in our economy. If it were not for our minerals both the Commonwealth and the Western Australian Governments would be in greater financial stress than they are at the present time.

I think a very careful estimate has to be made both by the conservation authority and by the officers of my department in regard to where we are heading with mineral activities. If my memory serves me correctly, I think both pastoral and rural interests have caused more damage to the ecology than any other interests that have caused destruction. For example, mineral activity has caused about 3 per cent. of the destruction brought about in conservation areas.

If we are to rely on mineral production in Western Australia, obviously we must find out where we are heading. I appreciate the concern of the member for Roe in trying to get this project off the ground. However, I hasten to add that I do not think one month would be sufficient time in which to find out whether it is a viable proposition. If we sink only 40 30-foot drill holes we will only be scratching the surface. I know that from our own experience in the Mines Department in regard to iron ore, and possibly in the new legislation that will be introduced to the House we will have to provide ample time for exploration.

This project involves mining close to the surface and we do not have to engage in diamond drilling or deep drilling to any extent. However, I still maintain that we have to look after the conservation areas as well as the mining interests. And we have to look at montan. The member for Roe did mention some of the uses of montan. I have an interpretation of its uses, but whether it coincides with that of the honourable member I would not know. However, the interpretation reads as follows:—

It is difficult to obtain accurate information as to world production figures, prices, world importation figures,

for montan wax. The product known as montan wax may be extracted from peat, lignite, brown coal. Its value is as a hard wax with a high melting point and is generally used for certain polishes. Various processes are used to extract different qualities of the wax. The bulk of the international market seems to be in crude benzine-extracted wax.

The available Australian figures show that it is not a significant import (for the year 1969-70 the value of waxes imported was \$56,000). One of the reasons why it is difficult to obtain accurate figures for montan wax is that the United Nations and Commonwealth Department of Trade and Industry, Bureau of Census and Statistics, do not differentiate in their statistics between montan wax and other mineral waxes.

I thought it advisable to mention that. We have gone into it very thoroughly at the Mines Department, as has the member for Roe, and we will endeavour to encourage the mining of this deposit. There are other deposits, as members realise, of course.

Mr. Gayfer: The qualities differ do they not?

Mr. MAY: There is another deposit on Crown land at Lake Muir, and the department is also investigating this. The Forests Department is interested in this deposit as it is located in a State forest area and once again the Mines Department is being restricted in regard to the avenues that are available to it. This represents one of the matters that concern the Mines Department following the recommendations of the mining committee. Whilst the report was received quite favourably at the time it was released, it is considered by many people that it was formulated during a boom period and if a commencement were made to implement the recommendations many difficulties could be encountered. This is one of the reasons I am taking so long to bring the measure before this Chamber.

I wanted to indicate to the House that the mining committee has recommended many radical changes in connection with conservation and if the Mines Department were to adhere to some of these changes many mining projects in Western Australia would not get off the ground. I want members to realise the true situation. From my own point of view I would agree that up to this point in time the matter should have been brought before the warden's court; but information that has subsequently come to hand—and it is available to members to look at—confirms my opinion that the Government did the correct thing in withdrawing the matter from the Warden's Court.

I appreciate that the people who are concerned with mining the deposit are anxious to prove it. We have been trying

to work out ways and means whereby these people could enter the area without causing any undue harm. Whilst I agree with the member for Roe that the deposit takes up only a small portion of the Fitzgerald River Reserve, it must be understood that invariably where this type of coal is found, the seams run through rivers and creeks, and the hills that abut the creeks. Obviously this is an area which is of value to tourism and where the ecology should be preserved. It is an area where various types of flora of world renown are located, and whilst it is only small a great deal of harm could be done to the area unless it is properly looked at.

Mr. Gayfer: Has the Minister a copy of Dr. Beard's report? He did not think much of it.

Mr. MAY: A few people conflict with him and with other experts who have looked at the area.

Mr. Gayfer: I merely wondered whether you had a copy of his report.

Mr. MAY: Yes, I have.

