

to look into this matter again. It would not be very costly, but it would be appreciated by so many people in our agricultural areas.

I appreciate that the Governor's Speech has forecast legislation dealing with education and native welfare, and a number of other matters. For that reason I do not intend to speak on those other matters today, but will content myself with what I have already said.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. A. R. Tonkin.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta — Deputy Premier) [5.20 p.m.]: Before moving the motion expected of me I wish to inform members that Parliament will not be sitting during the week following the Easter holidays. I refer to Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday the 4th, 5th, and 6th April. I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.21 p.m.*

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 21st March, 1972

The **PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON

### Return

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.32 p.m.]: Mr. President, if I may have your indulgence: Before we proceed with today's business I would like to acknowledge the fact that The Hon. Graham MacKinnon is back in his seat. We hope he will be there frequently from now on.

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

## QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

### 1. THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

#### Claims

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) How many claims have been received by the Third Party Claims Tribunal since its inception?
- (2) How many have been finalised?
- (3) How many of those finalised were consent agreements?
- (4) In what degree did the decisions of the Tribunal differ from those by the Trust?

- (5) How many of the Tribunal's decisions were challenged in the Supreme Court?
- (6) To what degree did the decisions of the Supreme Court differ from the Tribunal?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

- (1) As at 10th March, 1972, 2,690 claims have been filed in the Tribunal.
- (2) As at 10th March, 1972, 2,074 claims have been finalised.
- (3) Of the 2,074 claims finalised, 1,738 were finalised by consent agreements.
- (4) It is not clear what statistical information is required by this question. If information is sought as to the number of times the Tribunal awarded less or more than the sum offered by the Trust the answer is not readily available and would require perusal of all the files mentioned in Answer (1).
- (5) 57 appeals have been filed in the Supreme Court against decisions of the Tribunal.
- (6) Information obtained from the records of the Supreme Court is as follows:—

Appeals upheld—11.

Appeals dismissed—18.

Appeals discontinued—6.

Appeals, result of which unknown—22.

2.

## FIREWORKS DISPLAY

### Fire Hazard

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Was permission granted for the fireworks display on the 14th March, 1972, at the opening of the Carousel Shopping Centre, Cannington?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) who gave such permission; and
  - (b) were any conditions imposed when the permit was granted?
- (3) What was the fire hazard in the area on that day?
- (4) What precautions, if any, were taken to prevent fire?
- (5) Will any compensation be paid to the owners of the fifty acres of grassland burnt out?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

- (1) Yes. A "Permit for Display of Fireworks" was issued on the 14th December, 1971.

- (2) (a) and (b) The Chief Inspector of Explosives issued the Permit and the conditions imposed were as prescribed by the Explosives Regulations 1963 viz—

- (i) the use of fireworks be in accordance with operational procedures required by the Chief Inspector for the safety of spectators;
- (ii) the approval of the Police Department be obtained;
- (iii) the approval of the W.A. Fire Brigades Board be obtained.

These conditions were fulfilled and in addition the Town Clerk signified his approval of the display.

- (3) The fire hazard was considered to be "low".
- (4) Fire fighting units were available for the control of any fire outbreak.
- (5) This would depend upon the outcome of any civil action taken by the parties involved.

### 3. EDUCATION

#### *Electricity Costs to Teachers in Remote Areas*

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Will he ascertain if the Minister for Education is aware that some school teachers in remote areas pay as much as \$30.00 per month for electricity in non-air conditioned houses?
- (2) Does the Education Department subsidise teachers in such cases?
- (3) If not, why not?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The Education Department is unaware of such charges.
- (2) No.
- (3) Tenants of Government houses are similar to tenants of privately owned homes and expected to meet costs of electricity consumed.

### 4. TIMBER INDUSTRY Assistance

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

Further to a question asked by me and the answer given on the 15th March, 1972, in regard to the timber industry of this State, with particular reference to (1) (a) (ii), what were the specific values of concessions in respect of—

- (a) freight rates; and
- (b) timber royalties—

in quoting for a recent South African sleeper order?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

Specific values cannot be given because they vary from place to place depending on distance from point of shipment and the type of mill concerned.

The combined concession offered on timber royalties and rail freights subject to the industry being successful in this particular order, approximated 20%.

### 5. STATE FINANCE

#### *Additional Commonwealth Grant for Schools*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question on the 15th March, 1972, relating to the allocation of the additional monies granted by the Commonwealth to the State Government at the recent Premiers' Conference, would the Minister—

- (a) give complete details of the manner in which the \$32,280 allocated to schools will be expended; and
- (b) as this represents only 1.08% of the total Commonwealth grant, does he think this is reconcilable with these words "The Government is determined that there shall be no retreat from its policy that education is the most rewarding investment an administration can make, and its record keeps faith with its policy"?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) Bentley Senior High School—Improvements to bus bay and retaining wall steps—\$7,870.
- City Beach Primary School—Improved access to the oval—\$1,100.
- Fremantle Technical College—Kerbing and Signs—\$538; Ground improvements—\$3,330.
- Forrestfield Primary School—Extensions to the parking area—\$500.
- John Curtin Senior High School—Access road from Finnerty Street—\$2,670.
- New parking area—\$5,526.
- Extensions to the parking area—\$1,754.
- Kapinara Primary School—Fencing—\$700.
- Redcliffe Area Annexe—Extensions to the parking area—\$2,320.

Thornlie Primary School—  
Site filling—\$2,200.  
Yale Primary School—Fencing—\$1,660.  
Secondary Teachers' College—  
Sanding sports area—\$615.  
Hollywood Senior High School  
—Paving extensions—\$275.  
Bicton Primary School—  
Fencing—\$1,222.

In addition, \$83,219 was allocated to school works from the further allocation of funds for the relief of unemployment approved on 20th March.

- (b) Yes. The relatively small proportion of funds for unemployment relief works that could be allocated to schools indicates the high priority given to the needs of Education by the Government when framing its capital budget this year. The total capital allocation to the Education Department in 1971-72 amounts to \$16,695,000 compared with expenditure of \$13,138,000 in 1970-71 which was provided in the last Budget of the Brand Government. Consequently there were no outstanding major school projects which were at a stage where tenders could be let immediately when additional funds for unemployment relief became available. It must be appreciated that the primary purpose of the additional loan allocation made available to the State in February was the relief of unemployment. Therefore the funds were allocated to labour intensive works which could be implemented at the earliest possible date.

6.

#### MAGISTRATE

##### *Port Hedland*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

In view of the reply to my question on Thursday, the 9th September, 1971, concerning the appointment of a magistrate at Port Hedland—

- (a) has the position been examined in view of the fact that 1,763 charges were heard in Port Hedland during 1971, and realising that the 1972 figures already indicate a 31% increase in cases being heard in that court; and  
(b) when will the appointment be made?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) The position has been kept under review.  
(b) No appointment is contemplated at present.

#### LAND AGENTS

##### *Annual License Fee*

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What is the annual license fee payable by land agents?  
(2) Is there any concession for non-operative land agents who may be temporarily unable to operate as land agents due to illness, semi-retirement or for other good reason?  
(3) Would it not be desirable to have a concessional fee for such persons who desire their licenses to remain current in case they return to full time employment as land agents?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) \$15.00.  
(2) No.  
(3) Consideration may be given to providing for a concessional fee in such cases where the holder of long standing of a license, if such license were to lapse through non renewal, and such licensee would be unable to meet the present requirements of the statute for the granting of a new license.

8.

#### COURTHOUSE

##### *Port Hedland*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

In view of the reply to my question on Tuesday, 14th September, 1971, concerning the urgent need for air conditioning in the Port Hedland Court House—

- (a) has the need been considered for financing in 1972 prior to the 1972-73 summer;  
(b) if the answer is "No", will consideration be given for priority because of the extreme conditions and the large number of cases heard in the court house?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) and (b) Yes. Funds have been allocated; tenders are to be called as soon as possible.

**MINISTERIAL VISITS: FREQUENCY***Statement by the Leader of the House*

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.47 p.m.] : Mr. President, recently I gave a wrong reply to a question regarding Ministers' travels. I thought I would have the correct reply with me, but it has not arrived.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have you been overseas since?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I hope to go, but at the moment I am not capable of travelling anywhere. Perhaps you will permit me, Mr. President, to alert the House to the fact that I have made a mistake, in all honesty, and that I will endeavour to supply the correct answer when we meet again.

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY***Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 16th March, on the following motion by The Hon. D. K. Dans:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [4.48 p.m.] : I support the motion moved by Mr. Dans in reply to the Governor's Speech. First I would like to refer to a report in last Friday's *The West Australian* wherein I was credited with supporting a motion moved by Mr. Ron Thompson calling for a reform in the dress of members of Parliament. I would point out that Mr. Thompson did not move such a motion, nor did I support it. Mr. Thompson was speaking to the Address-in-Reply, and I rose to adjourn the debate when he finished his speech.

Nevertheless, I would endorse his remarks. I think members of Parliament are probably just as gully as any other section of the community of adhering to dress which is unsuitable in our climate. I feel any move made to reform the style of clothes we wear would be of benefit to us.

In the Governor's Speech reference was made to the likely introduction of legislation concerning dog racing. Whilst I was in Adelaide recently, along with other members of the Western Australian Parliament I was invited to view a dog racing track which has been operating for only

a short time. I was favourably impressed with what went on. I indicate now that I intend to support the legislation when it is brought forward.

I am concerned about a matter which was recently brought to my notice by one of my constituents; it relates to the kennelling of dogs in suburban areas. The woman concerned lives close to a person who, she says, keeps three dogs. Her family is disturbed by the baying of the dogs—they do not bark—and this interferes with their rest. She said she would not object to one, or perhaps two dogs, being kept, but she believes the owners of these dogs are applying for a kennel license which will enable them to keep more than two dogs. I agree with her; this should not be allowed in built-up districts. I do not necessarily dislike dogs, but as so often happens people who do not own dogs are sometimes pestered by others allowing theirs to run free. I could quote a number of instances which occurred, in the district where I live, of dogs of all sizes and shapes proving to be a nuisance to many people.

I believe that people should be permitted to keep dogs, particularly when they live alone. Such people find comfort in keeping a dog, which not only supplies them with company but also serves as a watchdog. I am not denigrating the keeping of dogs or saying they should be banned from the metropolitan area. I say there is need to keep reasonable control of these animals, particularly since legislation may be introduced to permit greyhound racing.

In his contribution to this debate last week Mr. Griffith made reference to the agitation that has been published in the Press and other media in relation to the Legislative Council. He quite rightly complained that the remarks he made had not received any attention in the Press. I would point out that he is not the only member of Parliament who has suffered from this sort of censorship. I myself have written a number of letters to the Press, which have not been published. Notably there were letters I wrote in relation to criticism of Mr. Charles Court when he was Minister for Industrial Development. They did not appear in the Press at all.

