

I have gone on at considerable length, but I believe for no longer than is necessary on a subject of this importance to the State. Even if much has already been said, there is a great deal more to be said. Some people may say it is time we got on and did the job and stopped talking about it. Maybe that is a good proposition and I should stop talking about it myself. However, I wish to conclude on this statement: I believe we have a magnificent agricultural State and we have an agricultural industry which has shown itself to be capable of adjusting to many problems in the past. I believe it is a function and a responsibility of the industry itself and the organisations connected with it to do everything possible to induce a positive confident attitude. I ask the question: are the problems of today really any greater than those the farmers have faced and overcome before? There have been drought years, the financial crises of the 1930s, and the problems of establishing farms in a harsh environment before the days of fertilisers and trace elements. These tremendous difficulties have been overcome.

I feel this Bill falls a long way short of what is needed. I might describe it almost as a pitiful effort, but I hesitate to do that because, after all, it represents a genuine and sincere effort. I said at the outset of my speech, this represents an acceptance of responsibility by Governments to at least make a major effort in the spending of \$100,000,000. This is not perhaps the effort I would like to see, but it is the total effort we should support.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan.

*House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.*

---

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 22nd September, 1971

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

### TIMBER RIGHTS

#### *Urgency Motion in Council: Personal Explanation*

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Lands) [4.33 p.m.]: I desire to inform members of this House, by way of explanation, of a rather serious matter which was reported in today's issue of *The West Australian* under the heading, "Minister centre of contempt move." The matter was also the subject of an urgency motion in another place, but I understand the motion was subsequently withdrawn.

I am not critical of the Press in any way; however, I do make reference to the report as it has been presented. The significant point is this—

... moved an urgency motion in the Council because of a contradiction between an answer given to him by Mr. Evans and a letter Mr. Evans wrote.

I make the point that I gave the honourable member in another place no information at all. I could not have been guilty of contradiction because I had no knowledge of the question and answer, and neither did any of the officers in my department. I make that point at the outset.

I can probably give some clarification of the content of the report, and I would like to do so. The report probably emanated from the fact that such a reply was prepared by my colleague, the Minister for Forests, and it was prepared with every correctness having regard for the time the answer was given.

I would like to refer to the dates contained in the documents I have with me. I did write to a constituent indicating that revision in the timber royalties regulations was to become effective as from the 1st February, next year. I did so in every good faith and with every justification, having also been empowered to make such an announcement. But on the 7th September the Minister for Forests had his attention drawn to a rather awkward situation which could have arisen and changed the entire policy being proposed.

The situation was so serious that a senior officer of the Forests Department was immediately sent to make an on-the-spot investigation, having regard for the possible change of policy emanating from this. The honourable member who asked the question, referred to in the newspaper report, did so on the 15th September, and the Minister replied stating that the matter was under review. So it was; a senior officer was at that time in the south-west conducting such an investigation. I have with me a file containing the minute to which I have alluded, and I can quote it, if you so desire, Mr. Speaker, or I can make it available for perusal by any member who so desires.

The SPEAKER: It can be quoted provided it is not too long.

MR. H. D. EVANS: The minute is dated the 7th September, 1971, and it will suffice to read the concluding sentence, which is as follows:—

As suggested, I am arranging for a senior officer to look further into this and will advise you.

A subsequent minute, which is also involved in this matter, is dated the 21st September and refers to the report of the officer to whom I have referred. So it can be seen that as far as the Minister for Forests was concerned the matter was under review until yesterday. So the Minister for Forests got that correct.

The point I do make is I was not involved in the answer given, but I was fully entitled to write in the manner in which I did.

### ALUMINA REFINERY AT UPPER SWAN

#### *Environmental Protection: Petition*

**MR. NORTON** (Gascoyne) [4.37 p.m.]: On behalf of the member for Ascot (Mr. Toms) I wish to present a petition which is addressed as follows:—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will recognise the environmental threat to Perth of the establishment of heavy industry close to the Metropolitan Area and hence will act immediately to prevent the establishment of an alumina refinery near the Upper Swan Valley.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

There are 11 signatures to the petition. I have signed the petition and certify that it conforms with the rules of the House.

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

### QUESTIONS (27): ON NOTICE

#### 1. EDUCATION

##### *Royal Show Holiday*

**Mr. LEWIS**, to the Minister for Education:

What are the holiday arrangements applying this year for country children to attend the Royal Show?

**Mr. J. T. TONKIN** replied:

Schools within the south-west land division may use, for the purpose of attending the Royal Show, one of the two special holidays which may be granted by the Director-General of Education to all country schools for agricultural shows or important local functions.

#### 2. AIR POLLUTION

##### *Bureau of Meteorology Warnings*

**Mr. A. R. TONKIN**, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) As a result of the meeting between the Air Pollution Control Council's scientific advisory committee and the bureau of meteor-

ology officers on 20th August, has the decision been made to provide daily air pollution warnings?

- (2) If "Yes" when will they commence?
- (3) If "No" what reasons are advanced?

**Mr. DAVIES** replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) It is hoped to make an announcement on Friday next.

3.

### HEALTH

#### *Fish: Mercury Content*

**Mr. A. R. TONKIN**, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) When is it intended that the announced tests on fish caught in Western Australian waters for the purpose of determining mercury content will be implemented?
- (2) Will the results of these tests be made public?
- (3) If "Yes" what form will the publicity take?

**Mr. DAVIES** replied:

- (1) In the very early future.
- (2) The policy in respect of this matter is still under consideration. At the present stage it is intended that the collective (rather than individual) results, with an appropriate interpretation will be made public, as soon as a sufficient number of tests has been carried out.
- (3) A press statement.

4.

### CROSSWALKS

#### *Midvale School: Attendant*

**Mr. BRADY**, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has any decision been made to place a crosswalk attendant on Midvale school crossing, Morrison Road, or other crossing near the school?
- (2) When will the decision, if any, be given effect?

**Mr. MAY** replied:

- (1) A decision has been made not to install a school crossing in Morrison Road near the Midvale school at the present time.
- (2) Answered by (1).

5.

### DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY

#### *University and Perth Medical Centre: Integration*

**Dr. DADOUR**, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many pathologists have successfully received their training

for the professional diploma of the Royal College of Pathologists of Australia from—

- (a) the State Health Laboratories, and
  - (b) the laboratories at the Royal Perth Hospital and Medical School which are controlled and directed by the Professor of Pathology?
- (2) How many research publications have been written by—
- (a) professional members of the State Health Laboratories since their appointment in Perth, and
  - (b) members of the University Department of Pathology at the Royal Perth Hospital laboratories?
- (3) If no approval was extended by the Royal College of Pathologists of Australia to the university department of pathology, how was it possible for several fellows of that college, including the newly appointed professor, the associate professor in neuropathology, and a medical officer of the State Health Laboratories, to obtain that diploma by being trained partly or fully while academic members of the university department?
- (4) (a) Is it true that in order to raise the unsatisfactory standards of the pathology services at the Royal Perth Hospital some 15 years ago, the board of the hospital approached the University of Western Australia with an offer to pay part of the future chairholder's salary on the understanding that he would also be in charge of the hospital laboratory services;
- (b) Would he agree that this arrangement has produced the desired results;
- (c) If so, why should this successful system be abandoned at the Perth Medical Centre?
- (5) Is it true that at the medical schools of New South Wales and Tasmania, which were established after our own, the professors of pathology are in administrative control of hospital laboratory services?
- (6) Is he aware that the faculty of medicine of the University of Western Australia resolved on the 27th August last that the diagnostic service at the Perth Medical Centre will be provided by the appropriate university departments according to the agreement reached between the Senate of the

University of Western Australia and the board of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and failing this, these departments being unable to teach adequately, will not move from their present site at the Medical school?

- (7) Is he aware that several professors in the medical school are considering resignation because of the situation regarding control of laboratory services at the Perth Medical Centre?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) Three (but it should be noted that the State Health Laboratories are primarily a service rather than a training establishment).
- (b) I understand that 12 obtained the diploma while employed full-time in the laboratories referred to.
- (2) (a) Over 30 (despite the fact that the State Health Laboratories are primarily a service rather than a research establishment).
- (b) The Member is referred to his own question 3 asked on 15th September, 1971.
- (3) Presumably because they were also members of the staff of the Royal Perth Hospital (the laboratories of which are recognised by the Royal College of Pathologists of Australia).
- (4) (a) I understand that part of the salary of the Professor of Pathology is paid by the Royal Perth Hospital.
- (b) and (c) These are matters for individual judgment.
- (5) I am not aware of such arrangements.
- (6) I have been informed that the Faculty of Medicine resolved as stated.
- (7) No; but I understand and am perturbed that such thoughts are being entertained by senior professional officers of the State Health Laboratories, which provide a vital and essential service throughout the State.

6.

## TOWN PLANNING

### Appeal Board

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Town Planning:

In view of the reported rejection by the Local Government Association of an appeal board to replace all present appeals (in town planning cases) to the Minister, will he still proceed with the compulsory appeal board suggestion?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The newspaper report referred to by the Member appears to reflect a misunderstanding by the Local Government Association.

I am at present gauging the whole question of appeal procedures in the light of actual experience and to assist me to reach conclusions I have invited the Law Society to convene a committee to consider the legislation and to make recommendations.

The Western Australian Chapter of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia, and the Local Government Association have been invited to nominate representatives to serve on the committee.

## 7. TRANSPORT

### *Vehicle Standards: Transport Advisory Council*

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

- (1) How much of the "Draft Regulations Defining Vehicle Construction, Equipment and Performance Standards for Road Vehicles" adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council has been accepted by the Government?
- (2) Which are the regulations which will be implemented?
- (3) Which are the ones which will not be implemented, and why not?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Of the 638 specifications in the draft regulations defining motor vehicle construction adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council, Western Australia complies in 456 instances. The nearest of the other States are Queensland and New South Wales, with 350.
- (2) It is expected all the draft regulations will be eventually adopted, and at present some are in the drafting stage.
- (3) Answered by (2).