Mr. W. G. Young: Have you seen the area?

Mr. MAY: No, but the member for Roe and others have mentioned that they have been through the area and I was wondering whether this is the first occasion that the member for Roe has visited the area.

Mr. W. G. Young: No. This time I went in and had a look at the coal. I did not know where it was before.

Mr. MAY: Consideration has been given to taking a party of Ministers there to inspect the area, and Dr. O'Brien has indicated that he will be looking at it. We thought that he was the best man to carry out such an investigation.

Mr. W. G. Young: I have flown over the area two or three times, but one would have to look at it from the ground.

Mr. Gayfer: You would need a compass, too.

Mr. MAY: I may find a couple of birds! I want to comment on a couple of other points. I hope the member for Roe will accept the assurance of the Government that it will look into this matter. I have spoken to Dr. O'Brien and this is one of the first jobs he will undertake. From the mining point of view we have advocated many jobs that we want Dr. O'Brien to undertake, and he has indicated that the Fitzgerald River Reserve will be one of his first assignments when the environmental protection Bill is passed by Parliament. That is, I trust that it will be passed by Parliament.

I hope the member for Roe will take a further look at this matter and, following the information I have given him this evening, he may consider withdrawing the motion because he has the assurance of

my department and also that of the Director of Environmental Protection that the matter will receive careful consideration as quickly as possible.

I have taken a few notes of the matters mentioned by the member for Roe. I have investigated similar matters myself. There is a special officer in the Mines Department who has been looking after the Fitzgerald River Reserve ever since it was decided to bring the matter to the Warden's Court. When he saw the information I had made available to him he admitted there was definitely a case for it to be further investigated. It is easy to be wise after the event but we, as a Government, have had a good look at this matter and have decided that the Director of Environmental Protection should be given an opportunity to consider it and make a recommendation to the Government. If he recommends the area should not be mined we will have another look at the position. At this stage, however, I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Director of Environmental Protection. He has all the officers at his disposal; all the information in my department, and he can form his own conclusions and make a recommendation to Cabinet. I sincerely hope the recommendation will be favourable in so far as the operation of this project is concerned.

I can assure the honourable member that so far as my department is concerned we are anxious that all deposits be investigated. We have other deposits in the south-west, but not of montan wax or of coal, in the areas where we want to investigate. Here we come up against the conservation aspect; when heavy machinery comes into the State forest dieback and deterioration of the forest area results.

Mr. Gayfer: Dieback would not be any trouble where this is.

Mr. MAY: No, but I am just pointing out there are other areas in the south-west we would like to have looked at. On behalf of the Government I would like to indicate that we have looked at the situation and have decided we need the guidance of the Director of Environmental Protection. He is an expert in this field and I am sure that when he has made his deliberations we will have another look at it. We will endeavour to bring about the situation where this area can be mined, if possible. I have much reluctance in opposing the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Gayfer.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Delay Pending Survey: Motion

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range)
[9.01 p.m.]: I move—

That, in the opinion of this House, no decision should be made on the construction of the high voltage power

lines from Kwinana to Balga until a survey by the proposed Environmental Protection Council or a competent independent authority has been submitted to the Government, and laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move this motion with a conscientious belief that there should be some review of the proposals of the State Electricity Commission in this regard.

A great deal of public concern has been expressed in recent times as to what is to take place in regard to the construction of these power lines. Many people have expressed their concern to me about the power the State Electricity Commission has within the terms of the Act. I believe the State Electricity Commission Act was never intended to cope with the construction of power lines of the magnitude of the ones presently proposed. As far as I can establish, there is no requirement in the Act that the State Electricity Commission take into consideration matters affecting the environment. That is why I believe there should be some review of what is proposed.

Many people are concerned with the damage that will be done to irreplaceable natural vegetation as a result of the construction of these power lines. Two petitions have been presented to Parliament bearing the signatures of 9,500 people. I feel this indicates the roused feelings over the issue. I would like to point out that in both the petitions a very high percentage of the people who signed were people not living in the areas immediately affected. This indicates it is not just a parochial issue but one which is regarded by a great many people as having significance for the whole of the population of the metropolitan area and, indeed, of the State.