In reply to a letter by one of my constituents which was published in *The West Australian* a few weeks ago, I wrote in refutation of the arguments which he raised in support of the Legislative Council. He cited the instances of amendments made to the Alumina Refinery (Upper Swan) Agreement Bill, and to a number of other amendments made to legislation. I do not feel I would be doing justice to this House or to myself if I did not say this Chamber serves a useful role in our State Parliament. I believe this Chamber does serve a useful role. The members who have been elected to this House spend long hours in their work, and put a great deal of effort into

examining legislation and so bring forward ideas to improve the State. I would say that a good deal of the work done by this House has benefited Western Australia. It acts as a Chamber of Review, and occasionally we perform other functions of an Upper House, such as delaying legislation.

What I complain about—and this is the burden of what I have written to the Press but which has not been published—is that a different situation appertains when a Labor Government is in office, as compared with the time when a Liberal-Country Party Government is in office. We have always faced a situation in which the Labor Party has been in the minority in this Chamber. We know that the Legislative Council has a great deal of power and can, in fact, reject all legislation of a Labor Government. As against that—and bearing in mind the way in which the party system operates—it is unlikely that important legislation of a Liberal-Country Party Government will be rejected or materially altered in any way. That is the basis on which I raise my objection in this instance.

If this Chamber can become a real House of Review, in which its present powers are reduced so that the Government in office does not have to suffer the indignity of having its policy legislation rejected, then we can say it should remain. The other argument given by academics in support of the retention of this Chamber is that it could be used more in the direction of forming committees to examine legislation in greater detail.

This can be effected more easily by a small group, such as a committee, than by the whole membership of this House. Furthermore, the examination can be undertaken in an atmosphere removed from the public, and we would be able to undertake more worth-while examination of any legislation that is brought before us.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You do not think this Chamber should be abolished?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am coming to that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Be careful what you say in this regard. You may find yourself out of this job.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have no hesitation in stating my opinions. I do not see any conflict arising when I state an opinion which may perhaps—and this is what Mr. Griffiths is referring to—be at variance with the policy laid down by my party. It is a different question when a policy matter is brought forward in this House; in that event, of course, I support what my party has adopted, after having decided the question in a democratic way, after having debated it, and

after having voted on it at our State conference. I feel there is no conflict in this regard.

The point I was coming to is that this could be a useful function of the Legislative Council: that is, that we could adopt to a greater extent the committee type of examination. I am sure that Mr. White, Mr. Griffiths, and I agree that while serving on the Select Committee, and now the Honorary Royal Commission, on Town Planning, our study of the subject has been extremely worth while to us.

I am not saying that this cannot be done usefully. What I am saying is that the system could be used equally in the Legislative Assembly if this Chamber were abolished at some time in the future. The back-benchers of the Legislative Assembly could review and carry out a deeper study of proposed legislation. I think those members would feel that they were carrying out a far more useful role in Parliament than is the case at the moment.

If we retain the Legislative Council—and there is no danger of its being abolished at this time—then we hope more effective use will be made of its members.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When is the honourable member due to retire?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think that Mr. Arthur Griffith is probably well aware of the arrangement made elsewhere when the Upper House has been abolished. However, I do not wish to carry that point too far because I might be trespassing on ground which is to be covered by some other member.

The present Leader of the Opposition spent a great deal of time discussing the 1963 amendment to our Constitution which gave this Chamber a role in common with the Legislative Assembly. At that time he said the members of all parties were unanimous in their support of the amendment and, therefore, were in favour of retaining the Legislative Council. I do not think that argument necessarily follows.

As I have said, if the Legislative Council decides to change its organisational set-up so as to reduce the powers of the House, but introduce more committees to study legislation, I will approve of such a move. I believe all members on my side of the House would also approve. However, I am not sure that the Opposition would approve when it came to reducing the powers of this House. What I have said does not mean that I would not prefer to see the Legislative Council abolished altogether, and a unicameral system introduced.

There is no inbuilt virtue in the present system. If we were a national Government the system might have some virtue. If we were worried about a particular party taking dictatorial control of this State—and perhaps this is the idea behind the thinking—there could be some value in a bicameral system. However, ours is a State

Government and we do not have control of the armed forces, foreign policy, and a great deal of the finance. Those matters are controlled by the Federal Government and if some particular group in this State attempted to break away through some form of armed uprising the Federal Government would have some thought on what should take place.

A bicameral system could have some value as a safety valve for illconsidered actions where a national Government rules the country, but such a system has no value in a State Parliament within Australia. Governments are elected by the people to perform a job, and if the policy adopted by the Government does not suit the people then the voters have the remedy in their hands. It should not be for some other Chamber of this Parliament to say which policy shall or shall not be adopted, or what is good for the people. The people can express their view through a democratic vote.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: They did that when they elected members to two Chambers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The honourable member is not suggesting it is not a democratic vote when the people vote for us.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not sure of the implication in that remark. When a member of the public is over 18 years of age, fulfills all the qualifications laid down in the Constitution, and quite freely exercises his right to vote, that is a democratic vote. It is a fact that it takes two voters in my electorate to elect a member of Parliament as against one voter in the electorate represented by the honourable member opposite.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How do you make that out?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The average number of voters in a country seat is 7,500, whereas it is 15,000 for a city electorate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said it took two electors in your electorate as against one in a country electorate.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When the number of voters is in the proportion of two to one, what other way could it be? Each individual voter democratically chooses the way he will place his vote.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would the honourable member be good enough to correct me if I am wrong?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Leader of the Opposition is not able to discern the difference for himself then further elucidation by me is pointless.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a smooth way of getting out of the difficulty, when the honourable member cannot explain the situation.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There must have been a very democratic crowd of people around when the honourable member was elected.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They voted very intelligently, too.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The same intelligent people re-elected me, of course.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would say that in the case of the Leader of the Opposition they elected a man who has shown his capabilities in this Chamber over many years. I would not deny that.

Enough of that, Mr. President. I would now like to endorse the remarks made by the Leader of the House in welcoming Mr. MacKinnon back to the Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Cloughton.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: He has already introduced some life into the debate and I am glad to see him back.

There are a number of matters upon which I would like to enlarge because this is one of the opportunities for a back-bencher to bring forward problems which particularly concern him. I know that other members are anxious to speak so I will not delay the debate any longer than I promised.

I want to point out, however, that on every occasion I have spoken I have mentioned education and what I thought should take place. Among other things, I have said there should be more involvement of the schools in the community. I have read a number of articles published lately which indicate that the involvement of schools is now more accepted in professional educational circles. The matter was discussed recently in an article published by the Western Australian State school teachers' union.

Another matter to which I have also referred is aged people's homes. I have spoken at some length concerning the problems experienced in one particular village. At that time I hoped the matter would receive some publicity, but it did not. I recently received a publication, with the compliments of The Hon. A. W. Bickerton, Minister for Housing. The publication is a copy of an address delivered by The Most Rev. G. T. Sambell, Archbishop of Perth. The address suggests that perhaps aged people's homes are not the right environment when grouped together, but should be scattered throughout a particular district.

I have made a similar suggestion—that the aged people's homes should be located where those people have spent their lives, and where they have friends and connections with various organisations. They can be serviced by meals on wheels and by the local social workers. To be located within their known locality would be beneficial to

aged people. My suggestion has the support of The Most Reverend G. T. Sambell. The Government, in association with local authorities, should be able to get something done. Perhaps church bodies could examine this idea with a view to achieving something within a reasonable time.

Quite a number of elderly people, whose families have grown up, are occupying large homes. This is an economic loss to the community because a young family could be enjoying the use of such a home. The houses are usually too big for the elderly people occupying them and if those people were able to move out into more compact units the younger families could move in and both groups of people would benefit.

A more recent happening which has exercised my mind—and exercised the minds of quite a few others—during the last few days is the report of the Environmental Protection Authority on the proposed alumina refinery project at Upper Swan. It has been suggested that the amendment made by this Chamber to the agreement Bill, providing that the Government would not sign the agreement until it received the report from the Environmental Protection Authority, was something which demonstrated that this Chamber had some value. However, we know that the Premier had given his own personal undertaking that this would be done, even before the suggestion came forward that such a provision should be placed in the legislation by this Chamber. Unless we doubt the word and the sincerity of the Premier I feel members of this Chamber will be taking more credit than is due to them if this idea is perpetuated.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Perhaps the honourable member can tell us why the Government in the Legislative Assembly so strongly opposed the amendment made in this Chamber.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Leader of the Opposition can draw his own conclusion about that. I would think that members of the party which I represent felt it was a reflection on the Premier after he had given an undertaking not to sign the agreement until the report had been received. However, in fairness I think that if I had been in the party in Opposition at the time I would have attempted to get something done along similar lines.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is an admission which will probably clear your soul.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you want us to nominate the penance you should do after your confession?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think it is commendable that the Government has done what it said it would. I do not think the Government had any choice, but its action is commendable.

The community can believe that there is an organisation of competent people who will examine industrial and other projects which might cause damage to the environment, and that the organisation concerned will be prepared to make a recommendation that might not gain favour with the Government of the day.

We can well imagine why the Minister responsible for introducing this legislation in another place said he was very disappointed. The community knows, however, that the body concerned is prepared to make this type of recommendation.

The Hon. J. Heitman: This could apply to practically every mining venture that takes place in the State from now on.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know what this authority will decide in the future. All sorts of possibilities could be conjectured. If the authority felt, after a detailed study of a project, that it was not going to be of benefit to the environment or the people then it is the duty of that authority to recommend against such a project. I think the public in this State can feel confident that they do have an authority which is prepared to make this type of recommendation.

I do not condemn the authority, and I certainly do not propose to condemn the Government in this matter, but I would remind members that I spoke in support of this legislation at the time, when I thought I had satisfied myself to the best of my ability that no harm could possibly arise.

I am not an environmental scientist or an ecologist and I am only able to make an assessment on the evidence put before us. This was also the case with the Government at the time. The Ministers are not specialists in this matter and, as a consequence, they seek advice from those who are experts.

I am not at all happy about the matter and, like Mr. Graham, I am disappointed that this decision was made. There were three main areas in which the report showed a great deal of concern: The first of these was in relation to the underground water supplies; the next was in connection with land use, particularly as it relates to mining or quarrying operations; and, thirdly, the report was concerned about aircraft operating from the R.A.A.F. base at Pearce.