## 8. BOYANUP SCHOOL

### *Site: Use*

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When will the department announce its decision on the future utilisation of the old Boyanup school site?
- (2) Is the department aware—
  - (a) the site is centrally situated and ideal for building blocks;

(b) of the acute shortage of blocks for sale in the Boyanup township;

(c) of the Capel Shire Council's requests over many months for this land to be made available for housing?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department has circularised all Government departments and instrumentalities likely to be interested in the site, and a decision on its future utilisation will be made when all replies have been received.
- (2) (a) The site is centrally situated but one of the major factors influencing the shifting of the school was the poor topography.
  - (b) No.
  - (c) There is no record of any correspondence from the Shire of Capel to this department requesting that the site be made available for housing. The only correspondence to the Public Works Department was on 29th July asking whether any further progress had been made towards handing the reserve back to the Lands Department.

## 9. WORKERS' SETTLEMENT

### *Establishment in Balingup*

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) In light of the critical position facing many of the businesses in Balingup due to Forests Department policy of purchasing farm properties, would the department consider establishing a workers' settlement in Balingup township?
- (2) Is the department aware of the excellent sporting and social facilities already existing in the town?
- (3) How far from Balingup are the settlements of Lewana Park and Grimwade?
- (4) Do these settlements—
  - (a) pay rates to the local authorities;
  - (b) use the social and sporting facilities provided by the neighbouring towns?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) In view of the current financial situation, the establishment of a Forests Department settlement in Balingup could not be considered. Five Forests Department employees working at Grimwade have their own accommodation in Balingup and commute daily.

- (2) The Forests Department is aware that some sporting and social facilities exist in Balingup.
- (3) Lewana Park—9 miles.  
Grimwade—8 miles.
- (4) (a) No. The two settlements of Lewana Park and Grimwade are not gazetted townsites and, therefore, they do not come within the category on which an *ex gratia* payment is made in lieu of rates. Furthermore, the shire council does not provide any services to either settlement.
- (b) Yes, to some extent, the residents of these settlements would use such facilities.

# 10. FREE SCHOOL BOOKS

## *Printing of Primary Textbooks*

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the printing of all primary school text books be carried out by the Government Printing Office?
- (2) If the Government Printing Office cannot cope with demand, will private contracts be let?
- (3) When books are issued will these become the property of the pupil, i.e., will the pupil be allowed to take the books home for study?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) A decision will be made should such a situation arise.
- (3) Books will not become the property of the pupil but they will be allowed to be taken home for study purposes.

# 11. WOOL

## *Shipment from Albany: Concession*

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Works:

As an aid to decentralisation, will he consider a concession on wharfage and handling charges to the shipper as a further inducement to the shipment of wool out of the Port of Albany; the cost of this concession to be borne by the Treasury as is the case with the 50% freight reduction on wool railed to Albany from points south of Narrogin?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

In view of the present state of Government finances it is not proposed to allow a Government subsidy on wool shipment charges from Albany at this point in time.

# 12. WITHERS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

## *Purchase of Units*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What progress has been made on the possibilities of enabling residents of Withers Park, Bunbury to purchase their homes and units?
- (2) If suitable arrangements have not yet been finalised, what are the problems, and when is it likely that a decision will be made?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The residential park town planning scheme for South Withers as approved by town planning authorities, is being developed by sections. As each section is completed to the satisfaction of those planning authorities, title will issue to the commission which will then arrange sales to tenants desirous of purchasing detached cottages.

The first section of 87 dwelling units, of which 29 are detached cottages, has just been completed and the commission is now seeking Bunbury Town Council and Town Planning Board clearance so title can be obtained. It is estimated that about twelve weeks will elapse before title could be obtained.

It is pointed out that those tenants who are in occupation of detached dwellings are, if paying the economic rental, accumulating an equity.

# 13. MOTOR VEHICLES

## *Seat Belts: Disposal after Severe Impact*

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

With regard to the scrapping of motor vehicle seat belts after a severe impact, at what speed is it considered by—

- (a) Standards Association of Australia;
- (b) Australian Transport Advisory Council;
- (c) National Safety Council of W.A.,

that a severe impact has taken place?

Mr. MAY replied:

The severity of impact is not necessarily related to speed and the question cannot be answered specifically.

14. **TRAFFIC LIGHTS***Great Northern Highway, Midland*

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

(1) Can he give any indication as to when traffic lights will be erected at the following intersections—

- (a) Great Northern Highway and Morrison Road, Midland;
- (b) Great Eastern Highway and Helena Street, Midland?

(2) Is he aware that a number of fatal accidents have taken place at both intersections?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) (a) No timetable has been set for the installation of traffic lights at this intersection. There are many intersections in the metropolitan area which have a higher priority.
- (b) Traffic signals are programmed for installation at this intersection this financial year.
- (2) In recent years only one fatal accident has been recorded at the intersection of Great Northern Highway and Morrison Road, and no fatal accidents at the intersection of Great Eastern Highway and Helena Street.

15. **SEWERAGE***Extension to Swan Shire Districts*

Mr. BRADY, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

In view of the great concern of the Swan Shire regarding the absence of a sewerage scheme in the Middle Swan, Bellevue, Hazelmere and Swan View areas, can he indicate when deep sewerage can be expected in the areas referred to?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Provision of deep sewerage in the areas is primarily dependent on the provision of capital moneys to carry out the necessary works.

Substantial extension of the sewerage system in the areas can only be done upon completion of the northern main sewer and its major branch, the Dianella branch sewer and the subsequent diversion of the flows from Midland into the new sewers.

In the current financial year \$700,000 has been provided to continue the construction of the northern main sewer. It is estimated that a further \$3 million will be required before the flow at Midland can be diverted into the new works. When this stage is reached the board will be in a

position to extend mains further eastward and to extend its reticulation system.

Because of difficult ground conditions, sewerage reticulation will be expensive and progress consequently is likely to be slow.

16. **MULLEWA-CARNARVON ROAD***Sealing*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it intended to seal the Mullewa-Carnarvon road or any part of that road this financial year?
- (2) If no such work is to be done this financial year, will he say when upgrading of this road will be undertaken?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The five mile section between the five mile and ten mile pegs north of Mullewa will be brought to the black top stage this financial year.
- (2) Answered by (1).

17. **NATIVES***Mullewa: Housing and Employment*

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

- (1) Is he aware that because of the downturn in the rural economy a large number of Aboriginal and part-Aboriginal people congregate at Mullewa?
- (2) How many such people now reside in or near the town of Mullewa?
- (3) What steps are being taken to provide employment and adequate housing for these people?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 242.
- (3) The Department of Native Welfare is not able to create employment for Aboriginals but its officers act as employment agents in conjunction with the Department of Labour and National Service; 15 additional houses would be required to satisfy urgent needs but in the current financial year sufficient funds are available to provide only two.

18 and 19. *These questions were postponed.*

20. **STATE SHIPPING SERVICE***Service to Darwin: Curtailment*

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

- (1) Does the Government intend to curtail State Shipping Service ships calling at Darwin?

- (2) If so, when is it intended to curtail this service?
- (3) If not, will the Government take steps to counter adverse publicity regarding this important service?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) The Darwin service is to be terminated on 31st December, 1971. However, in the meantime, should the Federal Government accept the proposals submitted to them, the service will continue.
- (2) The final voyage from Fremantle will be M.V. "Kangaroo" scheduled to sail 31st December, 1971.
- (3) Answered by (1) and (2).

21.

# **TIMBER**

## *Methods of Transport*

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

- (1) What amount of timber produced in Western Australia has been—
- (a) shipped;
  - (b) railed;
  - (c) carted by road,
- interstate in each year since 1966?
- (2) What amount of timber has been shipped—
- (a) interstate;
  - (b) overseas,
- from the ports of Fremantle, Bunbury, Busselton and Albany in each year since 1966?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) and (2) The information required is not readily available. A major collection of statistics from various departments will be necessary to answer this question. The information will be supplied when available.

22.

# **NATIVES**

## *Mullewa Houses: Effluent Disposal*

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

- (1) Is he aware that effluent disposal systems servicing homes occupied by Aboriginal people in Mullewa are not functioning correctly?
- (2) Will he ensure that immediate steps be taken to provide a suitable system to reduce what appears a very real health hazard?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Indications are that the installation of a lagoon system will be necessary and the feasibility of this proposition is currently being examined.

23.

# **SEWERAGE**

## *Mullewa*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it intended to provide a sewerage system at Mullewa?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) Is he aware that disposal of effluent from septic tanks is causing considerable concern?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department has no proposals for the construction of a sewerage scheme at Mullewa. However, the Mullewa Shire Council has under consideration a proposal by them to construct and operate a sewerage scheme under the provisions of the Government subsidy scheme. The shire commissioned a consulting engineer to submit a feasibility report on a sewerage scheme for Mullewa.

Departmental comments on the financial and technical features of this report were conveyed to the shire in June, 1970. To date no further approach has been made by the shire to proceed with the construction of a town sewerage scheme under the Government subsidy scheme.

- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) Yes.

24.

# **PAY-ROLL TAX**

## *Reduction in Financial Assistance Grant*

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Treasurer:

By how much will the State's financial assistance grant for 1971-72 be reduced by virtue of the State's takeover of payroll tax during that year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The estimated reduction is \$19.9 million.

25.

# **HOUSING**

## *Applicants, Waiting Period, and Completions*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Will he advise the House under separate headings as at the 30th June, 1970, and now, the number of applicants and waiting times for flats and homes with one to four bedrooms in the various zones in the metropolitan region and country areas?
- (2) How many homes and flats initiated by the present Government have been—
- (a) commenced;
  - (b) completed,
- in the past six months?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The number of applicants waiting for flats and homes with one to four bedrooms in the various zones of the metropolitan region and country areas under the separate headings of 30th June, 1970 and now are:

	30 June, 1970	Now
Applications on hand ....	14,049	13,675
Less estimated wastage ....	5,707	5,922
Real demand ..	8,347	7,753

The above figures exclude single unit and single working women applications and the following numbers were outstanding in these categories:

Single units ....	1,386	1,237
Single working women ....	132	132
	<u>1,518</u>	<u>1,369</u>

The waiting periods for applicants on the waiting list at those dates cannot be determined; however, the date of lodgement of applications which were being assisted at those dates was as follows:

30th June, 1970  
Metropolitan Tenancy

Area	One Bedroom Pensioner		(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	4 B R
	Cottages	Flats	2 B/R	2 B/R	3 B/R	3 B/R	
Perth ....	Dec. 1965	Feb. 1968	Mar. 1966	N Dec. 1968 S N/A	Sep. 1965	N Aug. 1967 S Jul. 1967	Oct. 1965
Fremantle ....	Nov. 1966	Apr. 1966	Jul. 1966	Oct. 1967	Mar. 1966	Sept. 1966	May 1965
Midland ....	Oct. 1965	N.A.	Sept. 1967	Aug. 1969	Sept. 1966	May 1968	Jan. 1965
Armadale ....	May 1969	N.A.	Feb. 1966	Sept. 1969	Oct. 1966	June 1968	N.A.
Kwinana ....	Dec. 1966	N.A.	Sept. 1968	Jan. 1970	June 1967	June 1967	Apr. 1966

(A) Individual and duplex housing. (B) Terrace and flat housing. N.=North. S.=South  
N.A.=Not available.