One petition opposing the line through the Helena Valley bore the signatures of something in the order of 4,500 people. In the area concerned there are only about 170 or 180 residents. I think this clearly indicates it is not a parochial issue.

I am not asking the House to give consideration to something which was not contemplated by the previous Government. The Brand Government gave an undertaking to the people that there would be no decision on the construction of the power lines until such time as the matter had been vetted by the environmental protection body as proposed in the last Parliament. I feel that if the matter were referred to some other authority having an interest in the protection of the environment, there would not be the great concern that is being expressed at the present time.

I am rather concerned that the Premier has indicated he is not prepared to delay this decision until such time as the new environmental protection council has been set up under legislation to be enacted later in the life of this Parliament.

Mr. Jamieson: You do not know if it is proposed that this will cover it.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not know.

Mr. Jamieson: Well, what is the point of it?

Mr. THOMPSON: It is reframing some legislation that was enacted in the last Parliament.

Mr. Jamieson: That did not cover it.

Mr. THOMPSON: That would have afforded protection. I feel any Minister who did not refer a matter such as this to that body would have been extremely irresponsible. I have the assurance of the previous Government it would have been referred to that body.

Mr. Jamieson: You can always say that sort of thing.

Mr. THOMPSON: The legislation to be introduced is to replace legislation which we believe would have afforded protection. I think it necessarily follows that the legislation the Government proposes to enact will give some protection. If it does not, I think the people of the State have a legitimate case to ask why.

Mr. Jamieson: The last legislation definitely did not.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Jamieson: It is a matter of definition in the Act.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is a question of fact.

Mr. THOMPSON: I have a letter from the Premier on this matter. I referred to this in my maiden speech, but I believe I ought to make reference to it again tonight because I feel it is a matter of some significance. I asked the Premier whether he would refer this matter to a body to be set up under the Government's environmental protection legislation and I quote part of his reply—

It is inherent that under its Act it must relieve the Government of the detail of running a major public utility.

The Premier is referring to the fact that the State Electricity Commission is going to make this decision. This word "detail" is the operative word. I do not think the construction of these power lines is a detail. He went on to say—

The Commission is broadly responsible to its Minister and hence the Government. The Act provides for proper procedures in matters of this nature.

I fail to see where any proper procedures are contained within the State Electricity Commission Act when we relate it to the protection of environment.

I think the present Government has a responsibility to the people of the State to refer this matter either to the environmental protection council as mentioned in

the Governor's Speech or, if it is not prepared to wait until that legislation is enacted, the matter should be submitted to some competent independent authority.

We have been told just recently that another matter affecting the people of the State has been quite dramatically referred to an independent authority for review. I assume the Government considers this authority to be competent.

I refer to the matter of corridor planning. I agree with the principle. I do not necessarily support the selection of the particular person who has been appointed by the Government, but I do sincerely support the principle of matters of this nature being referred to some party other than those who are responsible to the Government for devising such plans.

When we talk in terms of spending \$14,000,000, \$17,000,000, or whatever be the cost of the power line, I think it is only fair to the people of this State—may I point out this power line will have a dramatic impact on the aesthetics of the metropolitan region—that some review should be made.

We have heard a number of utterances by the General Manager of the State Electricity Commission and by the Minister; these utterances would indicate to me that they did not think the power line and the pylons would be very obtrusive or ugly. In fact the general manager (Mr. Gillies) has said the power lines are not ugly, and that similar power lines ring other major cities of the Eastern States, so he could not see why the same should not be constructed in Western Australia. The Minister for Electricity said these power lines look majestic, and perhaps to him they are; but I believe beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and that to many people these things are not majestic. I believe the wishes of the people ought to be taken into consideration.

I am firmly of the opinion that because our city has not reached the same degree of development as some cities on the eastern seaboard, we have a very great advantage in our ability to ensure that we do not make the mistakes which have been made by the planners or the people who developed those eastern cities. Therefore, I think we should take a great deal of interest and pride in planning and developing our city.