I feel—and this is only a personal view—that the E.P.A. has arrived at a decision after viewing the worst possible situation. We cannot protect ourselves in every step we make; there are times when we must make a step into the unknown. I am still of the opinion however, so far as the facts as they are available to us are concerned, that there was no cause for anxiety in connection with the site chosen for the location of the Pacminex refinery.

At the time I was making inquiries, and since, it has been my impression that the water supply department showed no concern as to what might happen to the underground water supplies.

When I was present at the opening of the reservoir site at Mirrabooka I asked about the possibility of the movement of water as it relates to the Pacminex site from the location of the bores serving the Mirrabooka scheme. I was not given an authoritative statement on that occasion but no concern was expressed at the time; the movement of the water through the sand was not of great speed and not from that particular direction.

Yesterday I was with a party examining the red mud ponds at Kwinana—I refer to the Alcoa red mud ponds. I must say I was very pleasantly surprised at what was happening there. We drove over one of these pits or ponds and I noticed some vegetation growing right to the edge of the pond. There was no sign from the vegetation growing close to the pond that there was any leakage.

The report from the E.P.A. says that no records of leakage from the ponds are available; that the most recent records of testing were in 1969. This is a long way back. I think the previous Government and, perhaps, the present Government, are remiss for not seeing that some record was kept of what is happening.

I do not think it would be difficult to take a reading of the water under those ponds at this time, particularly if there is concern or doubt expressed as to whether leakage is taking place. I acknowledge that the supply of water to feed the metropolitan area is very short, and if this sort of thing is happening it is quite natural for concern to be expressed and for our water supply to be protected.

The previous Government introduced legislation particularly to protect those underground supplies north of the city. At the same time, however, these ponds are being condemned without a sufficient assessment having been made as to what is actually taking place.

I would like to revert to a statement I made earlier when I said that the authority must arrive at a decision which will protect the environment for the people. The authority can only do that on the evidence before it. In this case it feels it did not have sufficient evidence to say the ponds were not leaking and not affecting the underground water supplies.

The authority seems to have taken the gloomy view. I believe the tests are not difficult to make and they should be made as soon as possible to meet the objection that has been raised. There are also objections to the location of the site insofar as it relates to the supplies of water

from underground. I will not go through all of them but reference was made to the demands of the growing metropolitan public and the need to conserve our underground water supplies north of Perth which are roughly estimated to be 30,000,000 gallons a day. This is only a rough estimate because no definite assessment has been made as to the amount of water available to the north. The capacity of the Mirrabooka Reservoir is 30,000,000 gallons. An estimate of underground supplies available based on this figure would be 10,000,000,000 gallons a year.

The requirement of Pacminex for 1,600,000 tons of alumina would be in the vicinity of 3,000,000 gallons, or one-tenth of the 30,000,000 gallons I have mentioned. It takes 30,000,000 gallons from Mirrabooka to provide 20,000-odd services. If we take one-tenth of that and the figure is reduced to 2,000 this will still provide 18,000 services. So there is not a great deal of difference in those figures.

The last report of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board—the report for 1970-71—indicates that our sewerage services consumed approximately 4,500,000,000 gallons of water a year. If we are concerned about the availability of water this is an area at which we could look, because 4,500,000,000 gallons a year is a lot of water and there could be the possibility of a great saving from this source, particularly when we arrive at a point where it is a matter of great importance that the water should be used for some purpose other than that for which it is being used now.

I do not think we can condemn the refinery for that reason. Even if it is sited somewhere else and produces at the rate I have mentioned it will still require the same amount of water to carry out its refining.

So this leaves me in some doubt as to why the authority arrived at its decision in relation to water supplies.

The Hon. F. R. White: Have you read the E.P.A. report which was published?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have it here.

The Hon. F. R. White: But have you read it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes I have read it several times from cover to cover. Reference is made in the report to caustic in the water and it is said that 3 cwt. of caustic is used to produce one ton of alumina. I am not sure what the authority's concern is in this connection, because this is not mentioned. Is the authority concerned that the whole of the caustic in the plant might be spilled at one time? This is the type of question that one is prompted to ask.

I notice that in relation to pollution the term synergistic is used. I imagine that this report would be studied by both professionals and lay people, and yet we find that very little explanation is made of the term synergistic. Nor are we told in what way it is a matter of concern so far as it relates to the Pacminex site. I would ask where else has the problem arisen; what are the different types of problems, and how do they relate to this particular site? The report says that there is no danger in controlling the output of sulphur dioxide even when oil is used. It says there is no problem associated with fluoride and yet at the end the report brings in the term synergistic and does not indicate in what way it is a matter of concern. This raises all kinds of questions. I would like to know what the position is. Probably I could go to the Minister and say I would like to study the 500-page file to find out all about this. As I say, I could do this as a member of Parliament, but what about the members of the public; how will they get on?

There must also be a doubt about the R.A.A.F. base at Pearce creating air pollution. I wished to refer to Mr. Willesee's speech in the Legislative Council on this topic but I have mislaid the reference. Mr. Willesee indicated that discussions had taken place with the R.A.A.F. administration and that the R.A.A.F. had expressed satisfaction with the safeguards laid down by the Clean Air Council. This raises a further question in my mind: How can we reconcile the statement made by the Leader of the House and the conclusion arrived at by the Environmental Protection Authority?

I could spend a great deal of time on this matter of air pollution, but I will refer only briefly to the siting of the refinery and the winds. The report says that the danger of air pollution at the Pacminex site is seven times greater than that at Kwinana. However, the report does not give the complete figures on which this conclusion is based. The authority mentions that these conditions exist for 29 days of the year at the Pacminex site but for only four at Kwinana. It must be borne in mind if there is a north-east wind at Upper Swan there is also a north-east wind at Kwinana, and pollutants would travel over the area adjacent to Kwinana as well as over the Swan Valley. There are a number of factories at Kwinana but we have not heard mention of pollution effects in the Rockingham district.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Having performed the dentistry, are you now complaining about the teeth?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No, I opened my remarks by saying that this report is a good thing. However, I am at a loss to understand how the Environmental Protection Authority arrived at its decision based on the material in this report.

I raise this matter because I believe it is important to our State that we have faith in the authority. My comment is that the authority made its judgment on the information available and that information is not sufficient in my opinion. The authority had to make a hurried decision and it is a pity that this development at Upper Swan has to be lost because of a precipitate recommendation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you not remember that we amended the legislation by adding that the authority had to report by the 29th February?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is not important at this stage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is important when you say the authority was rushed.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I feel I have sufficiently indicated my opinion on the authority's decision.

I believe the report issued by the Environmental Protection Authority was an important milestone in our State's history. It was also an important milestone in that the Government accepted an unfavourable decision. I hope a further examination will be made of the points of doubt in the report.

I do not comment on the effect of the refinery on the landscape in Chittering Valley, except to say that any operations undertaken would have had to conform to the standards laid down. It seems to me that the company and the Government departments could have negotiated to overcome the problems.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [5.36 p.m.]: I would like to comment on the views expressed by Mr. Cloughton concerning the work of the Legislative Council but as my opinions conflict with Mr. Cloughton's, and they have been expressed and reported accurately in the Press, I will not speak at length on this subject. Mr. Cloughton may concur with my comments on some other points later in this address.

I point out to the House the grave conditions which our descendants will face within the next 50 years. It cannot be denied that Perth has natural and developed beauty and that succeeding Governments have endeavoured to continue developing the metropolitan area whilst maintaining the beauty of the city. I believe there is still room for industrial development in our city and in the metropolitan area but it must be remembered that our water resources are limited. We must be aware that we are entering a phase of destruction by development. Our descendants can still have a city of which they are proud, if we realise the limitations and start planning now.

This is not a tenuous plea against pollution; it is a plea based on facts. These facts have been assembled by studying

the experiences of cities which are older than Perth. I would like to present ideas which could possibly correct the direction in which we are heading and at the same time permit increased industrialisation. We must expand national and international trade. We must increase our exports to become a great nation. It is a requirement of society today that we expand industry and develop technology to meet increased demand.

There are several basic commodities necessary to meet today's standards. These commodities are well known to members: Land, minerals, water, sun, clean air, electric power, and fuel. Within the next 15 years two of these commodities may not be available in sufficient quantity or at reasonable cost. Therefore, we must plan now.

Sixty-four years from now the expected population of the metropolitan area will be 10,000,000. This may be checked in schedule 7 of the Environmental Protection Authority's report on the alumina refinery at Upper Swan. The capacity of our water supply to meet future demands is frightening. We can only expand for five years using the current expansion rate of our dam system in the metropolitan area. If we consider our current expansion rate together with the projected development we can only go forward for 15 years. After that time we will have to use waters from the sands north and south of Perth and possibly saline shandies from the Murray River. Industry must expand but our metropolitan resources are not sufficient to cope with the expansion.

We will destroy the Perth we know if the current expansion rate continues. New York is now dying and Perth will do the same. If members saw the television show two nights ago about this subject they will realise that the future ahead of us is frightening. It is easy to dismiss these fears as being many years away, but considered in terms of the life of mankind, it is a very short period.

The second commodity which may be in short supply is electric power. At the moment it is planned to use steam turbine combination methods of power production. However, if members bear in mind our present-day problems of reticulation they will have some idea of the problems which will develop within the next 50 years. In a period of 50 years in the United States of America the power requirements rose by a factor of 40. If we had an increased demand of this nature in Perth, the situation would be chaotic.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What about nuclear power?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: My leader suggests nuclear power. Of course this is a possibility but I believe I have a better idea.

We would be completely irresponsible if we took the attitude that something must turn up. We need to examine recirculation and treatment of our refuse; we need to examine the prevention of pollution, and we need to look at the treatment of sewage as is being done in Chicago. The United States of America faced a big problem with sewage and they believe they have solved it in a way which benefits the whole population in the urban area of Chicago. Air pollution is something that we should also be aware of.

I do not believe the problem in Perth will become as great as it is at the moment in Tokyo, London, and San Francisco. I say this because of our geographical location, ocean currents, and climate. We do not have the conditions to produce lingering smog—that is, a combination of fog and industrial smoke.

I do not wish it to appear that I am anxious to see the cessation of industrialisation. I want to see increased industrialisation and development. This nation can become great through its exports. The life blood of our country depends on these. The first major step in industrialisation through mining was in the Pilbara. We are now exporting huge quantities of ore and the Pilbara will continue to develop along with the service industries.

I suggest that the next best areas in which to start industrialisation are the large coastal areas. I consider that the most economical industrial complex that man can have, disregarding the cost of labour, is the one that has cheap water, cheap power, and raw materials close to the source of manufacture, together with service industries that can service the major industries within the area which must also be close to or surrounding a port from which goods can be exported to markets which are also close to that port. All of these requirements for industry are in one small corner of the State; in the Kimberley. To be specific, in that area we have the cheapest water in Australia. The Ord River dam holds 4,250,000 acre feet of fresh water at supply level. This expands to 800 square miles of fresh water at flood level. This dam is located in a monsoonal region so the supply will replenish itself each year. If the need for water becomes greater we also have in the Kimberley the Fitzroy River to the south-west of the Ord and this is capable of being dammed to hold an even greater quantity of water than the Ord River dam.