Metropolitan Purchase

Area	Own Land		3 B/R	4 B/R
Perth ....	....	....	June 1966	Nov. 1966
Fremantle ....	....	....	Dec. 1965	Jul. 1966
Midland ....	....	Subject to availability for finance	Oct. 1965	Nov. 1965
Armadale ....	....	....	Dec. 1965	Dec. 1965
Kwinana ....	....	....	Jul. 1966	Apr. 1966

31st August, 1971  
Metropolitan Tenancy

Area	One Bedroom Pensioner		(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	4 B/R
	Cottages	Flats	2 B/R	2 B/R	3 B/R	3 B/R	
Perth ....	June 1967	June 1969	N Feb. 1969 S Apr. 1968	N Dec. 1970 S Dec. 1970	N Aug. 1968 S Nov. 1967	N Jan. 1971 S Jan. 1970	Jan. 1968
Fremantle ....	Dec. 1968	Mar. 1967	Nov. 1968	May 1969	Nov. 1967	May 1971	Oct. 1965
Midland ....	Oct. 1965	N.A.	Sept. 1970	Jan. 1971	Oct. 1967	Jul. 1971	Jan. 1965
Armadale ....	May 1969	N.A.	Feb. 1966	Apr. 1971	Oct. 1966	Oct. 1968	N.A.
Kwinana ....	Mar. 1969	N.A.	June 1971	Sept. 1971	Oct. 1970	Sept. 1971	Feb. 1967

(A) Individual and duplex housing. (B) Terrace and flat housing. N.=North. S.=South  
N.A.=Not available.



## Metropolitan Purchase

Area	Own Land	3 B/R	4 B/R
Perth	Aug. 1971	Aug. 1967	Oct. 1967
Fremantle	Aug. 1971	Dec. 1965	Jul. 1966
Midland	Aug. 1971	Feb. 1967	Nov. 1965
Armadale	Aug. 1971	Dec. 1965	Dec. 1965
Kwinana	Aug. 1971	May 1967	Apr. 1966

In country areas, the waiting period varies. South of the 26th parallel between June, 1970 and August, 1971, the waiting period has lessened considerably and in the majority of towns, eligible applicants can receive immediate assistance with rental accommodation.

In every area, emergent priority is afforded to applicants in urgent need of assistance and in almost all instances, in these circumstances an immediate offer is made.

- (2) (a) 1,100 (922 houses).  
(178 flats).  
(b) 111 (95 houses).  
(16 flats).

Housing is a continuous operation and although only 111 houses started since 1st March, 1971 were completed in the 6 months, there were 1,262 completions (1,032 houses and 230 flats) in that period.

## 26. IRON ORE TEMPORARY RESERVES

### *Extensions*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Mines:

Will he advise when he will grant extensions to temporary reserves on iron ore deposits in Western Australia?

Mr. MAY replied:

I am not sure from the question whether the Member means when will rights of occupancy of temporary reserves for iron ore be renewed or whether he means when will the existing areas of temporary reserves be enlarged.

Assuming the former is the case rights of occupancy of temporary reserves for iron ore will not be renewed but new rights of occupancy under new conditions will be issued as deemed necessary and desirable following a thorough examination of reports made on work performed during the now expired term of occupancy. This examination is currently being carried out.

27.

## HEALTH

### *Cow's Milk and Breast Milk: Toxic Residues*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

Will he inform the House of the results of the testing for toxic residues of—

(a) cows' milk;

(b) breast milk,

that have been undertaken by the Department of Public Health over the past three months?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(a) Fifteen samples of bulk milk were taken on behalf of the Public Health Department during the three months ending 31st August, 1971, and residues of several pesticides were detected. All were below the tolerances recommended by National Health and Medical Research Council; in the majority of cases much lower than those tolerances.

(b) No samples of breast milk have been tested by the department during the past three months.

## QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1.

### TIMBER RIGHTS

#### *Personal Explanation of Minister for Lands*

Mr. COURT, to the Speaker:

May I address a question to you, Sir, and ask for your guidance on a particular matter?

The SPEAKER: You may.

Mr. COURT: I refer to the personal explanation made by the Minister for Lands. We on this side are not quite clear about one aspect. With regard to the letter he sent, we do not know whether he signed it as the local member or in his ministerial capacity as Minister for Lands or Minister for Agriculture. Is it competent for me to address a question to him; I think he would be prepared to answer it?

The SPEAKER replied:

Yes.

Mr. Graham: Ask Mr. Willmott.

Mr. COURT: The Minister should not start throwing brickbats about, because I remember on one occasion when I returned from overseas his party refused to allow me the right to make a personal explanation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You know the reason.

Mr. COURT: I do not know the reason to this day, unless it was pettiness.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We would have had no opportunity to comment on it.

Mr. COURT: We will deal with that later.

## 2. TIMBER RIGHTS

### *Personal Explanation of Minister for Lands*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister for Lands:

In view of the fact that from his remarks we are not sure about the nature of the letter to which he referred, would the Minister indicate whether he signed the letter as the local member, as Minister for Lands, or as Minister for Agriculture?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The letter to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition alludes is one of three I wrote to constituents in my area. If I recall correctly, my signature was above the designation of Minister for Lands and Agriculture, and member for Warren.

## 3. ROADS

### *Albany Highway-Bunbury Highway Junction, Armadale*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware of the accidents causing death and serious physical disabilities which have occurred at the junction of Albany and Bunbury Highways, Armadale?
- (2) As the plan and design for the upgrading of the junction have been finalised, what is holding up the construction commencing immediately?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of this redevelopment?
- (4) For the protection of life will the work be commenced now? If not, why not, and when?
- (5) As a temporary safety measure pending upgrading of the junction, will he have the area re-signed, including "Give Way" and "Stop" signs for the public's protection?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Accident records do not indicate that this is a particularly hazardous intersection.
- (2) Negotiations for the acquisition of property and the relocation of the BP service station have delayed commencement of this work.
- (3) A detailed estimate has not yet been prepared.

(4) Work will commence when negotiations and relocation referred to in the answer to (2) have been completed.

(5) It is not considered that the situation at this intersection could be improved by the provision of "Stop" or "Give Way" signs.

## FOODSTUFFS

### *Level of Pesticide Residues: Grievance*

MR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [4.59 p.m.]: On the 25th August last I asked a question of the Minister for Health relating to the level of pesticide residues in foodstuffs. I was informed that the information was confidential because it was supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry to the Public Health Department of Western Australia on a confidential basis and, therefore, could not be released.

I view this as a serious matter. Chlorinated hydrocarbons such as dieldrin, aldrin, heptachlor, and DDT are outlawed or strictly controlled in many countries of the world. For example, Sweden, one of the leading countries in pollution control, has been the first country to impose a total ban on chlorinated hydrocarbons. Japan has recently joined the growing numbers by introducing a partial ban on these substances.

The question arises as to why one should be worried about this matter. It has been shown that, for example, DDT will affect the brain, particularly the cerebellum which controls the motor senses. Furthermore, there is evidence to show that such damage is irreversible.

It has been shown that DDT affects the fertility of birds; and perhaps the other kind of "bird" might be similarly affected! We have no experimental evidence of this; however, the signs are there. As long ago as 1947 the U.S. Food and Drug Administration showed experimentally that DDT is a carcinogen, a cancer-inducing agent. It has been alleged that Western Australians carry three times as much dieldrin as do the British people.

I am not raising this matter to indicate that a ban should be placed on the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons, or that restrictions should be imposed. The point I am making is that either the reports of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry should be made available to the people of Western Australia; or, if that is not possible because of the confidential nature of those reports, the State Department of Public Health or similar agencies should take over the testing of foodstuffs and the information so derived should be released to the public of Western Australia. I cannot agree there is any other reasonable alternative. People have a right to know what they are eating, and what the effect of such foodstuffs is likely to be on them and, in particular, on their children.

## CROSSWALK AT KELMSCOTT, AND BUS TRANSPORT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

### *Policy: Grievance*

**MR. RUSHTON (Dale)** [5.03 p.m.]: I wish to raise two points briefly, and these are of great importance to all members—certainly to those representing electorates in the metropolitan area. The first relates to the establishment of pedestrian crossings, and the second relates to bus trips by school children during holidays.

In respect of the first matter, the provision of crosswalks, I have been putting forward a proposal on behalf of many organisations and of the local shire; it is for the establishment of a crosswalk on Albany Highway at Kelmscott. I have been taking this matter up for a long time but have not received any satisfactory conclusion to my representations; so I consider it is now necessary to bring the matter before the House, and to ask the responsible Minister and members opposite to give some support to my request.

I know that other members have experienced a similar problem in trying to have pedestrian crossings established. I know the member for Mirrabooka is interested, because he raised this issue recently and he showed his concern by asking a number of questions in the House.

I wish to refer briefly to a letter I have received from the Minister for Police and Transport in relation to the provision of a crosswalk on Albany Highway at Kelmscott. I acknowledge from the start that the Minister is concerned with this matter. I ask him to revise the present policy—one which has had an influence on this issue for a long time. I want to see greater regard being paid to my submission. In the letter of the 26th May, to which I have just referred, the following appears:—

As regards the fatality in this area, and the inference that a 35 m.p.h. speed limit may have prevented this tragedy, it is advised that the cause of this accident was listed as carelessness on the part of the elderly pedestrian. (Accident pattern attached).

To digress I wish to point out that the accident report states "the pedestrian female of 65 years walked carelessly." That does not satisfy me, and I presume it does not satisfy other members. To continue with the letter—

The recent review again supported the universal finding that the average driver will not submit voluntarily to needless speed restriction, but will respect and obey a reasonable limit, since the re-survey disclosed that the operating speeds of vehicles are actually lower under the existing 40 m.p.h. limit than under the previous 35 m.p.h. limit.