Recently we were told by the Minister for Electricity that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is a body which is concerned with the environment of the metropolitan region, and I believe to a degree it is.

Mr. Jamieson: It plans our environment; that is its job.

Mr. THOMPSON: It plans the environment and that is its job, but if that is the case why did the commission reach

agreement with the shires concerned before the matter was referred to the M.R.P.A.? I will tell the Minister why—because there was no requirement under the Act for the State Electricity Commission to do that. I think the State Electricity Commission Act needs revising when we talk in terms of the construction of power lines of this nature. If the Act is not amended to prevent the S.E.C. from acting in the way it appears to be acting in this case, then the Government or this Parliament ought to step in and protect the interests of the people of the State.

I should point out that the Group D Committee of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority—which committee is representative of all the shires affected by the eastern and northern part of this route—has resolved that the most objectionable route of the two that are under discussion is the foothills route. It arrived at that decision and it made a recommendation to the M.R.P.A. before the latter recommended which route should be adopted. It rather perplexed the members of the shires which constituted the Group D Committee that the M.R.P.A. came out—as reported in *The West Australian* of the 22nd April—in favour of the Darling Range foothills route for the construction of this power line, quite contrary to the wishes of the shires in that group.

In relation to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority I might point out it did not say it would recommend that the S.E.C. should adopt this route; it said that it favoured this route and felt it would be the least objectionable. If this were a body which had power to dictate to the commission which route should be adopted, it would have recommended rather than suggested. I do not think it can be taken that the M.R.P.A. is a body which has any power to dictate to other utilities as to the routes they shall adopt, and what they shall do in respect of the installation of services.

Mr. Jamieson: You see what power the M.R.P.A. has if you try to rezone any local authority district.

Mr. THOMPSON: I imagine it has power in that regard, but I have been referring to the power it has in connection with the construction of the S.E.C. power lines. In this respect I suggest it has not very much power.

We have been told by the Minister that only two routes have ever been seriously considered. I dispute that, because I have a plan here. It has been marked by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and in fact it shows three routes—the green line representing the foothills, the blue line representing what is known as the valleys route, and the red line which has been referred to as the easterly route.

The M.R.P.A. also considered another route, and that is the one further into the coastal plain. I suggest this is the route which ought to be adopted if the Government is intent on saving money, because this is a shorter route; and as the cost of a line is proportional to its length it necessarily follows that this route would be cheaper.

I would like to make reference to the standard gauge railway line shown on this map. I believe it forms the ideal route for the construction of the power line in question. The railway line is reasonably symmetrical, and it passes through land which is not densely populated or highly developed. This land has, no doubt, been devalued by the construction of the railway line, or its value will not have risen nearly as sharply as land which has not been affected by the railway line.

Mr. Jamieson: Tell that to the valuers who are trying to buy that land.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am comparing the value of that land with the value of the land along the foothills. I suggest the value of the latter land is a great deal higher. If the Government is intent on saving money it can look at a route which is shorter than the two that are under consideration. If the Government is really concerned with the protection of the environment it should look at a route a little further east of the valleys route.

Mr. Jamieson: The whole argument is whether or not the environment is being protected.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not think it is, but that is only my opinion.

Mr. Jamieson: The academy award for this year has already been presented!

Mr. THOMPSON: I am so pleased that a member of this House of the standing of the Minister considers that I am worthy of an academy award.

Mr. Jamieson: Well, you are overacting a little.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would now like to make reference to a memorandum from the M.R.P.A., dated the 27th November, 1970. I do this to show that more than two routes have been considered. In fact, there were four routes, but at the time when this memorandum was written there were three routes. With the addition of the easterly route which was considered earlier this year there have been four under consideration. I will quote from this memorandum. It reads—

Possible Alternative Routes:

There are three basic alternative routes that these power lines could follow and for sake of clarity these could be described as the coastal plains route, the valleys route, and the foothills route.