The next great potential for the establishment of industry in the Kimberley is cheap power. To explain this I will now quote from an article which was published

in a journal issued by the Institute of Engineers, Australia. This article reads as follows:—

**The Tidal Power Resources of the Kimberley**

By John G. Lewis, B.E., D.I.C.,  
M.Sc. (Lond.)  
(Associate Member)

**Summary:—**This report summarises the tidal power resources of the whole northwest coast from La Grange Bay to Darwin Harbour.

Darwin Harbour, of course, is not far from the border of Western Australia, and La Grange is near Broome. Continuing to quote—

These resources total approximately 300,000 megawatts which is an astronomical figure compared to Australia's present installed power of about 6,000 megawatts.

At this point I would like to emphasise that the total installed power for the Commonwealth is approximately 6,000 megawatts, whereas in the Kimberley we have tidal resources to produce over 300,000 megawatts. The article continues—

Some 25 possible proposals have been chosen which do not appear to have any insuperable problems and could prove economically attractive on detailed analysis. After comparison with similar schemes proposed in other parts of the world, the author has come to the conclusion that nowhere is there a better combination of high tidal range and topographic advantages. The best of the proposals are quite spectacular by world standards and probably form the largest block of hydro electric power in South East Asia.

This report is intended to focus attention on a large and virtually unknown national asset awaiting development by modern scientific and engineering methods. This could be the key to development of the overall resources of the western half of North Australia, and could play an outstanding part in the development of the nation generally.

That article was written in 1962. Also, in the Kimberley iron ore is already being mined most economically at Yampi Sound, and at Cockatoo and Koolan Islands. Natural gas has been found in commercial quantities within the Kimberley. On the Mitchell Plateau we have bauxite deposits which the Amax Company will commence to develop for mining in May of this year. That company will be producing alumina and using starch for its production from the Ord River irrigation crops.

I point out that to convert alumina to aluminium, cheap power, lime, soda ash and carbon are required, and there is plenty of limestone in the Kimberley to

meet the lime requirements for such production. I have been informed by an honourable member of this House, whilst talking to him in the corridor, that he understands there are no limestone deposits suitable for the production of alumina in the north. However, now that I have pointed out to him that I am personally aware—and so are some Government departments—of the existence of the Devonian coral reef above the surface, 15 miles inland along the Kimberley coast I am sure he will have changed his mind.

Carbon, in its purest form, can be produced from burnt sugar; and we also have the best sugar available, but I will refer to that later. So it can be seen that if other industries are introduced to the Kimberley—sufficient industries to commence and use the total power resources available—we will be able to manufacture aluminium right on the site and provide all the services for that production as well. I doubt whether any other place in the world would be able to compete with us on an economic basis.

Cypress pine timbers have been found growing in a natural state in the Kimberley and no doubt a timber industry could be developed from these pines. With our irrigated black soil plains, river loam flats and grasslands, we can grow a variety of crops. In addition, our production of cattle could be increased. A fishing and prawning industry is about to commence after feasibility trials conducted in the Kimberley indicated that the grounds were of a commercial quality. Rock oysters are also available for table use, ranging from small to large varieties. We also have the pearl oysters which are used for the production of cultured pearls. At the moment barytes—92 per cent. pure—is being mined. This is used in medicines, chemicals, plastics, and paint. It is also used for drilling mud. This mineral is just sticking up out of the ground. It is being knocked over by bulldozers and then processed.

We have an abundance of mineral sands in the northern rivers. Some people have just taken out dredging claims to mine these sands. Earlier in my speech I mentioned limestone deposits. I am not an expert on limestone, nor on cement production, but I would be very surprised if sufficient deposits of limestone were not available in the Kimberley suitable for cement production. With the production of seafoods, meat, and fruits that could be developed with the irrigation scheme and which could also be developed at other places, a canning industry could be considered. If a canning factory were placed somewhere near Wyndham, because of its proximity to Asian markets, it would be an advantage. I feel we could do well with a canning industry. Vegetable oils could be produced from the crushing of our cotton seed if a crushing mill were available, and there are other crops we

could grow. I mentioned earlier that we could grow sugar better than any other place in the world. Tests have shown that our sugar crop is better than the sugar grown in the Lower Burdekin Valley and this valley is considered to be one of the best regions in the world for the growing of sugar.

To those interested in farming I point out that in the Ord River Irrigation scheme we can produce and crop wheat at the rate of 2½ tons to the acre. This is approximately double the wheat production at any other centre in the State.

At the moment we have no markets available for these products so we do not grow them, but if we consider the growing of these products in the light of establishing the major industries that I have proposed, the Kimberley could become an extremely worth-while area.

Cotton could be grown more economically if fertilisers could be imported without the loadings of tariff protection, and on the condition that the fertilisers were brought into the country in ships which were shipping export cargoes from Australia. As I mentioned earlier, if we had an oil seed mill we could obtain a greater return to the farmers who produce this seed in the Ord River irrigation area. At the moment they are bagging the seed and exporting it. This is a most uneconomical method.

With increased industrialisation and farm productivity, in conjunction with cheap water, cheap power, together with the production of cotton, which I believe is grown in one of the best areas in Australia, we could enter the field of cotton textile manufacturing in competition with other manufacturers on world markets. I feel confident about this because the Deputy Premier has already visited Indonesia with a view to finding possible markets and if this were achieved it would be of great benefit to the Kimberley in view of the fact that the Kimberley foreshore is only 300 miles from the foreshore of Indonesia which has a population of 21,000,000 people offering a great trade potential. Our Kimberley foreshore is also close to other Asian markets.

If we developed this potential in the Kimberley it would not only benefit the north and the whole of the State in general but would also solve many of the problems I have mentioned which now exist in Perth. To commence this type of development we will need Government planning at State and Commonwealth level. Firstly, we would need to invite the representatives of major industries in Australia generally and if Australia could not meet the need we could seek assistance from overseas. I feel certain there are many large industries in Australia and the rest of the world that would like to participate in such a scheme, because they would be quick to see the economics of it.

The developers of this proposed scheme would need guarantees from the Government to build roads and an international port. They would also need guarantees for the development of tidal power and the reticulation of water. The developers would need concessions for the purchase of land or for the leasing of it; whatever the Government of the day decided would be the best method. Company tax and payroll tax would need to be waived during the development period on the condition that the waiving of these taxes would mean the developer would, for example, reinvest in the area and the industry for the next period of development. Personal income tax concessions would also have to be made during the period of development.

I would point out that, by using this system, the State and Commonwealth Governments would not be subsidising industry. They would waive the collection of taxes, which is a different thing altogether, but the taxes would be waived only for a given developmental period. At the end of that period the State and Commonwealth Governments would discover that their coffers would be holding a great deal more income than they would if they tried to progress by the standard method of development.

I consider these suggestions should be studied so that the population and our essential services might develop. If we do not look at this system we will be left with the current system which is a bit horrifying. People are invited to go out into isolated areas to develop them. They accept the invitation and commence the development with enthusiasm, but because of the low population which is evident in newly developed areas, the high cost of living as a result of the isolation, and the lack of secondary education, after a certain number of years they find it necessary to leave the area. This particularly applies to those with children who are approaching or have reached secondary education level, because this education is not available in the isolated areas and the parents cannot afford to send their children away. This limits both the development of the State and its income.

I hope that my suggestions will be received in a more favourable manner than have the pleas of Mr. Berry concerning the Carnarvon situation. Lethargy and a lack of imagination are evident in that connection. Mr. Berry has been pleading for the damming of the Gascoyne River so that Carnarvon might still produce \$4,000,000 worth of crops each year. If the Gascoyne is not dammed and the river ceases to flow then the area will fall within a very short period.

Mr. Berry was told why his suggestions could not be adopted, but we do not need men and women to tell us why things cannot be done. Such people are negative-thinking people. We require men, women,

and planners who say, "Do such and such by a certain date, and if you run into problems then solve them."

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: This problem has not arisen only in the last 12 months you know.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: What does the honourable member mean?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The problem concerning nothing having been done.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I would not say that. The previous Government made investigations and was doing so for some years. The previous Government and the present Government have indicated that investigations are in progress.

A little more imagination should be displayed and the Government of the day should consider Plough Share; that is, the use of atomic energy in the development of dams.

I hope that my suggestions will be considered and will be of assistance to this Cabinet and future Cabinets so that the living standards of Perth and other regions of the State might be improved.

I compliment Mr. Dans on the presentation of his address under trying circumstances on opening day; and I support the motion.

*Sitting suspended from 6.04 to 7.30 p.m.*

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [7.30 p.m.]: History informs us that when the English first came to settle this great country of ours they decided to supplement their population with convicts who provided more or less slave labour. In many cases the convicts had committed very minor crimes in England, such as poaching a rabbit or stealing half a loaf of bread when they were hungry. These poor creatures were placed in the holds of ships and made the journey to Australia under extremely bad conditions; the food was bad, the sanitation was bad, and generally their lot was a cruel one. In the early history of our country they helped develop Australia to what it is today. Now we have modern cities and all the amenities which I believe anyone could wish for. Today we do not lack for entertainment, there is sport of every nature, television, radio, youth clubs, and many other associations to cater for the people.

In spite of all this we have in our midst what I term a virulent disease; namely, the unauthorised use of motor vehicles. Some young people cause annoyance and inconvenience to decent citizens by taking such vehicles off the street or even from people's homes. They go joyriding in stolen vehicles and often damage them by driving them into rivers and swamps. It seems they will go to any lengths to get what they term a "kick." One cannot understand the workings of the minds of young people who do this kind of thing.

It is interesting to look at the Criminal Code to find out the penalty for the unauthorised use of motor vehicles. Section 390A reads—

Any person who unlawfully uses, or takes for the purpose of using, or drives or otherwise assumes control of any vehicle as defined in the Traffic Act, 1919-1931, without the consent of the owner or the person in charge thereof, is guilty of a misdemeanour and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for any term not exceeding three years.

How often is a person convicted of the unauthorised use of a motor vehicle sent to gaol for a period of three years with hard labour? Even if the full penalty were enforced, what would it mean? I believe it would mean very little to the type of person who is convicted. Many of them seem to think their companions look up to them if they have been to prison—or should I call it "a house of correction"? An article appeared in the *Daily News* of Thursday last, the 16th March, 1972, wherein the Director of the Department of Corrections commented on the fact that Western Australia has the highest gaol rate in Australia. He pointed out various factors which contributed to this and mentioned short-term prison sentences as being one.