This raises a conflict of opinions. Other localities, not far from Kelmscott, have a speed limit of 35 m.p.h.; but in Kelmscott the speed limit is 40 m.p.h. The argument put forward in the letter appears to be totally unsatisfactory.

A short while ago it was contended that, because the average speed of vehicles through Kelmscott was 42 m.p.h., it was satisfactory to impose a 40 m.p.h. speed limit. Then with the passage of time there was a reduction in the average speed of vehicles to under 40 m.p.h.; but we still could not bring about a review of the speed limit. Recently when I made a request for a review I was given a report verbally that the average speed had gone down by 0.5 m.p.h. through the town.

Many organisations have put this matter to the Minister. I believe it is imperative for urgent attention to be given to reviewing the policy relating to the provision of pedestrian crossings.

In the Kelmscott area the population is growing. A few years ago it was about 1,000 and there were 10 to 12 shops; at the present time the population is around 6,000 and there are almost 60 shops. This is an important issue which requires immediate attention. I am hopeful that members opposite will at Caucus meetings or on other appropriate occasions impress on the Government the need to effect a change in policy. Kelmscott urgently needs this crosswalk.

The second issue I raise is related to the transport of school children when they go on holidays. Under the practice of the previous Government, the children from Kingsley School were able to make a trip by M.T.T. bus to Pemberton. Under the present Government, it has been stated in this House that those school children would be prevented from going on a similar trip because of the change that is orientated towards the use of the railways. I could go into the details, but I do not have the time.

However, I want to highlight the issue. I would like the Government to have more regard for this problem of providing transport for school children when they are on holidays. In the past the arrangement was a flexible one; but now we seem to be moving towards an inflexible position, and this is affecting one of the schools in my electorate. I also know of other schools which have been similarly affected, and the children have been prevented from making bus trips during holiday periods. An urgent review of the Government's policy in this regard is required. I hope the Government will give full consideration to the two issues I have raised.

## FOODSTUFFS

### *Level of Pesticide Residues: Grievance*

**MR. DAVIES** (Victoria Park—Minister for Health) [5.08 p.m.]: First of all, I want to apologise to the member for Mirrabooka

and to the House for not replying promptly to his grievance. This is a subject in which I know he takes an intense interest. I thought he would wax eloquent on it for the full 10 minutes, but I was caught napping. However, I do happen to have with me a report from the Commissioner of Public Health on the very question which the member for Mirrabooka has raised.

Mr. O'Neil: That is coincidental!

Mr. DAVIES: His grievance is that tests are carried out by the Department of Primary Industry on pesticide residues in foodstuffs, and the figures are made available to the Public Health Department but not to the general public. That is the position.

I have a great deal of interest in this question, and have at other times expressed concern in this regard in the House. For that reason I followed up quite closely the whole question with my own department. Furthermore, the matter has been under consideration by the Minister for Agriculture, and submissions have recently been made to the Public Health Department and these will be referred back to Cabinet in due course.

To a large extent I agree with the member for Mirrabooka that there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion that the public should be made aware of the level of pesticide residues which exists in foodstuffs, but on closer examination I believe this question could cause some panic amongst the community at large if the whole matter was not taken in its proper perspective.

Over recent years several investigations by the Department of Public Health, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Primary Industry have been made. For the most part those investigations showed that the residue of pesticides is well below the generally accepted World Health Organisation tolerances.

In the report I have before me it is stated that in Western Australia the pesticides residue level is approximately one-tenth of the accepted level, and the DDT level is about one-twentieth of the World Health Organisation accepted level. Of course, the use of DDT in stock and poultry foods is banned. In this respect I would point out that investigations are being carried out to determine whether its use should be banned on pastures.

The department is fully cognisant of the restrictions that are imposed overseas on the use of DDT and other pesticides. There is, of course, some degree of concern not particularly in regard to this form of pesticide and some of the others mentioned, but to the level of dieldrin. I am sorry to say this is approaching almost the limit of the tolerances which are regarded as acceptable by the National

Health and Medical Research Council, the World Health Organisation, and other organisations.

With this concern in view, the matter is being taken to the Minister for Agriculture; and I understand it is to be discussed on a national basis to determine whether any action needs to be taken—and quite obviously some action needs to be taken—to restrict the use of dieldrin and other pesticides throughout Australia.

I believe one pesticide that is giving cause for concern is hexachlorobenzene, commonly referred to as HCB, and this is found in pork. I understand this hazard has been brought about by the drought conditions, where grain treated with this pesticide is fed to pigs. This is one of the dangers which exist at the present time; but the important fact is that the Public Health Department and the Department of Agriculture are aware of the position and are doing something about it.

We can rest assured that if there is the slightest danger, or if danger is imminent, then immediate action will be taken to restrict the use of the particular pesticide involved. While the position remains as it is in respect of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry, I believe we will have to continue keeping the information confidential; but I can give an assurance to the House and to the public at large that this matter is not being treated lightly. It is, in collaboration with the Minister for Agriculture, being attended to at the present time.

## STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

### *North-West Freight Increase: Grievance*

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [5.14 p.m.]: I have a grievance, and it will not take me very long to ventilate it. I have listened to the other grievances, but I think mine is much more important. However, that is beside the point.

My grievance is that the Government has seen fit to increase the freights to the north-west by \$5 a ton. I realise that the service to the north-west provided by the State Shipping Service does not pay; and I do not think it ever did. I do not believe it was ever intended to pay, or that it ever will.

Western Australia is one-third of the area of the continent of Australia, and that is a fairly large area to service. The north-west, above the 26th parallel, is equivalent to one-sixth of the area of Australia, and naturally it too must be serviced.

The State Shipping Service has been relied on for a long time to ensure freight rates are kept to an absolute minimum. In 1966-67 the service made a loss of \$2,357,000 and a loss in 1970-71 of near enough to \$5,000,000. But much progress was made in the north during that time.

My grievance with the Government for increasing the freight rates is that I cannot see how the Government can win by this move. Probably 50 per cent. of the people in the north-west towns are either directly or indirectly paid by the Government. In these circumstances naturally if the freight rates are increased somehow or other the Treasurer will have to pay. Anybody working for the Public Works Department, the Main Roads Department, and D.C.A.—if we include the Commonwealth—will have to pay these increases. They will then submit a case at some time for an increase in wages to cover the extra cost of living. How did the Treasury officers decide that the Treasury would gain by increasing the freight rates on such a public utility as the State Shipping Service? Someone in the Treasury must have decided that an overall profit can be made if freights are increased, but I cannot see it.

Maybe the Treasurer can explain to me how in 12 months' time with this increased rate he has placed on the freight to the north-west, the department will show a profit. I do not think it can.

The State Shipping Service was established to ensure people could at a reasonable figure live in comparative comfort. Now we have been told that two new ships are to be acquired. They are beauties and are named the *Wambiri* and the *Beroona*. I do not know how much was paid for the ships, but, believe me, we did not get them for nothing.

Mr. O'Connor: About \$4,000,000, I think.

Mr. BICKERTON: One would think that with two perfectly new ships cheaper freights would be possible. The ex-Minister for Transport had something to do with this. He had ideas with which, to be quite honest, I went along. However, if the taxpayer is asked to buy two new ships to keep the north-west run operating, and then on top of that the residents of the north-west are asked to pay an extra \$5 a ton, it does seem to be a little bit illogical, particularly as the cost will be loaded back onto the Treasury. It must be.

Let us consider the State Housing Commission. If it is asked to provide 20 houses in Derby and the freight rate is a certain figure, and that is loaded by \$5 a ton, surely it is reasonable to assume the State Housing Commission must pay that extra amount of money when building those houses. Surely it is reasonable to expect that any private operator who has to transport goods to the north-west cannot afford to go broke. He must load his contract price—and most contracts come back to the Government—with the extra amount which is eventually a charge on the Treasury. Surely the Treasurer has some officer who can explain to us how by increasing the freight rate the overall costs chargeable to the Treasury can be reduced.

Mr. Gayfer: This is also a good argument against increased vehicle license fees up there.

An Opposition member: And railway freights.

Mr. BICKERTON: For years railway freights have been subsidised.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has only two more minutes.

Mr. BICKERTON: What a pity. I was working up to something good. A man wanted to establish a railway line in Canada and somebody said that it would not pay because there was no-one out there. The man replied that it would pay when the line was established because many people would go out there.

Most forms of transport are established to service an area, as was the State Shipping Service. Cannot we concentrate on the efficiency of the operation and endeavour to increase this efficiency in order to keep the costs down without increasing the charges? If every time the State Shipping Service has a loss of \$1,000,000 the rates are increased, this is not necessarily the answer. The answer is to make the service more efficient and so reduce the freight charges. I am sorry the Government has seen fit to increase the charge on shipping to the north-west.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Treasurer) [5.22 p.m.]: To answer the problem highlighted by the member for Pilbara one would have to be Solomon as well as the Treasurer of a completely sovereign State. As members know, Western Australia is not a completely sovereign State. It is part of a Commonwealth bound by a Commonwealth Constitution. As everyone would be most willing to agree, I am certainly no Solomon and I lay no claim to that effect.

If one was Solomon and the Treasurer of a completely sovereign State, then the administration of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the body politic concerned would be such that every taxpayer would pay according to his ability to pay, and every worthy recipient from that fund would receive according to his need. As we are all aware, since 1942 when uniform taxation—in fact, if not in law—became the prerogative of the Commonwealth Government, no longer has a State Government been able to manage its administration of the Consolidated Revenue Fund so that one pays a tax according to the ability to pay.

I have been asked to explain how the Treasury Department can select the area in which to impose an increased tax for the purpose of augmenting necessary revenue. In this case the honourable member is referring to freight rates to the north-west. In answer to this—and it may not be a complete answer, but I offer it as such—in the first instance a very

senior member of the Treasury Department also happens to be one of the commissioners of the Coastal Shipping Commission.

A member: Is that good or bad?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I have here certain figures which I believe are worthy of recording.

Mr. O'Neil: Another coincidence.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I was prepared for the Opposition on the Budget and that is why I compiled them.

The mounting losses of the State Shipping Service have been a cause of considerable concern not only to me but also, for many years, to the member for Mt. Lawley in his former role as the Minister for Transport. The following are the annual losses met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the last five years:—

			\$
1966-67	....	....	2,357,000
1967-68	....	....	2,629,000

Mr. Bickerton: Chicken feed!