The Coastal Plains route is one where the power lines would be placed well into the coastal plain and would follow a line west of Gosnells, between Maddington and Kenwick northwards across Forrestfield and Maida Vale and thence between Midland and Guildford.

It was this route that the Commission first favoured—

This is contrary to what we have been told in this House because we were informed only two routes were considered, yet the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority states—

It was this route that the Commission first favoured because the land was relatively flat, presented no great engineering problems and was the most direct route thereby keeping the length of the lines to the minimum. However this route has proved impracticable because of the conflict with the operations of the Perth Airport, and the very real danger of aircraft crashing into the power lines.

I would like to make reference to that a little later on. To continue—

As an alternative the Commission have now proposed routes that will take the lines over the Hills escarpment between Wungong and Byford; and Gosnells and Kelmscott, and thence through the State Forest across Victoria Reservoir and through Bickley and Helena Valleys. This route is shown by the solid black lines on the Plans—

The plan numbers are then given. To continue—

By taking this route the extra length of power line involved will add about another \$½ million to the cost of the line alone.

I do emphasise that more than two routes were studied and I believe that more ought to be said of each of the four routes which were considered.

I wish to make reference to the route known as the easterly route. This route, to traverse the city, travels about 111 miles whereas the other two involve 85 and 89 miles respectively. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the very devious line the route takes. It dives and darts all over the place and I see no reason for the route not being as direct as the other two which, it will be observed, take a very smooth and symmetrical line and therefore their lengths are reasonable. If the easterly route were taken in a more direct line, and not as far east as it is planned, it would be an economic proposition.

In recent times correspondence has been forwarded to all members of Parliament by the Guildford Grammar School. Those in authority at the school are extremely concerned because it is proposed

that the power lines be constructed across the playing fields. I am aware the member for Swan knows a little about this; and I draw the attention of the House to a recommendation made by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority with regard to that section of the line. The following appeared in *The West Australian* of the 27th April this year:—

The authority—

That is, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. To continue—

—would suggest to the State Electricity Commission, which had the final decision, that it should consider routing the line east of Midland instead of crossing near the Guildford Grammar School,

If the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority carried any weight in this matter, surely to goodness the commission would take cognisance of the authority's suggestion in relation to the section of the line which is, it appears, to pass through the Guildford Grammar School.

Recently we were told in this House that very little or no radio or television interference would be created by the lines. That contention is not supported by certain technical information I have received. A paper presented by an eminent electrical engineer to the Society of Engineers in Victoria stated quite categorically that this was a problem and that these lines are causing difficulty in the Eastern States. Therefore, in stating that there will be no interference of this nature, the commission and the Minister are not entirely accurate.

To return to the route which passes the Guildford Airport: one of the objections to that route was that it would cause interference to the communication and navigational aids at the airport. The two statements just do not tally. I suggest that if no interference would occur to domestic radio and television sets, then surely no interference would be involved to equipment at the airport. That equipment is constructed to the highest specifications one could imagine, which is in contrast to the construction of the television and radio sets owned by the average person. I do not believe that any interference would occur to the highly sophisticated equipment installed at the airport.

The people of this State recently spent \$2,500,000 to acquire land across the face of the escarpment, to be set aside as a recreational reserve known as the green belt. I believe it would be a sacrilege if the commission were allowed to construct its lines across the face of that escarpment. It would also be wrong to construct the lines through the Helena and Bickley Valleys which, in the words of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, represent some of the best scenery and recreational areas in the Perth metropolitan region.

Alternative routes are available and the Government and the commission should be looking at them. This is another reason that some independent authority should study the matter. The following is from an article which appeared in the *National Trust of N.S.W. Bulletin*:—

Despite the doubtless sincere efforts of the Electricity Commission of N.S.W. to minimise the visual impact of its transmission line in the Lapstone-Penrith area, it has defiled the natural beauty and sadly diminished the dramatic impact of this great wall of rock at the portal to the Blue Mountains. The trouble lies not in the manner of executing the works but in the sense of values which sees fine landscape as a natural corridor for public utilities because it cannot defend itself against the depredator or seek compensation in the Land and Valuation Court.