What a nuisance it is that an individual cannot leave a motorcar on a public street, or in his home without some loud coming along and taking possession of it. We find the penalties handed down by the courts are often very small, although the vehicle taken could be worth from \$5,000 to \$6,000 and is often practically destroyed. Even if the penalties which are meted out are considerable in money value, this does not mean a thing today for the simple reason the offenders do not care whether they pay a fine or go to gaol for a short time. As long as this type of young person gets a kick out of taking a motor vehicle that is all that matters to him.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is a very serious offence.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not think it is treated as seriously as it should be.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you suggest the penalty should be?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I shall deal with that subject shortly. We have increased penalties and taken all kinds of steps to try to stop this disease. What has this achieved? Absolutely nothing. We are looking in every direction for some remedy.

Some young people take possession of motor vehicles, as I have said, and others are committed to acts of vandalism. I do not suppose vandalism in our community has ever been as rife as it is today. When I was a young man unruly lads were called larrikins. They had a little fun, but they were nothing like the vandals of today.

because they did not set out deliberately to destroy other people's property. They did not smash up what decent people owned and, in fact, they seemed to have respect for the goods and property of others. This kind of respect does not exist today amongst many young people.

In a town in my electorate a young lad of 15 years of age recently went into a school and did \$80 worth of damage. When apprehended he was questioned and asked why he had done it. He said that he was drunk and he hated schools anyway. That boy was 15!

Another young lad whom I know recently turned 21 and a party was held to celebrate the occasion. He was given presents to the value of almost \$200. Unfortunately he did not take them home with him that night. He had intended to do so, but while talking to someone outside, the premises were locked. When he went back for his presents the next morning they were missing. The police were informed but nothing was discovered immediately. The parents offered a reward of \$50 whereupon an informer came along and the police managed to apprehend those responsible. One of them was fined \$170 in the local court and had to pay compensation of \$19.50. Another was fined \$170, with \$19.50 restitution. A third was fined \$20, with no restitution, in the Pemberton court.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Were they convicted of the same offence?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, all three were convicted of the same offence. They took the presents into the bush and smashed them completely or mutilated them in some way. The State collected \$360 in fines but the restitution for the goods destroyed came to a total of only \$39, although the goods were worth \$200.

When the boy and his family objected to this they were told that some of the presents could be repaired. For instance, it was suggested that a rug with a hole in it could be mended and, consequently, they would receive nothing for the rug. Would that rug ever be the same as when the boy received it as a present? I say it would not, no matter how well it was mended. They were told the same thing in connection with other articles which were damaged; that they could be repaired. In all, only \$39 restitution was awarded after the parents had provided a reward of \$50. What a financial fiasco this was for them.

Surely this kind of thing must make us wonder what we should do in connection with penalties for such offences. As I have said, it is of no use putting the offenders in gaol or fining them. I think we should look at our Criminal Code to see the penalties provided for different offences. I cannot locate the appropriate section at the moment but the Criminal Code provides that a person can be

sentenced to gaol or fined, with or without a whipping. I know many do-gooders would hold up their hands in horror at the thought of corporal punishment being meted out to these young demons who are doing so much destruction in our midst and annoying decent citizens in Australia. However, I cannot see any other penalty which will bring them to book. They should be made to realise that if they insist on doing this type of thing they will be on the receiving end of a darned good hiding.

I think it is a great pity that we ever did away with the cane in our schools, because this is the crux of the matter. Corporal punishment in schools was not very severe. I had many a cut on the hand and many a whack across the tail. Many other members in the House have experienced the same and it has not done any one of us much harm. No member would be able to show the scars of the battle he entered into at the time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not here anyway.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The President would not allow it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Any member is at liberty to hold his hand out to show any scars he might still have. I say most seriously I believe corporal punishment is the only way we can possibly deal with these offenders. I have pointed out that gaol sentences and fines mean nothing to them. In many cases restitution is poor. So, what do we do? Do we go back to a system of corporal punishment? When all is said and done, is it so very cruel? I am certainly not suggesting that we should take out the cat-o'-nine-tails to whip the skin off their hides. Instead, I am suggesting only a light whipping; just enough to give them a lesson. We would probably find that most of the offenders are cowards anyway. A touch of the whip would do a world of good and would probably make decent citizens of them. It is a pity all of them are not taken into the Army or given a good boot in the tail like that given by the old Irish policeman when people in Ireland got into trouble.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had better lay off the Irish. They are in enough trouble as it is.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Was it Northern or Southern Ireland?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Any Government which has the courage to introduce whipping or some other form of corporal punishment to help teach this type of person a lesson will receive the approbation of the majority of the people of our country. I am quite serious about this, but I shall not dwell further on this issue at the moment.

The question of the opening ceremony in hot weather such as we experienced last Tuesday has been mentioned by other

members during the Address-in-Reply. I too, would like to deal with this briefly. In particular I noted that the heads of the Services and other officials—Commodore Doyle of the Navy, Brigadier Larkin of the Army, Air Commodore Dallywater of the Air Force, Commissioner Wedd of the Police Force, Lieutenant-Colonel Burt, the Governor's Official Secretary, and Captain Howard, his A.D.C.—stood on their feet in terrific heat in heavy uniforms for at least 30 minutes while the Governor's Speech was being read. They were perspiring freely.

I know it has been protocol for 100 years or more, but those people had to stand there for that length of time in hot weather. To my knowledge, they are not men who would do a great deal of physical exercise, because of the positions they occupy, but they are the heads of our defence and law services and men who should command the highest respect in our community.

Of the 200 or more people who were in this House that day, six were standing up and the rest were sitting down. I think we are taking protocol a little too far when we subject people in such high positions to having to stand for just on 30 minutes in the terrific heat we experienced that day. When Colonel Burt came past he had beads of perspiration on his face. Surely in these modern days we can provide seats for them to sit on when the day is as hot as it was then. I cannot see any reason for protocol debarring the representatives of the defence and law services in this State or any other State from sitting down.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you not think the difficulty could be overcome by having the opening at a reasonable time of the year?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I still do not think it is necessary for these gentlemen who hold high positions to stand while everyone else is sitting down. There is no reason for it at all except protocol, and surely in this day and age we can do without protocol to that length.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What about air-conditioning in the Chamber?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I would like some thought to be given to this matter. I cannot see any reason for not providing seats for these gentlemen to enable them to sit here in comfort at the opening of Parliament, even though they represent the services. They do not represent the services any better by standing up than they would by sitting down.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Judges usually sit down.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Judges always sit. On that note, I support the motion.

**THE HON. J. L. HUNT (North) (7.48 p.m.):** In supporting the motion I would like to refer to some matters mentioned by previous speakers. The first matter was mentioned by Mr. Ron Thompson and Mr.

Baxter and relates to the mode of dress in this House. It also seems to me that a more appropriate time than during the heat of the day could be chosen for the opening of Parliament.

Some good arguments have been put forward for modification of the style of dress to be worn in this House, and I would like you, Mr. President, to give earnest consideration to making some change. The style of dress should, however, be uniform and not left to the choice of individual members, who might come in shorts or sports jackets, long sleeves or short sleeves, and with or without ties. Personally, I think the discarding of coats would not lower the dignity of the House. The effect of it might be that some members would not get as hot under the collar as they do at the present time.

In the north of the State, where I come from, the standard dress for social occasions is slacks, a shirt with long sleeves, and a tie. I have never heard any complaints about the mode of dress in the north country. I do not feel the heat very much, and I was by no means distressed in the Chamber the other day. I do not know what the temperature in the Chamber was on that day but I noticed that His Excellency and his *aide-de-camp* were slightly distressed when they left the Chamber.

As far as air-conditioning is concerned, I can think of many other places in the State that warrant it before this Chamber. In many parts of the north country, even though electricity is supplied, air-conditioning is well and truly out of the question because of its cost. I have previously mentioned this matter in the House.

At Wittenoom the price of electricity is about 12c a unit for the first 100 units, dropping to 9c or 10c for the next 100 units, and over 200 units it drops to about 6c. One can imagine what would be the cost of air-conditioning a home of reasonable size in that town. Unfortunately, in Wittenoom the power is supplied by private enterprise, and I do not know how we could go about subsidising the people in places like Wittenoom, Nullagine, Marble Bar, and Wyndham for the cost of electricity.

At Wyndham the power is supplied by the meatworks. It is supplied to the shire at about 3.5c and retailed to consumers, both business people and private consumers, for 9.5c up to about 150 units, and above that the cost is lower. Some businesses in Wyndham, such as butchers' shops and small stores, pay somewhere between \$300 and \$500 a month for power. Just east of Wyndham, at Kununurra, where the power is supplied by the Government power station, the price of electricity is half the price paid in Wyndham, but it is still high.

The cost of water in those towns is on a par with the cost of electricity. I am renting a house in Perth and I was surprised

when a card came the other day which stated that the house has an allowance of about 98,000 gallons of water a year before any excess is paid. As I have previously mentioned in this House, up north one pays heavily for the first gallon of water registered on the meter.

It is ironical that in an area where water and electricity are the main items which make life reasonably pleasant, nobody can afford to have them. They are out of the reach of the man on the basic wage, or little more than the basic wage, and it is hard to imagine how those people exist under such conditions.

I was recently very pleased to hear that, through the representations of the Government and of the Opposition to the Federal Government, the State ships will continue on the Darwin run for the time being. If those ships had been taken off the run, it would have been a tragedy for the producers and business people in Western Australia who have built up considerable business in Darwin. Thank goodness we have overcome that problem for the time being. We hope the State ships will be able to continue on the Darwin run. Many people in the north cannot afford to travel to Perth by air. Although sea travel is expensive and the return trip takes some time, people can stay in Perth for a week and have a fairly cheap holiday.

We trust the passenger ships will continue to run to the north and that they will carry tourist traffic to that area in the cool season of the year and in what is called the "green" period—the "wet." The tourist trade will give an impetus to towns like Derby, Broome, Wyndham, and Kununurra, where there is very little other than small local industries and pastoral properties at the present time. Tourists will also have an opportunity to see the iron ore development in the north at Dampier, Port Hedland, and shortly, we hope, in the Cape Lambert area.

During a recent trip to the north country I was shocked to read an article in the *Northern Times* with the headline "Aboriginal Rights are Disastrous in the Kimberleys." I do not know whether or not this was merely a political gag. I do not know whether it came from the Opposition benches or whether it was a private idea of the member concerned, but it caused great confusion in the areas through which I travelled recently. In Derby and Broome and in the Pilbara area the native people were very upset at the thought that some of their rights would be taken away from them by the present Government. They felt that if these rights were taken away from them the right to go into the towns might also be taken away from them. They wondered whether they would be sent back into the desert or into the bush. I have not been able to find out where this

announcement came from or whether the author of it thought these people would be better off out in the bush or on the stations.