Mr. T. D. EVANS: To continue—

1968-69	....	....	3,251,000
1969-70	....	....	3,651,000
1970-71	....	....	4,796,000

That is \$4,796,000 in the last financial year and it is borne by John Citizen, meaning the typical taxpayer in Western Australia.

Mr. Court: That was the previous Government protecting the people of the north.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes, and casting the burden on John Citizen. There has been no increase—

Several members interjected.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: There has been no increase in State shipping—

Mr. Court: You are getting so far into the mire at present that it is refreshing.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: It may be worth while to repeat again that no increase has been made in State Shipping Service freight rates—and the former Government can take credit or share the blame for this—since the 1st October, 1968. Since that time unprecedented increases have occurred in salaries and wages, and in the cost of all classes of ships' stores and fuel oil, and stevedoring levies have risen steeply. No-one can deny that.

Mr. Court: Before you sit down, don't forget to get back to Solomon.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Shipping freights on all other services on the Australian coast have been increased since the 1st October, 1968, when the freight rates of the State Shipping Service were increased, and in some cases they have moved more than once in that period.

Mr. Bickerton: I have not had my grievance answered.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Give me time. I still have about eight minutes.

Mr. O'Neil: You will run out of time before you get through.

An Opposition member: What about Solomon?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Earlier this year losses of the State Shipping Service were running at a level equivalent to an annual loss well in excess of \$5,000,000, again being borne by John Citizen. Obviously such a drain on the finances of the State could not be allowed to continue without remedial action being taken. It would have been unreasonable—and no-one can deny this—to increase the taxes on the community to finance a deficit of this order. We have budgeted for a deficit of \$3,500,000. I can anticipate the screams from the Opposition had I tried to defend a loss of \$5,500,000 on this service.

Mr. Court: Do not be too rough on the member for Pilbara.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. T. D. EVANS: If the Government had been responsible—perhaps I might say "over-responsible"—and sought to budget for a deficit of \$5,500,000, well, heaven forbid!

Mr. Gayfer: What about vehicle licenses?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: On the other hand, to remove the loss by increasing freights would have required an average increase of something like \$30 a ton, and not \$5 a ton. What did the Government do? The Government chose a strategy aimed at keeping freight rates on goods carried to citizens in the north of the State to a minimum, but reducing the overall level of losses to a more reasonable level. What did this strategy involve? The member for Pilbara has already referred to this point. The Government has decided to replace part of the existing fleet with more ships—the *Wambiri*, due to arrive in Fremantle on Friday, and the *Beroona* which is due to arrive in Fremantle on Friday of next week. These two vessels will, it is hoped and expected, allow an economic service to be operated.

Mr. Bickerton: What—with an extra \$5 a ton?

Mr. O'Neil: Keep going, and you will not have to answer the grievance.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Secondly, in the absence of any Commonwealth support it is important to know that the Government reluctantly decided—in fact, as Treasurer I would say the Government not only reluctantly but belatedly decided—while waiting on a negative answer from the Commonwealth—

Mr. O'Neil: That helps.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer has two more minutes.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: It decided to discontinue the Darwin service.

Mr. Blaikie: But will this affect the timber industry?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Finally it was decided that a cargo service to the north would have to be continued and the passenger service discontinued, because it was found of all passengers carried to the north most were tourists and not residents of the north-west. As Minister for Tourism, this hurts me grievously.

Despite all these moves members will know it has still been necessary to provide an amount of \$2,907,000 in the Consolidated Revenue Estimates to cover the expected loss of the State Shipping Service during this financial year.

With particular reference to the member for Pilbara, I indicate—and stand by the claim—that freight rates have been kept to an absolute minimum.

Mr. O'Neil: All you have proved is that you are not a Solomon.

#### **CROSSWALK AT KELMSCOTT, AND BUS TRANSPORT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN**

##### *Policy: Grievance*

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) [5.32 p.m.]: Belatedly, and without detracting from the importance of the matter raised by the member for Dale, I would like to indicate we are mindful of vehicular and pedestrian conflict. I will refer the points the honourable member brought up in his speech to the Minister for Transport and arrange for a reply to be forwarded to him.

#### **BUNBURY REHABILITATION CENTRE**

##### *Type of Inmates: Grievance*

MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [5.33 p.m.]: I hope I am as fortunate as the Government members who have voiced grievances and the Minister who represents the Chief Secretary may happen to have a file on the Bunbury Rehabilitation Centre in his hand.

Mr. Graham: The member for Bunbury is not starting off in a good way.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The way the Deputy Premier is going, I may get a little rougher.

Mr. Graham: You are welcome.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not expect the Minister will have the file, because the Chief Secretary is in another place.

Mr. Graham: That is what the member for Bunbury's party likes: shoot from afar!

Mr. WILLIAMS: My grievance may be different before I sit down—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has only 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: —if the Minister for Industrial Development keeps on interjecting.

My grievance concerns the Bunbury Rehabilitation Centre. If we take our minds back to the time when an announcement was made to the effect that the centre would be established, I think it would be found that not one person in Bunbury or the near vicinity made any noise or lodged any objections to any degree in connection with its establishment in the area where it is now established; namely, on the North Boyanup Road. People had no objections because when it was established—and as late as the opening in February this year—it was stated that the institution would be a minimum security one.

Over the past few weeks a great deal of concern has been shown by many people in Bunbury itself but mainly in the area surrounding the rehabilitation centre. A couple of trainees from the centre have escaped and one of them—the case is *sub judice* at the moment—is alleged to have committed another crime after he escaped.

For these reasons a most unfortunate situation could occur in the area, because of the fears of some people which, I suggest, are not unfounded. At least seven people who live in the near vicinity of the rehabilitation centre have come to see me. They have taken dismantled rifles out of their cupboards—rifles that had the bolts taken out and the barrels dismounted from the stock—and have put them together again. They have gone to the extent of showing their wives how to use them. In one case a man—unwisely, I think—has shown his 11 year old son how to use a shotgun. I am not exaggerating the position one iota.

A friend of mine, in fact, has put his rifle together again, shown his wife how to use it, and has put it away in as safe a place as possible. However, he has an eight year old son and the fear of his life at the present time, quite apart from any attack on his wife, is that his son may some day grab the rifle, pop somebody off, and be up on a charge of manslaughter or something similar.

I was rather surprised by the answers I received in the House last week in reply to questions I had asked. I asked whether the centre was a minimum security one and I was told that it is a medium-minimum security centre. As a result of some stories that had been circulating in the area, I also asked the types of offences for which people were serving sentences in this institution. I was told they were serving sentences for a number of various crimes, including some sex offences. Upon further questioning without notice last Thursday, the Minister in this Chamber who represents the Chief Secretary told me that four people in the institution had been convicted of

rape. I do not care what the psychiatrists say, to my mind the person who commits rape is not the type of person who should be placed even in a medium security institution, let alone a minimum one. I am sure the public also thinks this. This is the kind of thing which is causing a great deal of concern in Bunbury itself and the area around the rehabilitation centre.

From questions I asked last week I also know that the Comptroller-General of Prisons (Mr. Campbell) and two other officers were at the rehabilitation centre in Bunbury earlier this week to look at the security. It was mentioned that some new grille was to be put into "C" block in this centre. To my knowledge none of the people who have escaped have actually escaped from the buildings themselves. I do not see what purpose a grille will serve in "C" or any other block, because the escapees have been in the fenced area surrounding the centre and have gone over the fence. I think something should be done about the type of trainees—or prisoners—who are placed in minimum or medium security institutions.

At the time the department sold the people of Bunbury and the surrounding area the story—and sold it very well—that this was a minimum security institution and would house only first offenders. This statement is quite right, because there are only two people in the institution at the present time who are not first offenders. Having sold the story of a minimum security institution, people convicted for sex offences have been sent there. In my opinion a person who has committed a sex offence should not serve his sentence in a minimum security gaol.

I know—as do other members—it has often been stated by Ministers and the Comptroller-General of Prisons that we are short of prison space. I think the time has come for people convicted on minor charges not to take up room in prisons; they should be given weekend detention and keep their wives and families during the week instead of the taxpayer keeping them.

Mr. Hartrey: Why not abolish these "irreducible minimum penalties" and not putting so many people into gaol?

Mr. WILLIAMS: That could be so, but this is in the hands of the present Government.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two more minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That is my grievance, Mr. Speaker. I did not think I would take up my full 10 minutes but other members drew me off the track earlier on. I would like the Minister in this Chamber who represents the Chief Secretary to draw attention to the fact that this feeling exists. I have no doubt it was drawn to the atten-

tion of the Comptroller-General earlier this week when he visited Bunbury. I hope that when his report is available it can be made public for people to see the type of security and to know what action is intended.

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn—Minister for Housing) [5.40 p.m.]: The member for Bunbury was quite right in his opening remarks; because, in representing the Chief Secretary, I do not have any files alongside me from which I can reply to the points he has made. Perhaps it is a pity—in one sense only—that the former Chief Secretary (the ex-member for Toodyay) is not still in this Chamber. He may have been best fitted to answer some of the queries raised.

Mr. Gayfer: He was here this morning.

Mr. TAYLOR: The rehabilitation centre was established in that locality on the best advice available at that time from the department concerned. As the member for Bunbury has pointed out, there was no objection to this site from the people in the area. I appreciate and understand that prisoners at the rehabilitation centre would have been selected for very good reasons and on the advice of the Prisons Department.

The building was opened only in February of this year. It is a new institution and perhaps one could expect a settling down period. This should not be an excuse for people escaping from such a centre, but nonetheless with a new building and prisoners starting to come together there may perhaps be some mitigating circumstances through which problems have developed.

Mr. Williams: It has a fairly new staff.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes. Certainly there could be reasons for it not working out initially as planned, despite all the best intentions in the world.

I know the Chief Secretary, if only from the answers he has conveyed over the last few weeks, is well aware of the situation. If my memory serves me correctly he intends that certain measures pertaining to security will be tightened up. Inquiries will be made into this matter. As the honourable member mentioned, one case is *sub judice* at the moment.

I shall certainly bring the grievance of the member for Bunbury to the attention of the Chief Secretary, but I make the point that I think the Chief Secretary is well aware of these matters. They may have developed solely because of the newness of the centre and not because of any laxity on the part of the staff.