We should take into consideration the opinions of people who have had this type of power line constructed in their cities.

A group of people known as the Escarpment Protection Committee banded together when it was first learnt the commission proposed to construct power lines near or through the Darling Range. This committee does not act emotionally. It comprises very highly responsible people in the community and they have gone into this matter in a very scientific and expert way. They recently circularised all members of Parliament giving them some technical information in support of their argument, and although every member of Parliament has this information, I would like to read part of the covering letter so that it might be recorded in *Hansard* because I believe it is a document of some significance. It reads—

We enclose copy of information prepared by a member of our Committee who has had some 16 years experience with the Central Electricity Generating Board of the U.K., and commend it to you for the detailed case made for the erection of only a single row of towers, as against the State Electricity Commission's proposal for a double row.

However, we do acknowledge that at present the Commission have not yet completed the evaluation of the 2 routes under consideration and our case is based on the possibility that the shorter foothills route may be chosen by virtue of the cheaper line erection costs.

The conclusions to be drawn from the technical information are:—

- (1) That the table of load growth shows conclusively that a single row of towers would be sufficient to carry the forecast

power transmission requirements up to the year 1982. This is confirmed by the fact that the S.E.C. are seriously considering stringing only one side of each of the proposed dual towers for the present.

Might I say I have been told by a senior officer of the State Electricity Commission that the commission is, in fact, intending to construct half the conductors at this time. Two lines will run in parallel one being sufficient to carry the load at any one time. The other line is then capable of being serviced. While each row of towers is capable of carrying six conductors, at the present time they will be equipped with three only. To continue the letter:—

- (2) that the statistical and technical analysis suggests that there is a very slight chance of outages due to lightning strikes on a single tower system. There is therefore only a marginal difference in security of supply between a single and the S.E.C. proposal.

One of the objections—in fact, I think the only objection—the commission could have to constructing both lines on one row of towers would be that of security. When two power lines are run along the one five chain reserve it is not very likely that an outage would be confined to only one line. To continue:—

- (3) that initially a considerable economic saving, of approximately \$7.3 million can be made should a single row of towers be erected (see item 2.2.2.). This is the difference between dual towers on Route 1 and single towers on Route 2.

There is reference to the item in the technical data which accompanied the letter. I think it necessarily follows that if it costs \$7,300,000 less to construct the longer line on the single towers, that a far greater saving could be made by using single towers on a shorter route. If the Government is in financial difficulties, as we are told by members opposite, it can save more than \$7,000,000 by using one row of towers along the shorter route.

Mr. Jamieson: When will this money be spent?

Mr. THOMPSON: Between now and 1975.

Mr. Jamieson: That is a horse of another colour.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not think so; I think it is a very pertinent point. If \$7,300,000 is to be saved over that period of time I think it is an argument for us to be prepared to pay a little more to construct the longer line and take into consideration the environmental aspect.

In recent times I have spoken twice on the matter of the State Electricity Commission power lines, and I do not propose to take up any more of the time of the House tonight in advancing my arguments in support of the motion. I conscientiously believe that there should be a review of what is proposed by the State Electricity Commission in the matter of the construction of the power lines. I hope my motion will have the support of the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Jamieson (Minister for Electricity).

OFFENDERS PROBATION AND PAROLE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 10th August. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Norton) in the Chair; Mr. Bertram (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4: Section 34C added—

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered. Clause put and passed.

Mr. BERTRAM: Perhaps, in fairness, I should say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause has been put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Treasurer) [9.40 p.m.]: I would like to apologise to members for not being present to hear the debate continue last evening after the dinner break. I have, however, had copies of the speeches made by those who spoke to the Bill submitted to the State Taxation Department for examination and comment. I had understood that the debate would not be resumed until tomorrow.

Sir David Brand: So had I.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Consequently, I am not able to do justice to some of the comments at this stage.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What made the Leader of the Opposition think that?