I cannot speak with these Aboriginal people because not many of them speak English, but they were perturbed about the possibility of these rights being taken from them.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Did you mention which Government gave them the rights?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I cannot converse with these people very well. Very few of the old people can discuss these matters, and the young people are not interested in discussing them as long as they have their rights.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did not your Government get a report which said these allegations were true in substance?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I am not sure about that. I can only refer to the answers to questions asked in this House the other day about the disastrous situation in the Kimberley. The same situation would apply in the Pilbara, Perth, and the eastern goldfields. I do not know the southwest of this State very well but I imagine the same situation would also apply there.

The other day, Mr. Heitman asked the following questions:—

- (1) What is the monthly cost of store orders provided for natives and part natives at Moora, Mingenew, Mullewa and Goomalling?
- (2) How many natives in these towns would receive store orders on a monthly basis?
- (3) What was the cost of the Native Welfare Department annually for the years 1960, 1965, and 1971?

The answers supplied by the Leader of the House were—

(1)	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.
	\$	\$	\$
Mingenew	245	Nil	14
Mullewa	188.50	270.75	243.75
Moora	—	129.25	111
Goomalling	—	Nil	53.25
(2)	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.
Mingenew	1	Nil	Nil
Mullewa	1	Nil	Nil
Moora	—	Nil	Nil
Goomalling	—	Nil	Nil

Figures for the month of December for Goomalling and Moora were not available.

Departmental policy requires that store orders only be used in the first instance until payment by cheque can be arranged.

Exceptions are made where it is clearly in the interests of the family to receive orders.

This information does not show conclusively that the people concerned are not working and that they are spending

all their money on booze—up north it is called "the three T's": Taxis, Tanglefoot, and Tailormades. It seems they spend some money on buying things for the house.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They were only store orders. If I had gone further and asked how much they received in social services, it would be a different story.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I do not know how much they get in social services.

The Hon. J. Heitman: I know one chap in Mingenew has received \$200 since the 20th February because he lost his job.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: In social services?

The Hon. J. Heitman: Yes, in social services.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: That would be no different from the case of a white man.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They would rather receive social services than work in many cases.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: That is a difficult question as far as I am concerned. The answer to the third question asked by Mr. Heitman was as follows:—

30th June 1960—\$1,272,448.

30th June, 1965—\$2,120,534.

30th June 1971—\$3,358,684 plus Commonwealth Grant of \$1,680,000.

It would appear to me according to those figures that much of the money available to the department is taken up by administrative costs and the natives are not receiving a fair share. Recently I heard people discussing where most of the social services cheques would finish up at the end of the month. At one time a certain percentage of them would finish up in the store and a certain percentage in the bakery, etc. However, now the majority of them end up in the hotel, according to the people I heard discussing the matter. Whether that is right or wrong I would not know.

The social service cheques do not amount to much. I do not imagine these people would be very enthusiastic about getting a home with the paltry sum they receive in social services. Our first aim should be to house them. It is no good their applying for jobs if they have no home to which to go and have a shower after work.

When the iron ore companies commenced operations in the north-west a golden opportunity for employment was lost to these people. I am sure the companies concerned would supply housing for native employees. Natives are adept at truck driving and in the use of heavy earthmoving machinery. They are ideally suited to all sorts of driving and mechanical work. Also, they live in the area and they do not want to leave it. The numbers of natives are increasing at the present time and I feel that many labour problems in that area could have been avoided.

Up until 12 or 18 months ago the turnover of labour on the mining projects was up to 150 per cent.; yet to my knowledge the local natives were not approached to take jobs with the mining companies. They could have been given a rough idea of how to work a conveyor belt, or given a working knowledge of the dumpers or the crushers. A person does not need any skills to do that type of work. However, the people in question were not approached. Consequently, they are out of work. I should imagine that every native in the Pilbara could have been employed on those projects.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you know of any company which has refused employment to a native who has applied for a job?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I will not try to answer that question because I am not sure of the facts. It is difficult for natives to apply for jobs because they will not push themselves into a group of white fellows and ask for employment. Natives just do not operate in that fashion. However, if they were approached in the right manner I am sure that the majority of them could have been employed. I include also the girls. Members can imagine the amount of labour required to staff the messes in the Mt. Newman-Goldsworthy area. Dozens of people must be employed in cooking and waiting on tables. So I feel a golden opportunity has been lost to have these people employed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was my understanding that there were precious few natives in the Newman, Goldsworthy, Tom Price, and Paraburdoo areas.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: There are plenty of natives in those areas but they are congregated around the towns. What would a native do in the Newman area—live on air and red dust?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You said there were none in that area.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: What about Nulagine and Marble Bar? Many hundreds of natives were also living around Port Hedland.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did any seek a job?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I am not sure; but the Government did not approach the companies in an endeavour to have these people employed in the industry.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do you think the Government should have written something like this into the agreement?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: It would not be a bad idea to include a provision that a certain amount of local labour should be employed. The labour situation was costing iron ore companies thousands of dollars a week.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do you believe this is what the Government should have done?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I certainly do. I think it would have been a wonderful thing because these people can do any amount of jobs. Take the railways as an example. Thursday Islanders were imported to work on the railways because they could stand the heat and the rough conditions in the camps along the line. If camps had been constructed under supervision I am sure the natives could have been included in the work force and the mining companies would not have had so many problems with labour. As far as the Government is concerned, the Aboriginal problem would not be so great.

I admit the problem has been with us for a long time, but it could be down to a minimum at the present. I am not an expert on this subject, but I would say that in the first place the natives must be housed. If members go through the Kimberley or the Pilbara they will find natives living in mia-mias—just a few sheets of iron thrown up against a tree, or something like that. Admittedly the children attend school if there is a school within a reasonable distance. But if a child learns something during the day he cannot discuss it with his parents because they are not educated. He would be lucky if there was even a hurricane lamp at his home. If the child tries to tell his parents what he has learned it goes over their heads because they have no knowledge of English. So the child just sits around in the dark or the semi-dark and then goes to bed.

People then say that such a child is not as bright as a white child. But the white child can go home and ask his parents about certain aspects of his day's work, and his parents can answer him. However, the native child is out on a limb. Unless we get the natives housed with proper facilities, such as electric light and water, this problem will be with us forever and a day. We will get nowhere until we house them. We are merely wasting time and \$3,000,000 a year. I can see nothing good whatsoever coming out of that expenditure until the natives are suitably housed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is why we established the hostels. They have helped.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: They help to a certain degree, but they are not enough. I was at the hostel at Onslow recently and I found that the children are well cared for; but it is not the same as living with their people. The children do go home occasionally. I have been told by people at the hostel that when the

native children go back to their environment it is amazing what they have forgotten when they return. Even if they visit their parents for a short period during the Christmas break they lapse into the habits of the older people and lose all they have learned.

It is no good sending them back into the desert. They would survive all right because they have survived for 30,000-odd years. But since they have been under the control of the white man what has happened? We say they are no-hopers and we degrade all they do. But we forget we have taught the natives all they know. They did not learn it themselves. They have held their society together for 30,000 years and very few of them have fallen by the wayside. They lived by their own laws and everything went along well.

However, under the conditions in which we expect them to live and learn they will get absolutely nowhere until they are housed. That is the first thing to be done. At the moment we are throwing money down the drain, and people might say it does not matter. However, over a period of 15 to 20 years the money will amount to a colossal sum. If this wastage goes on indefinitely the natives will be further down than they are at present.

I can remember in my lifetime that the natives from the eastern goldfields were proud people who had very little contact with the white man. Since then they have gone downhill quickly and they will continue in this manner.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It would be inhumane to put these people into modern houses without first training them.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: It does not have to be a modern house such as the one built at Hall's Creek at a cost of \$20,000. I would say we could build four or five transitional houses for that amount.

The Hon. J. Heitman: As long as they are taught good hygiene.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Of course, we must have social workers to teach them. These people have had some training, although they did not receive any encouragement from those who employed them in the Kimberley in earlier years. They were left to fend for themselves in their mias. We must take the bull by the horns and see that these people are treated like human beings and not like animals from the desert.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Some of the natives of the Kimberley do not want to live in a house. So what do you do?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Well, I do not want to live in a mia-mia. These people have never lived in houses and they have no idea what it is like. No other nation in the world has had such problems with regard to housing its people. Let me give

members an instance. On the TV programme "Four Corners" last Sunday night there was an item regarding the people living around Alice Springs. Hundreds of people were living in the creeks without toilet facilities or showers. I think the child death rate in that area is the highest in the world. I think at the end of the film the commentator mentioned—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Correction. He was advised that this decision had been made just prior to the film. They had just heard of it.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: It must take a long time to get through to these people because the natives have been living there for 20 years that I know of and they have had no facilities of any kind. Yet people wonder why the mortality rate among infants is so high. Admittedly, they are a little better off now than they were a few years ago because a hospital has been established there. The kiddies look quite healthy. One sees this when one visits the hospitals in the north. The doctors and the nurses at the hospitals will tell one that they send these kiddies out in a healthy condition and that with reasonable care they should be able to make progress; but within a matter of a few weeks they are back in the hospital with the same complaints—ear infections, chest complaints, and so on. The mothers do not know how to look after them.

I would say that if we could get these people into houses and provide social workers to help them we would not have to spend the \$3,000,000 a year that we are spending now.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is nearly \$5,000,000 if you read that properly.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Yes, that is with the Commonwealth grant. That amount would go a long way towards subsidising homes, social workers, and that type of thing. I can see no possibility of these people doing any good whatsoever until they are housed; then we can start to educate them.

The natives will work all right. Take for example the McLeod people in the Pilbara. They are not very popular because McLeod took all his natives away from the pastoralists 20 or 30 years ago, because the natives were not being paid sufficient wages. Of course, he was the worst man in the world for doing that!

This position still obtains. There are groups of natives living in the bush, and not too many are found in hotels. One group is mining a tin field which they discovered themselves. They are maintaining it, but admittedly it is not a very rich field and there is no surplus with which to build homes or camps. They are living under rough conditions, but at least they are keeping themselves and are not proving to be a burden on the country. They are not hanging around the hotels, and if some of

the natives in that group are found in a hotel they are "out." That is the understanding.

The same applies with a group of natives at Yandeyarra. They were supposed to be assisted by the Commonwealth to run cattle there. As far as I know they have received nothing.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It requires \$350,000 to make the station economic.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: They were promised that. The only cattle they have are scrub bulls.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But grants are being made now.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: These people have been operating that station for two or three years. All that has been said is that "they are going to give."