Although I appreciate the right of the member for Bunbury to air his grievance, I am not quite sure that to do so in this House and in this manner is perhaps the right way. The purpose of the centre is one of rehabilitation. Many of the inmates may be genuinely trying to rehabilitate



themselves. It is a medium-minimum security centre and, in consequence, many of the prisoners may possibly be allowed some contact with the public as part of rehabilitation treatment. I do not think it would be right for the centre to acquire a bad name so soon after its establishment simply because of the actions of two or three inmates who have taken it upon themselves to try to break out. It would certainly be disappointing if this happened.

Mr. Williams: Only one of those has broken out.

Mr. TAYLOR: I understood it was two.

Mr. Williams: One in particular, but a couple of others have escaped. The situation which I would like to see corrected concerns the type of inmate. The offences for which people are committed there is creating the concern.

Mr. TAYLOR: I understand the point and I will raise it with the Chief Secretary. It is also pertinent to note that the Prisons Department and staff have set up a worthwhile institution; they believe they are doing the right thing and I am sure they are.

### **BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

1. Environmental Protection Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Minister for Environmental Protection), and read a first time.
2. Loan Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Treasurer), and read a first time.
2. Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. May (Minister for Mines), and read a first time.

### **BILLS (4): THIRD READING**

1. Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.
2. Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.
3. Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. May (Minister for Mines), and passed.
4. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. May (Minister for Mines), and transmitted to the Council.

## **SUITORS' FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

### **BILLS (3): RETURNED**

1. Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill returned from the Council without amendment.
2. Pay-roll Tax Assessment Bill.  
Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.
3. Pay-roll Tax Bill.  
Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

### **DAYLIGHT SAVING**

#### *Reasons for Introduction: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 15th September, on the following motion by Mr. I. W. Manning:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take this opportunity to explain the extent of its research and the reasons why it has resolved to introduce daylight saving—as it appears the varying problems confronting different industries and regions of Western Australia with its vast area, have not been given sufficient consideration.

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [5.53 p.m.]: The motion moved by the member for Wellington suggests to the Government that it should take the opportunity to explain the extent of its research and the reasons why it has resolved to introduce daylight saving.

Perhaps this is not the most suitable time to introduce such a motion; because, as members may be aware, this particular matter is the subject of a Bill which is presently before another place. I understand the proposition will possibly be debated this evening, so we will be looking at the matter in a general way whilst it is being debated in a specific form in another place. I do not know whether or not it will come to this House but it could be we will have to repeat this exercise within a few days.

The matter of daylight saving has been one which has exercised the minds of Governments for a long time and there is very little difference in the approach the Government makes to this subject now and the approach made, for example, in 1917—the first time that this State took action to implement daylight saving. The State has chosen to review the situation at the moment because the other States of Australia have decided to amend their legislation.

The idea of daylight saving is not a new one; there have always been advantages in changing the method of time

assessment, and there have always been reasons for not doing so. Therefore, the matter is usually left as it is, but we have chosen to review this situation because of the moves made by the other five States of Australia.

The Government noted that the other States intended to move in this direction, so it examined the effect of this on our State. The Government checked on the past record as to the gains and disadvantages of daylight saving. It requested submissions from various organisations and individuals as to whether they thought daylight saving would be of advantage to us or a disadvantage under these general circumstances. The result was that the Chief Secretary received 99 submissions and a petition, making a total of 162 submissions in favour of daylight saving.

Mr. Lewis: Did a petition come from country housewives?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not sure of the source of that particular petition. On the other hand, 271 letters were received against daylight saving. In general these submissions came from the following sources: merchants, bankers, money-market operators, airline services, the P.M.G., short-term money brokers, the Australian Chamber of Shipping, the Western Australian Turf Club, an assurance group, the Law Society, the Stock Exchange, the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures, the Australian Sportsmen's Federation, and a number of residents in the country. Comments were made by members of the Country Shire Councils' Association at their annual conference, and I understand comments were received from the Country Women's Association.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Where did this come from?

Mr. TAYLOR: The motion requested information from the Government of its research and the type of groups approached.

Mr. W. A. Manning: You are not saying they are in favour of it?

Mr. TAYLOR: No, I am saying this is the type of organisation which submitted opinions.

Mr. McPharlin: Anything from the Farmers' Union?

Mr. TAYLOR: Nothing has been presented to me. However, I am discussing this on behalf of the Chief Secretary and I will be able to give more information when the Bill is presented here.

There are other associations listed, such as the West Australian Road Transport Association, the Associated Women's Service Guild, at least one workers' union, and as I mentioned, any number of individuals.

Mr. Nalder: Any from Parliament House?

Mr. TAYLOR: We do not have a good active union.

The content of these submissions was weighed by the Government with the knowledge of past experience of daylight saving with a view to determining the advantages and the disadvantages to the State if we continued with our normal time rating. The Government looked at the reasons for and against and came to the conclusion that it should introduce legislation for daylight saving for a trial period.

I think it is pertinent to include some additional comments which have been suggested by the Chief Secretary who is the person responsible for this legislation. The Government's proposal is to promote the early use of daylight saving for a period commencing at 2.00 a.m. on the 31st October, 1971, and ending at 2.00 a.m. on the 27th February, 1972.

It will apply to the whole of the State but only for the period stated. It will be a trial period for daylight saving in Western Australia. If it is intended at any stage to have daylight saving again after the trial period, another measure will have to be introduced. That is the Government's proposal; namely, that this will be for a trial period only. Perhaps I may repeat some of the points I have already made with a little more detail. Probably the most important reason for the introduction of daylight saving in Western Australia is that Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia are each taking action to introduce legislation for daylight saving of one hour for the same period that we intend to introduce it in Western Australia. The State of Tasmania passed legislation in 1967 to give daylight saving a trial in the 1967-68 summer. As we understand it in Western Australia, the experiment was so successful that that State has repeated daylight saving for two years.

If Western Australia does not follow the other States in this change of time, the effective business hours for communication with the Eastern States will be drastically reduced from four hours to three hours. This was the point made by a number of business houses; that is, at present we have two hours from 8.30 a.m. to 10.30 a.m. for business communication with the Eastern States before their lunch break starts; then one hour from 12 noon to 1.00 p.m. after their lunch hour and another hour from 2.00 p.m. to 3.00 p.m. after our lunch break.

With one hour of daylight saving operating in the east, and with standard time here, the effective hours of business would be one hour from 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. (11.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m., Perth time), and two hours from 11 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. (2.00 p.m. to 4.00 p.m., Perth time)—a total

of only three hours. With daylight saving operating here as well as in the east, the position would be the same as it is now—four hours—and we would maintain our present time relationship with the Eastern States.

It has been emphasised to the Government that the circumstances today are unlike those that existed during the Great War and also during the World War when daylight saving was introduced during a military environment and when there was little need and fewer facilities for business communication with the Eastern States. Today there is an optimum demand for telecommunication facilities for inter-communication between Western Australia and the Eastern States. A particular point forcibly emphasised by the P.M.G.'s Department was the doubt expressed about the capacity of the interstate communication lines to cope with the increased traffic during the reduced trading time which would be available if daylight saving were not introduced. Many business houses, including stockbrokers and those who deal in shares and similar trading important to the State, would be at a great disadvantage if we were not able to conduct our business with the Eastern States during the trading period that is already available.

Many letters received in favour of daylight saving expressed the benefits of an extra hour of daylight after the working day. It would increase the leisure hours of summertime which could profitably be spent in physical and passive recreation and, as I understand the position, a number of people from the United Kingdom and others from the Continent expressed the view that this would be of assistance and a worth-while facility.

Opposition to daylight saving came mainly from the rural areas. The people there were opposed to daylight saving for a number of reasons. They claimed that there would be no benefits in such areas where work is governed by solar time rather than by the clock. Concern was expressed at the effect on school children, some of whom use school buses, often necessitating their leaving home at 7.15 a.m. at present, which would mean 6.15 a.m., solar time, under daylight saving. This would be during the school period from the end of October to the end of November. It would apply to the six weeks at the end of the school year, because the balance of the daylight saving period would be spread over the school holidays.

It was said that with regard to the school children the same situation would occur on their returning home; they would be travelling in the hottest part of the day. Wheat farmers complained that the crops could not be stripped until the sun had dried the heads so that starting an hour earlier by the clock would be of no advantage. The dairying industry was mentioned, and also the fact

that cows were accustomed to being milked at regular times. However, with the children, the claim was made that they would adjust quickly to an earlier rising time and they would go to bed earlier in much the same way as children in northern climates do where daylight saving is implemented.

Mr. Stephens: And where it is a lot cooler than down here.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is quite so. Another suggestion came from the areas of entertainment, particularly from those who conduct drive-in theatres. They felt that daylight saving would not permit them to start their programmes until an hour later. So the show would end much later in the evening and this would seriously reduce attendances at such theatres.

Mr. W. A. Manning: They are not much good in daylight.

Mr. TAYLOR: This is so. A case was also put forward by the airline companies, particularly by our own State airline which pointed out that at present its timetable was geared to allow the planes to land at certain centres in the north where the necessary facilities for landing in the dark were not available, and that a change in time could well affect their connections with Eastern States' airlines. It could be that people arriving from the Eastern States intending to travel north would have to wait for 24 hours because the margin of time for a connection between the two airlines would not be very great.

As I have mentioned, the points for and against daylight saving were weighed by the Government. The points against its introduction were looked at in relation to the situations in the Eastern States and the point was made that as Tasmania has had daylight saving for something like two or three years, and with the other States being prepared to introduce it at this time—bearing in mind that they are all faced with the same situations that we are faced with in this State in regard to any disadvantages that may be felt by those in rural sectors, and by school children—it was felt that this State could really not afford the time differentiation which could affect us materially. It was considered that, on balance, it was in the interests of the State to introduce daylight saving.

Mr. Court: We were hoping that as a result of this motion we could elicit some information from the Government as to whether it had considered the conditions of dealing with this matter on the basis of whether people with special local problems could be dealt with without getting caught up with things like awards, shops and factories' hours, and so on.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made a point, and one which I appreciate. I am attempting to be as careful as I can in this debate because this matter is currently being discussed in

another place and the points that are being made by his colleagues in this Chamber should be placed before the Minister concerned who could more accurately give answers to them.

The type of question asked by the honourable member has been discussed and I believe flexibility will be exercised in some areas, but I would prefer that a specific answer be made either in another place or when the legislation arrives in this House.