Sir David Brand: It was never done when we were in Government.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is on the notice paper. We have a right to proceed with business.

Sir David Brand: I thought we would finish with private members' business.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I give an undertaking to supply the necessary information to members at a later stage. I again endorse the Bill and hope the House will approve the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement—

Progress

Mr. RUSHTON: I move—

That the Deputy Chairman do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion put and negatived.

Committee Resumed

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 8B amended—

Progress

Mr. RUSHTON: I move—

That the Deputy Chairman do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Graham: The member for Dale cannot move that motion twice.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bateman): Order! This motion cannot be put for another 15 minutes.

Committee Resumed

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 10 amended—

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brady	Mr. May
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Graham	Mr. Toms
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Jones	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Reid
Sir David Brand	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Williams
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Nalder	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Ayes

Mr. Davles
Mr. Hartrey
Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Bickerton
Mr. Burke

Fairs

Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Court

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bate-man): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 12th August, 1971

The SPEAKER (Mr. Toms) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Delay in Passage of Bills: Request by Leader of the Opposition

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Toms) [11.01 a.m.]: I am led to believe that towards the end of business last night there was a little misunderstanding. It is the desire of the Leader of the Opposition, with the consent of the Premier and the House, to make a certain request to the Premier. Is the house agreed?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I agree.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Leader of the Opposition) [11.02 a.m.]: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I also thank the House for its indulgence. I agree there was, perhaps, a little misunderstanding last night. At least, I felt very upset even though no one else may have been affected.

I raised the point that the House had moved to the third reading stage of the Offenders Probation and Parole Act Amendment Bill and the Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill without further explanation of both Bills when I felt there had been an undertaking in this regard.

In the first place might I say I understand that the intention of the Government to go on with Government business, following the conclusion of private members' business on private members' day, was advised by the Government Whip to our Whip. However, here again there seems to have been some misunderstanding: At least, I was not informed. As proof of the misunderstanding in this matter the Treasurer—who did undertake to explain certain queries relating to the Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill—was not present. At least, he did not have his notes with him and he found it very difficult to get into his seat. There is no evidence that he had been advised we were to proceed with that Bill.

In the case of the Offenders Probation and Parole Act Amendment Bill, the Attorney-General delayed somewhat and missed the call. I am of the opinion that his was a genuine misunderstanding and he was waiting for a member of the Opposition to stand up.

A great deal of confusion was caused. As the time was past 9.30 p.m., and the Premier had indicated that 10 o'clock would be the adjournment time throughout the session, if possible, I thought the Premier would adjourn the House and call it a night, because private members business had been concluded.

I want to ask the Premier: Would he consider delaying the third reading of the two Bills I have mentioned in order that we might place on the notice paper our intention to request the recommitment of both Bills. I also request, at least, an explanation from the Treasurer regarding the Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill before proceeding to the third reading.

I do feel that the atmosphere which was created was unfortunate, and perhaps not in the best interests of the decorum of the House. We will know better next time; we will know that we can expect to go on with Government business after private members' business if that is finished before 10 o'clock. I make my request to the Premier along those lines.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.06 a.m.]: It is regretted that a little bubble did occur last evening which, I feel, might have been avoided and was not entirely due to a misunderstanding, so far as I can see. There was no intention of any discourtesy from this side of the House, nor do I admit that it actually occurred.

The necessary steps were taken from this side of the House to advise the Opposition of what was proposed. If something went wrong with the system we cannot be blamed for it. However, the request is quite reasonable and I will agree to it. I will agree that we should not proceed with the two Bills mentioned and I will take the necessary steps.

I would like to point out we made it clear at the commencement of the session that our aim was to try to eliminate the long sittings which almost invariably occur at the end of sessions. We made it clear we would endeavour to finish about 10 o'clock in the early part of the session. So far we have been able to stick fairly closely to that time.

When considering the notice paper for yesterday's business it would have been obvious to anybody that in the ordinary course of events private members' business would be disposed of very early. As a matter of fact, if one Minister had not chosen to reply there and then to one of