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member please address the Chair and not invite questions?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Recently we read in the newspapers about two natives who applied for a loan from the Commonwealth Government to buy a plantation in the Carnarvon area. This project was fully backed by the Native Welfare Department. It is a well-managed plantation. They did a good job on the property and made a profit, but they met with the same result from the Commonwealth Government as did other groups of natives. Canberra simply ignored them. The Commonwealth did not even have the courage to say, "You are black fellows. You will not get any money from us." This appears to be the type of thing that has gone on for a long time. Where is the answer to the problem to be found? The answer, I suggest, lies in education and housing.

If education and adequate housing are provided we might get somewhere. However, under the conditions in which they are expected to survive they cannot even get jobs. They do not have a place in which to live. I do not know the answer, but it is a pretty difficult problem. I am no expert, but if I were I would be on the payroll of the department which has \$3,000,000 each year to run the organisation.

Recently I was in the Kimberley and made inquiries of the various clerks of court on the number of convictions of natives which went through the courts this year and in previous years. The figures I got for this year were very little different from those of last year or the year before. We should take into consideration the fact that most of these people are resident in towns, whereas previously they were resident on reserves. With the supply of liquor available, I did not see any greater degree of drunkenness, fights, or brawls among the natives.

I have spoken to many of these people. I managed to get through to them. They have their own ideas, and they appoint

their own councils on the reserves; councils which mostly comprise old people who try to advise the young ones. As far as I can see they get very little help from outside. On the "Four Corners" programme on television last Sunday it was shown that a native reserve out of Alice Springs has its own council. People entering that reserve after dark do not manage very well, but with some help from the Commonwealth Government I am sure conditions can be improved.

Regarding the officers who are employed by the Native Welfare Department, I have known of instances where decent young men were sent up north but they did not have the slightest clue about the country, let alone the ideas of the Aborigines. For some of them it was their first job. Perhaps if they were put through a course of the native language they would be able to converse with the people. In the Kimberley and the Pilbara many of the officers cannot talk the native dialects. If the department had officers who knew the language, or even had an idea of the language, it would go a long way towards getting over the problem.

The natives are prepared to talk if they know a person, but it is very difficult for a complete stranger to converse with them. It takes a while before they will confide in a stranger, but if they had someone to talk to them in their own language that would be a shortcut to overcoming the problem.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: There are very many native dialects.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Yes. In New Guinea there are over 400 native dialects, but some people are able to converse with the natives and make themselves understood. One might not be able to have a full-blown conversation with them.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Are you saying the department is too remote from the natives?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I say it is too remote in that it cannot get through to the natives. What is the good of my going to China and telling the Chinese what to do, if I cannot talk with those people?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: You are saying the department is out of touch with the natives.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Yes, for the simple reason that the officers of the department cannot converse with them. We should get through to these people and adopt their way of thinking. It is of no use trying to get them into our way of thinking. They see white people, and also Malays, Chinese, and Japanese in the pubs. They ask "Why can't we go into the pubs?" In this connection I should point out that on the last occasion that I was in the Kimberley and in the Pilbara I did not see

any fights among the natives. I was not lucky enough even to see a fight among the white folk!

On only one occasion have I seen a native being refused beer at a hotel, but this does not happen in coastal towns. As long as he has the money the publican will supply the liquor; and if he does not there is always a taxi driver waiting outside to take the last dollar away from the native. There is nothing surer than that.

If we can educate the native children and provide the natives with homes where they can live under reasonable conditions, half the native problem will be solved. One can go to the mission stations and see how well the native children are looked after. Some of the parents of those children live in close proximity to the stations. The missions have done wonders in the north, irrespective of their denominations. This is what is required on a big scale: educate the native children and provide the native population with homes. I still think we lost a golden opportunity to provide employment for the natives when iron ore developments began in the north. We have not made any real effort to employ them in this industry. There are hundreds of unskilled jobs which these people could undertake, such as drilling, driving trucks, and charging holes with dynamite.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Have you discussed this employment situation with the firms concerned in the area?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Personally I have not. Since I have been elected to this House I have not discussed this matter with those people. The companies did institute a scheme by employing a few apprentices at Roebourne and Port Hedland. The last time I was in the workshops at Newman I saw a couple of native electrician apprentices, but they were learning a trade. I am now speaking of unskilled labourers, such as truck drivers, drillers, and powder monkeys. The native people could do these jobs. They make excellent taxi drivers, road grader operators, and mechanics. They seem to have a flair for mechanics, and in such avenues they will do well.

In the Kimberley they undertake these occupations on the pastoral properties. The stations would not be able to operate without native labour. With the main Ord River irrigation scheme under way I can foresee in the future a huge increase in the production of stock. The natives will be absorbed back into the industry on reasonable rates of pay. However, they will still have to be housed decently before we will get anywhere with them.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: What percentage of the natives are reliable and will turn up for work five days of the week?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: We often hear this eye-wash about natives going walk-about. If there is nothing to induce a native to remain in a place he does not stop, and this is a legacy from way back; but if he is in an area where there is plenty of food he will remain in that area. If there is no food he has to go walkabout to find food. I am pretty sure that if a native is in a situation where he is employed and is provided with a house he will remain, particularly if he has children. Native people are fond of their children.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Do you think the experience you have recounted is applicable throughout the south-west?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I do not know whether it applies in the south-west, but I am sure it applies up north. Provide them with housing and employment and they will remain, and if they are placed in a dirty stall they behave like pigs, but if they are placed in a clean stall they look after themselves.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member please address the Chair instead of having a conversation with members across the floor?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I listened with interest to the contributions from previous speakers in the debate, particularly from Mr. Withers, regarding the potential in the north. I fully agree with him that the potential there is tremendous. Unfortunately it is quite uneconomic to bring some areas in the north into production, particularly to develop tidal power. The potential in that part of the State for the use of tidal power is the greatest in the world, but at the moment there is no industry to use it; and furthermore it costs a terrific amount to bring it into operation. If we can bring it into operation then I am sure industry will be attracted to that part of the State.

In respect of iron ore deposits, to my knowledge there is not a great deal of iron ore in the north, and what is available is held by B.H.P. at Koolan, Cockatoo, and other islands in that part of the State. I know of no other deposits, but there could be some. The deposit of barytes is similar to the deposit of manganese around Port Hedland; it is too far away from the coast to be a viable proposition. It is about 250 miles from Wyndham, and if developed the ore has to be transported by truck to Wyndham. That makes it hard to develop.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I can remember my first trip with you up north. In those days there was not much development.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: It is pleasing to know what is going on there. I remember the occasion well. It was a pleasant trip. I conclude my contribution on the few

points I have raised. There is much more I can talk about. I think that if consideration can be given to my suggestions on the native question we will go a long way towards solving the problem. One point regarding the native population has been brought up, and this could be applied in the north. Among the natives there are some who are up to the standard where they are able to sit on the bench as justices of the peace to assist the magistrates.

I have had a good look at this particular matter and I feel that a man in such a position would do much to uplift the standard of the natives in the north. Such a man would not require any special qualifications to become a justice of the peace. I have sat on the bench at Port Hedland on many hundreds of occasions and many times I have felt that if a native could be trained to the standard where he could sit on the bench with a magistrate—and I feel that magistrates in the north would agree with this idea—the natives would not feel that the white men were always telling them what to do. A justice of the peace of their own race would be of benefit to the people in the north. I will close on that note, and support the motion.

THE HON. L. D. ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.31 p.m.]: I support the motion moved by Mr. Dans. I wish to speak about two matters tonight, and the first concerns the controversy surrounding the argument whether our existing bicameral system of Parliament should be replaced with a unicameral system.

The issues which need to be examined are, firstly, is the two-house system a relic of feudal days and does it work in the interests of conservatism? Secondly, is the unicameral system working in a democratic and effective way in other countries? Thirdly, is an Upper House elected on party lines an effective and just House of Review; and, fourthly, does the bicameral system work to the advantage of the great majority of the people?

If the answer to the first two questions is "Yes and the answer to the second two questions is "No", then I submit it is time we took a serious look at our existing parliamentary system with a view to altering it.

The first issue I raised was: Is the two-house system a relic of feudal days and does it work in the interests of conservatism? I think everybody would find it pretty difficult to reject the answer of "Yes." Even the encyclopaedia defines bicameralism as "originally the two houses representing different elements in the population such as nobles and commoners."

In British parliamentary history Upper Houses have been notoriously houses of privilege and conservatism. One has only to look at the composition of the House of Lords in Britain, the Canadian Senate, and

the Legislative Councils which exist in five States of Australia. In Western Australia we have 10 Labor members out of a total of 30 Council members. In South Australia there are four Labor members out of a total of 20, and in Victoria there are nine Labor members out of a total of 27.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: What does that prove?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It proves that the electoral system is such that it is very difficult for the Labor Party to gain seats.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: It proves that the Labor Party is not popular.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: In New South Wales the Legislative Council has 26 Labor members out of a total of 34.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Both Victoria and Western Australia have adult franchise.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Tasmania has two Labor members out of a total of 19.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Incidentally, in Tasmania the Liberal Party has none.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is only the Labor Party which endorses its candidates. That only goes to show that if there are 17 anti-Labor members in the Council, surely they must be conservative.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It would be truer to say they are non-Labor members.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is not only in the British Commonwealth, of course, that it can be claimed bicameralism was adopted to protect conservative interests. In dealing with the origins of legislative processes in the United States, and the adoption of the bicameral system, *Collier's Encyclopaedia* quotes as follows:—

The general defense of this division in those days, and still today, is that a somewhat detached Senate would be more conservative and act as a check upon a more liberal House which was, by representational devices, closer to the people.

Closer to home, of course, we have just witnessed the battle in South Australia between Mr. Steele Hall and certain conservative elements of the Liberal Party. Mr. Hall said, on the programme "This Day Tonight" last Thursday, that one of the reasons for his resigning as leader of the party was the attacks on his leadership by members of the Legislative Council as a result of his initiated moves to democratise the franchise. He was never forgiven for agreeing to bring about an end to the disgraceful gerrymandering of electoral boundaries in that State.

The second question to be examined was: Is the unicameral system of Parliament working in a democratic and effective way in other countries? Let us take a look at

some of the countries with one-house legislatures. New Zealand abolished its Legislative Council in 1950. Denmark abolished its Upper House in 1953, and Finland and Israel have unicameral Parliaments.