I hope I have given sufficient information to explain the Government's reasons for considering that this particular measure is worth while.

Mr. Court: In view of the fact that a time factor is involved, we were genuinely hoping we would get some information that would facilitate our consideration of the Bill when it is introduced to this House. In other words, we would have some advance information on the Government's thinking on the flexibility issue.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Opposition wanted some further information perhaps it could have worded this motion differently or spoken to me privately before the matter was raised today. I truly believe I have answered the motion as it has been presented to the House. However, in view of the interjections that have been made, the points will no doubt be looked at and I hope we can provide the information requested before the Bill is introduced to this House. I will undertake to approach the Minister concerned and make a submission to the honourable member for his information.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [6.11 p.m.]: As much as I welcome the move by the member for Wellington I am sorry to say I am disappointed at the Minister's performance. In fact—although possibly in a very pleasant way—when speaking to the motion he relied on the second reading speech that was made by the Minister in another place. He did not refer to it because under our Standing Orders he would not have been allowed to continue. The Minister also said that there was some difficulty in dealing with the motion because the Daylight Saving Bill introduced in another place will come to our Chamber and therefore the debate and discussion that would be indulged in now would be on general lines, whereas the Bill can be debated on specific propositions.

However, first of all, when notice of the motion was given in this House, the Daylight Saving Bill had not been introduced in another place and we had no way of knowing when it would be introduced. Indeed, I believed it would have been introduced in another place much earlier than it was. On the other hand it is interesting to consider this unusual—and perhaps

I am right in saying most unprecedented—motion the wording of which makes it very hard to define what is the question before the House.

Mr. Taylor: Hear, hear!

Mr. MENSAROS: If the Government complies and give its reason for introducing daylight saving—and I was hoping that that would happen later during the debate—then there is nothing to comply with even if the motion is passed. If, on the other hand, the Government does not comply with the intention of the motion, then, even if the motion were put and passed it cannot comply any more, because this debate would have lapsed.

Mr. Taylor: Would you suggest that we have complied in taking the opportunity?

Mr. MENSAROS: I will come to that. The fact that I said previously I was disappointed with the Minister's performance indicated that I suggest now the Government has not complied. If we look at the motion it will be seen that it requests the Government to take this opportunity to explain the extent of its research and the reasons why it has resolved to introduce daylight saving to this State.

The arguments for and against the introduction of daylight saving which were outlined by the Minister—and also the effects of the introduction of daylight saving—are known to any normal-thinking man in this House or anywhere else. He would come to the conclusion that these arguments for and against already exist. By way of interjection the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a genuine request. I do not think I commit any breach of confidence when I say that the members of my party are of two minds. It is not a political matter, and consequently we sought information from the Government which is in a much better position to acquire it, because upon this information we can base our judgment on this question which we knew would come before the House at some time or other.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. MENSAROS: Before the tea suspension I was speaking about the nature and the intention of this motion and I indicated it was initiated in good faith. It was initiated for the purpose of obtaining all the information necessary to enable us to make up our minds about this important question.

I also indicated that it is the Government and the Government alone which is in a position to obtain this information because of the facilities at its disposal—it can call on its departments, on its statutory and semi-official organisations and research bodies; and can also seek the assistance of the university and other organisations whether they be scientific or

advisory. In any event I feel the Government is in a much better position to obtain this information than is the Opposition.

We did not doubt that the Government did all that was possible in this respect; but because nothing came out by way of publication we had no more information than did anybody else. That was one of the reasons for the member for Wellington moving the motion.

We thought it strange that we did not get any more information but we did not take any action immediately, nor did we doubt that the Government carried out this research. We only wondered why the Government did not disclose the result of its findings.

Because of the nature of the wording of the motion the Government's decision will hinge upon and must be indicated by its attitude in this debate and not by its vote as is customary. So far as I can see the Government's attitude appears to be that it opposes the motion because it did not seem to want to disclose the results of its researches and findings which presumably had been carried out.

What it showed was only common sense and I did not want to suggest that I was making any more serious charge about the Government having omitted to avail itself of all information.

Mr. Taylor: Are you suggesting that we did not use anything more than common sense?

Mr. MENSAROS: If the Minister wishes to interpret it differently. I only suggest that the Minister with all the resources at his disposal should have come up with more information—more information than people with common sense could have obtained as a result of their own experience without research and without approaching anybody else. As I have said, the Opposition, as a result of the Government's inaction, were and are undecided on this question. We wanted more information to enable us to make up our minds.

This is not a duplication of the debate as I emphasised at the beginning of my remarks, because when we look at the reports—and we can only base our knowledge on the reports that appeared in the newspapers—we find that on the 3rd August it was reported that in fact the Government had decided to implement daylight saving. It was further reported that the Minister would introduce legislation in Parliament within three weeks. That is in the same article.

We waited six weeks to give the Minister 100 per cent. extra time to implement his decision and we introduced this motion exactly six weeks after the 3rd August; and, what is more important, it was introduced prior to the legislation that was introduced in another place.

Mr. Taylor: It was introduced on exactly the same day in this House.

Mr. MENSAROS: That could be so but we, of course, have no knowledge of the legislation as we should have in the normal course of events. It could have been the same day but I think the Notice of Motion was given earlier; indeed it was because it comes at the very beginning of the proceedings.

The subject matter of the motion contains a question which affects every one of us, every one of our constituents and, furthermore, everyone who lives in our electorates whether he be an elector or not. I do not think anyone will argue that the subject has any political implication. We cannot find in any of the platforms, policies, or announcements of the existing political parties anything which will indicate from such policies that they are for or against introducing daylight saving.

As the proposed legislation has no political flavour but is rather social in its context—indeed it is more social than the liquor laws—we expected that there might have been a free and open deliberation of the question permitted in Parliament. The motion was also prompted because it was evident—and I say this without wishing to be harsh and without wanting to hurt anyone—that the Government was not sure about its decision. There is nothing wrong about this.

We can see that the first reports appeared in the *Daily News* on the 26th June, and in *The West Australian* they appeared on the 1st July. Even at that time it was announced and the article reported that the Premier said he was considering forming a committee to collect and collate all information on the subject and to canvass the views of people most likely to be affected—primary producers and business people.

Further in the same article the Premier said he was in two minds about this question. He said he knew the arguments for and against but had not made up his mind. This was reported a week later. Everything however indicated—including the fact of the delayed introduction of the legislation—that the Government was in two minds about this matter.

Mr. Taylor: I do not know how you arrive at such a conclusion.

Mr. MENSAROS: I have explained how I arrived at this conclusion and I thought the Minister might have been listening. Perhaps he did not understand me correctly. This matter was, however, indicated in Press reports and finally, when the Government announced that legislation would be brought down and that it could be expected in three weeks' time, we find it was not introduced till six weeks later, which indicates that no firm decision had prevailed all the time.

Mr. Jamieson: Are you for or against it?

Mr. MENSAROS: In answer to the interjection made by the Minister for Works, the entire motion is only designed—and I am sorry I have to repeat myself and I would not have done so but for the interjection—to obtain information. We have not made up our minds, but we are seeking information.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue.

Mr. Jamieson: What a comedian you are.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You are wasting your time by criticising the legislation and not being able to tell us whether you are for or against it.

Mr. MENSAROS: I think it is proper to mention the known arguments, some of which have been mentioned by the Minister who has omitted to mention others, for and against this case. We can then see how these arguments balance up and after balancing them we can determine the type of consideration that should be given.

The only argument the Minister brought forward in support of the introduction of daylight saving was the fact that business in relation to interstate trade needs these four hours at its disposal at the moment to communicate by telephone with the Eastern States.

The Minister did not say, as has been said elsewhere, that if we did not introduce daylight saving it would mean too drastic a reduction of these four hours. I do not know what the interpretation of "drastic" might be but I do not think that three hours as against four hours will mean a drastic reduction.

It is also questionable how strong this argument is because we all know that in the United States which has an equally vast territory and nearly 20 times as many people who do business, the two most populated States in the east and west are three hours apart. I have not read any complaints about this nor did I hear anybody complaining about the matter during my trip there. The people seem quite happy to live three hours apart.

The Minister mentioned that there is the importance of telephone communication and that trains, air transport, and perhaps other communications might also be involved. I do not think we can hope that the timetables of the airlines will be changed for our advantage. Therefore we would be advantaged in keeping the present times because the aeroplanes would arrive some time earlier and depart some time earlier at night.

Mr. Taylor: I made the point and referred only to the interstate service.

Mr. MENSAROS: The other argument—and I think it is a little exaggerated—is that three hours time difference with the east would aggravate unemployment. I do not think the lack of an hour—if it is to be the lack of an hour—will have any influence on unemployment in any way. There is another reason which has not been mentioned by the Minister—but it might perhaps be mentioned by other speakers from the Government side later. I refer to the argument we read in the Press that if we introduce daylight saving in summertime we will have more leisure time left after work and a greater possibility to indulge in open air sport.

I hope my colleague, the member for Subiaco, will elaborate on this but to my mind I consider it far healthier to indulge in sport before work than after work. I never think of indulging in sport after we finish at 10.00 or 10.30 p.m., but I always have a swim in the mornings.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Did you have any sport before you started this morning?

Mr. Court: Just listen.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Just tell us all about it.

Mr. MENSAROS: The third argument which I think is the most valid one for the introduction of daylight saving which has not yet been mentioned by the Minister is the argument to solve this problem on a regional basis—to solve the problem of the people in the Kimberley and East Kimberley. Members will recall when most of us were up north by the courtesy of the then Minister for Industrial Development we realised how early the day finished. We also noted how early the aeroplanes had to land as a result of the lack of night landing facilities at the airports. Those people have every justification for requesting to have what I would term extra daylight; to have adjusted time in their own territory perhaps summer and winter because this would suit them.

There is no close proximity between the population in those places and the next populated area further to the west. So it would mean even less inconvenience here than is the case in the United States, where, of course, there are various zones of time. Apparently the people in the United States can live with those conditions quite happily.

There are a number of arguments against the introduction of daylight saving. The first argument which comes to my mind was not mentioned by the Minister, and I refer to the geographic position of our capital city. We are already 16 minutes ahead of solar time because our time is set on the 120 degree longitude. That longitude is roughly in the vicinity of Southern Cross. There are other arguments against the proposal but I do not wish to speak about them at length. Inconvenience will be caused to people living in the

country, such as the dairy farmers and the wheat farmers—especially when the latter are stripping their crops.