Norway and Iceland, although appearing to have bicameral Parliaments, are actually unicameral bodies divided into two parts. For example, in Norway, the 150 members of the Storting are elected by the people through proportional representation. The Storting then chooses 38 of its members who constitute the Lagting. The remaining 112 members constitute the Odelsting. Most laws are first voted by the Odelsting, and then by the Lagting. In cases of disagreement, Bills are passed by a two-thirds majority, with both Houses voting together as the Storting.

Sweden is the most recent country to go unicameral. In 1971 the Constitution was amended, and the Swedish Riksdag now consists of 350 members elected by proportional voting. All persons over the age of 19 years are entitled to vote, and incidentally, they also have the right to stand for election to Parliament.

Two other places which I could mention with unicameral Parliaments are Queensland, which abolished its Upper House in 1922, and Nebraska which abolished its Upper House in 1937.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Could the honourable member tell us about some of the countries which have recently obtained their independence from the British Empire? What sort of Parliaments do they have?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: In answer to the interjection: No, I am not interested in those countries.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think the honourable member is not interested because many of those countries have bicameral Parliaments.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: That may be so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The honourable member desires to give a distorted picture.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: There are many bicameral Parliaments, but the point is that many unicameral Parliaments are operating quite democratically and effectively. To return to my argument: It is said of Nebraska that "No other State has adopted the single House although the estimate of observers is clearly favourable to the Nebraska experiment. With one House there has been a reduction in the number of committees, Bills receive more thorough consideration and the process is carried out much more openly and understandably than is the case in most States . . ."

Looking at the countries which have adopted unicameral Parliaments I do not think it can be claimed they are undemocratic or backward, but rather the reverse.

The issues raised in my third and fourth questions were: Is an Upper House elected on party lines an effective and just House of Review; and, does the bicameral system work to the advantage of the great majority of the people? Mr. A. F. Griffith, in his speech, referred to the fact that the Labor Party stands for socialism. Of course we do, because we are a democratic-socialist party and we believe that the application of democratic-socialist principles will result in a better life for the people of this country. However, opposed to the Labor Party are the Liberal Party and the Country Party, and those parties support the philosophy of capitalism. I do not condemn them for their support of that philosophy, but I mention the fact merely to emphasise that we are diametrically opposed on fundamental questions of principle.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The honourable member is right there.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Of course, there are many areas in which all parties can, and do, agree. That was illustrated when legislation was passed through this House last year.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In fact, 87 Bills out of a total of 89.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: There are also many important matters of policy on which we have disagreed, for example: Workers' participation in management; an improvement in industrial legislation contained in Acts covering industrial arbitration and workers' compensation; widening the scope of the State Government Insurance Office to allow it to compete with private insurance companies; or, for that matter the setting up of any public enterprise which would function in competition with private companies.

Other questions concerning social reform—such as the abolition of capital punishment—which are contained in the Labor Party platform could be defeated in this Chamber. I am not saying this particular question will necessarily be defeated, but it could be.

Mr. A. F. Griffith also said that the Legislative Council in this State could not be compared with the House of Lords because the latter body was a hereditary House where members either inherited their seats or were appointed. That may be so—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is not, "may be so"—it is so.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: —but what must also be pointed out is that the constitutional power of this Chamber in 1972 is the same as that which existed in the House of Lords in 1911.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: But there is no comparison.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Prior to 1911 the House of Lords had complete power to reject any legislation passed by the House of Commons. However, as a result of the Parliament Acts of 1911 and 1949 the power of the House of Lords has been reduced to the point where a Bill can be delayed for only one year. Money Bills cannot be delayed at all.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: That is because of the hereditary change.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is still an Upper House.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Only in name.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Although it may be claimed that the method of composition of our Chamber is preferable to that of the House of Lords, it must also be stressed that the Legislative Council of Western Australia is far more powerful in its ability to veto legislation sent to it from the Lower House.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The composition is different.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is different in composition, but surely the principle of bicameralism is the same.

I believe the situation which exists in Western Australia is intolerable: that a Government can be elected to the Lower House by the people, but any legislation passed by that Government can be rejected by a hostile Upper House.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That Upper House was elected by the same people.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: What is required is not a second Chamber, but an enlightened community with an education system that produces thinking citizens who are able to evaluate, know their rights, and question Government policies.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: We agree with that, entirely.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Good. I would say, without fear of contradiction, that the majority of people in this State do not even know that we have two Houses of Parliament in Western Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The honourable member is quite wrong.

The Hon. V. J. Perry: The honourable member does not live in the country.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: As I said in my first speech in this Chamber, when I was canvassing for the election last year the majority of people on whom I called thought I was standing for the local shire when I mentioned the Legislative Council. Quite often when I ring a department or an organisation concerning the problem of a constituent, and introduce myself as Lyla Elliott, M.L.C., the people to whom I am speaking wonder why someone from the Methodist Ladies College or the M.L.C. Insurance Company is inquiring about such a matter. I have to inform those to whom I am speaking that M.L.C. stands for

Member of the Legislative Council. Surely this is a reflection on our education system and shows the need for the community to be more enlightened about the political system under which they live.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The honourable member will have Mr. Dolan getting cross because what she is saying is a reflection on our school teachers.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I take strong exception to the suggestion that the people I represent do not know what they are doing when they vote.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I am quite sure that the large majority of the people just do not know what the Legislative Council is, and what it represents.

The other matter with which I want to deal tonight is the principle of one-vote one-value. It is bad enough for the metropolitan elector's vote for the Assembly seats to carry only half the weight of a country person's vote, but the imbalance in the value of votes for the Legislative Council is even worse.

I cannot see any justification for the vote of a country elector being three or four times greater than the value of a city person's vote.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: You would if you lived in the country.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: In one of the north-west seats it is 15 times greater. If we look at the electoral enrolments for 1971, we find that 348,306 metropolitan electors are represented by 10 members in the Council, and 178,816 country electors are represented by 20 members. In other words half the number of people in the country elect twice the number of members.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Where does the money come from that keeps these people alive?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I cannot see how that is relevant. We are talking about people, not money. I know it can be claimed that the physical size of Western Australia has presented difficulties in the past in the drawing of boundaries, but with the modern means of transport and communication a lot of these problems have been overcome.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are joking.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It certainly did not stop the Commonwealth from having electorates containing nearly equal the numbers of electors. Fred Collard, the Federal Labor member for Kalgoorlie, has the largest electorate in the world. It represents about one-quarter of the total land space in Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And his electors are disgracefully disserved by that fact because they cannot get access to their member.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: They keep on re-electing him, however, so I do not think the electors will altogether agree with that.

I do not think the physical size of electorates can be valid reason for mal-apportionment. I think it is interesting that the same argument has been going on in America for many years on the question of the value of votes in parliamentary elections.

As far back as 1946 a voter in Illinois by the name of Colegrove challenged in the Supreme Court the boundaries of Congressional districts, claiming his vote was worth only one-eighth of that of a voter in a nearby district and, as a result of this, it was a denial of equal protection of the law guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

On that occasion the Supreme Court ruled against him claiming that the matter was too political in character and that it should be dealt with in the Legislature.

The decision, however, was not a popular one and by 1961 the mal-apportionment of boundaries throughout the State became so bad that the court was ready to reconsider the Colegrove precedent; and in 1962, in the Baker v. Carr case, the supreme Court ruled in favour of the city dwellers.

Following this decision suits were quickly filed elsewhere and by the end of 1963 no less than 39 States were involved in litigation and in 24 States existing apportionments were invalidated.

In 1964 in the Reynolds v. Sims case from Alabama, Chief Justice Earl Warren said—

Legislatures represent people, not trees or acres . . . To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased he is that much less a citizen.

The court ruled that, "as nearly as practicable one man's vote is to be worth as much as another's."

The Supreme Court rulings were savagely attacked by Conservative and rural interests who tried to push through amendments to the Constitution to negate them, but they failed to receive the two-thirds majority required in the Senate to amend the Constitution.

I mention these cases in America to show that it is not only the Australian Labor Party which believes that one-vote one-value is fair and just, because its thinking is shared by the United States Supreme Court.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Do you want to abolish this House?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Yes.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Do you want also to abolish the Senate?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is the policy of the Labor Party to introduce a unicameral parliamentary system in Western Australia, and it is also our policy to abolish the Senate.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: To sum up: I believe the time is long overdue for parliamentary and electoral reform. I believe that in this State we should have a unicameral Parliament elected by men and women whose votes, irrespective of where they live in the State, are of equal value.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

*House adjourned at 8.51 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 21st March, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS (28): ON NOTICE

#### 1. TOWN PLANNING

##### *Housing Project: Kwinana Industrial Complex*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will he justify to the House by diagrams and explanation the siting of the 1,500-acre housing project near the Alcoa aluminium refinery at Kwinana?
- (2) Does not this housing project inhibit the future of the Kwinana industrial complex?
- (3) Will not this siting of in excess of 5,000 units of housing (20,000 people) close to the heavy industrial area and in the path of the prevailing winds prejudice the establishment of the proposed steel works at Kwinana?
- (4) If some planning for the housing project is prepared, will he make this available to the house?
- (5) Has a report from the Environmental Protection Authority been received regarding this urbanisation against heavy industry?
- (6) If "Yes" will he make the report available?
- (7) If "No" will he have the Environmental Protection Authority examine this housing project and report the authority's findings to the House in due course?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) and (2) The land in question is under the control of the Industrial Lands Development Authority and is zoned under the Metropolitan Region Scheme for industrial use. For a number of reasons, including the configuration of the land, it has not proved attractive for industrial usage, and it is now considered that a more appropriate use would be for residential purposes. Discussions are taking place between the Industrial Lands Development Authority and the Rural and Industries Bank on the possibility of the bank undertaking comprehensive development of the land. These discussions are at an early stage and it cannot be assumed that residential use will proceed. Obviously, if housing is undertaken on the land there would be a corresponding reduction in the area of land allocated for industry. I do not believe, however, that the future of the Kwinana industrial complex would thereby be inhibited.

- (3) Leaving aside the assumption in the question that a 5,000 unit housing project will eventuate, it is not the Government's intention to permit industrial development that would result in pollution sweeping up the coast across this land.

In any event, the standards set under the Clean Air Act determine the controls over industry in Kwinana, irrespective of the zoning and use of the land in question.

- (4) If and when a decision to proceed with housing is reached, plans will be made public.

- (5) No.

- (6) Answered by (5).

- (7) No. The Rural and Industries Bank will no doubt pay full regard to the possibility of the land in question being adversely affected by industry at Kwinana before it reaches its decision on the possibility of developing the land. The bank may, if it so wishes, ask for advice from the Environmental Protection Authority.

#### 2.

### SYNTHETIC MEAT

#### *Use of Term*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he noticed reports that foods being reported as "synthetic meats" are being manufactured for human consumption?