Inconvenience will be caused to school children and their parents living in the country, and there is the general inconvenience caused to any family with small children. Usually parents desire their children to go to bed early because they require more sleep than do adults. It will be very difficult indeed to get young children to go to bed during daylight.

Mr. Taylor: Will it be any more difficult than in New South Wales, Victoria, or South Australia?

Mr. MENSAROS: The main difference is the relationship between solar time and artificial time. The difference will be much greater in Western Australia than in the Eastern States, and this will apply especially to Perth. It will not make very much difference in a place such as Menzies, which is near the border.

Mr. Taylor: How many minutes difference is there? Between 21 minutes and 22 minutes?

Mr. MENSAROS: Tables are available so that the exact difference can be established.

Another argument against the proposal is the general loss of sleep, and the consequent general loss of efficiency. The Minister briefly mentioned the night entertainment industry, although I do not think he gave it the serious consideration it deserves. The drive-in theatres will be affected and we have infinitely more in Western Australia than is the case in the Eastern States, especially if population figures are taken into account. Apart from the drive-in theatres, worth-while entertainment such as the Festival of Perth, which is held in the summertime, will be affected.

An argument brought forward by the then Premier some 20 years ago in favour of daylight saving was the shortage of candles and electricity, but I do not think that argument can be applied today. Something else which has to be considered is whether the constant changing from season to season will be convenient or inconvenient to the people of Western Australia.

In the United Kingdom there used to be summertime and double summertime but that country has reverted to one time throughout the year. Admittedly they are now one hour ahead of Greenwich mean time, but their time provides for uniform summertime and wintertime. It is also worthy of note that as far back as 1949 both Houses of this Parliament passed a resolution opposing daylight saving. It was, in fact, resolved that daylight saving should never be introduced into Western Australia.

The question of daylight saving will affect everyone, unlike most of the legislation which is brought before us. We must ad-

mit that taxation Bills and certain other matters—certainly the majority of our legislation—affects only a section of the population. However, this question will affect every single citizen.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. MENSAROS: Daylight saving will affect all the people in their customs, occupations, and experiences, and will involve them personally. It is a more embracing question than some of the seemingly all-embracing questions which we face from time to time, such as the Fitzgerald River Reserve. In that instance many people became emotional but I venture to suggest that not a quarter of those people have ever seen or will ever see the reserve in their lifetime.

I do not advocate that legislation should be introduced in accordance with public opinion only, but when we discuss a question which affects everybody we must take notice of public opinion. From my experience when talking to city people I found that most of them were opposed to daylight saving. The people living in the country are almost unanimously opposed to the proposal. When we read letters to the editors of newspapers I think we will agree that the letters on this subject have not been sent in by pressure groups, but by genuine people. The letters I have noticed have been 14 to five against the proposal. On the 18th July the Chief Secretary was reported to have said that all representations made to him to that date were against daylight saving. Later on—perhaps as a result of that report—he was reported to have said on the 25th July that there was a two-thirds majority against the proposal.

The figures quoted by the Minister this afternoon show that even if the petition containing 99 signatures is taken as 99 units, only 38 per cent. of the people are for it.

Mr. Taylor: Most of the petitions were put in by organisations. How can one quote an organisation?

Mr. MENSAROS: I agree, but all the reports which have appeared so far, both in the Press and in the statement by the Chief Secretary, show that the majority are against the proposal. It appears to me that the business people are for it and the rest of the community are against it. If we accept that the minority of the people are for it and the majority against it we have to weigh the arguments and come to a conclusion. We have to consider whether the minority or the majority are inconvenienced more, and as a result of that inconvenience, how the rest of the people will be inconvenienced. We have to decide one way or the other.

The normal logic would dictate that if there is a question of inconvenience, and undoubtedly there is, it should be the minority which should be inconvenienced.

Mr. Taylor: Would you not agree that if only 350 people objected then the majority could not care less? Is that not more logical?

Mr. MENSAROS: I am not pressing the point, but I am mentioning that public opinion should be taken into account. We should do whatever we can to ascertain the public opinion, and the Government is at liberty to conduct a public opinion research programme. After all, the Premier and the Chief Secretary have both said it is a question of public opinion. We are waiting to see and to hear whether research has been carried out, and the result of that research. Obviously, the Government is able to conduct a more scientific research programme and obtain a better result than that which I am able to estimate.

It appears to me that the minority should give in. Those in that particular section will have to adjust their practices and their businesses. The question again arises: If those people adjust their businesses will that adjustment inconvenience others, and how much can those other people adjust themselves when they are inconvenienced? The business people who will be affected will have comparatively small staffs and, therefore, only a few will be inconvenienced by having to go to work an hour earlier. If I were a businessman having to communicate with the Eastern States I would welcome the change to daylight saving because by starting an hour earlier I would have a quiet hour without being disturbed by clients or by local telephone calls. I would be able to conduct telephone conversations with the east with possibly far better results than would be achieved during normal business hours.

Another question is raised regarding hours, and I notice the Minister made no reference to it. I refer to labour relations. Many industrial concerns work set hours, and those hours will have to be changed so that the employers will not be inconvenienced by having to pay overtime. Once again the conditions and customs will have to be changed. It could be also an advantage if the business people start an hour earlier and avoid the heavy traffic on the roads. Most of these people would not use public transport so they could help to ease traffic congestion.

I will now mention a very serious problem and that is the effect daylight saving will have on air pollution. Pollution should definitely be considered in the introduction of a measure such as daylight saving. The Government has stated many times—and quite often before the election—that it was vitally concerned with all aspects of conservation. I have no doubt that the Government has considered this particular problem and we will hear something about it.

A question from the member for Mirrabooka, addressed to the Minister for Health, was in connection with air pollution and the Minister, in his reply, implied that the Air Pollution Control Council was operating. I have wondered whether or not the Government had consulted this advisory council, and what the result might have been. I understand the introduction of daylight saving will have a tremendous effect—in fact, a detrimental effect—on air pollution.

Each one of us has witnessed a hazy mist in the air between 100 feet and 500 feet high on summer evenings. This results from there being excessive water molecules in a cold layer of air when the conditions are not cloudy. This can be seen much better from a hilltop. This layer has been called "inversion."

We also know that the temperature rises when the sun is up and, to a point, the further away from the ground the warmer the temperature. I am not speaking about stratospheric conditions. In other words, there is a temperature gradient in the first few thousand feet above the ground. As the sun rises, the air becomes warmer and the temperature gradually rises the higher it is measured. About an hour, an hour and a half, or, at the most, two hours after sunrise, the rise in temperature disperses the inversion—the hazy layer. However, if there are pollutant molecules in the hazy layer the dispersion is much more difficult and is sometimes impossible. When there are pollutant molecules in this hazy layer, the condition is called "smog." The sun's rays are unable to penetrate through the molecules, the air will not become so warm, and pollution will result.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Is the honourable member trying to prove that it is or is not a good thing?

Mr. MENSAROS: I am trying to prove it is not a good thing from this point of view if daylight saving is introduced.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What has pollution got to do with daylight saving?

Mr. I. W. Manning: That is the point—you have not researched it.

Mr. MENSAROS: I am amazed that the Government does not take this matter seriously.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Government has taken this matter seriously.

Mr. Rushton: You have not demonstrated it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: It will not make any difference to East Perth winning the grand final.

Mr. MENSAROS: This is the general attitude of the Deputy Premier, but I do not think it is the attitude of the Premier, who



usually takes more notice of scientific advice than some other people do. To continue: If we artificially set the time so that everything starts an hour earlier the pollution from car exhausts and factories will also start earlier. These pollutants could rise up and saturate this layer of inversion, which would then become smog, and it would be very difficult for the sun to penetrate the inversion and disperse it. This condition exists in Los Angeles, where there are many more factories and cars than there are here, and Los Angeles suffers the disadvantage of sometimes having no prevailing winds for days and weeks, which means the smog does not disperse.

Mr. Taylor: Should we move the time scale forward and stay in bed an hour longer?

Mr. MENSAROS: As a result of daylight saving, the temperature gradient will not be so effective and we could have much more aerial pollution. It has been established that about 60 per cent. of aerial pollutants come from car exhausts. I should imagine this condition would be experienced in cities where there is a greater proportion of factories to cars. I think Perth has a greater number of cars in proportion to the number of factories which cause pollution. I would venture to say, therefore, that perhaps 80 per cent. of the aerial pollutants in Perth are caused by car exhausts.

If those cars are on the streets an hour earlier, the result will be as I have mentioned. I hope and trust that in the spirit of the motion the Government will live up to its responsibility and tell us the result of all the research which the Premier said had been undertaken by a committee headed by the Under Secretary of his department. If the Government does not do so, we have only two alternatives—either to conclude that the Government wants to be secretive and not tell us the results of the research, or that no research was made other than the research that any member could undertake for himself without the help of any scientific or other advisory council.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville) [8.06 p.m.] : Very often when a member rises to his feet in this Chamber he makes the statement that what he is about to say is not political. I think what he really means is it is not party political, and as far as this motion is concerned that is the appropriate category. Everything we discuss in this Chamber is, of course, political because it appertains to public affairs.

By way of interjection, some members on the Government side have indicated that they are aware of the strange way in which this motion is worded. For the benefit of members who have not read the motion—there may be some—I will read it.

Mr. Jamieson: It is handy for the gallery.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right. The motion reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take this opportunity to explain the extent of its research and the reasons why it has resolved to introduce daylight saving—

Then there is the qualification—

as it appears the varying problems confronting different industries and regions of Western Australia with its vast area, have not been given sufficient consideration.

Mr. Graham: Would it not be pertinent to advance that when the Bill is before the House? It is all a farce.

Mr. O'NEIL: I want to make the point, firstly, that I trust it will be the case that there is no vote taken on this motion.

Mr. Jamieson: Why?

Mr. O'NEIL: Because if, during the discussion on this motion, the Government provides the information relative to the research it has undertaken, there will be no need for the Government to repeat it after the motion is passed. In other words, the motion is designed simply to give private members of Parliament—including the Government back-benchers—an opportunity to express some of their fears and views on the subject of daylight saving.

Mr. May: That can be done when the Daylight Saving Bill is before us.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am prepared to agree with the Minister and I am so prompted by the interjection of the Minister for Mines—that the motion is inopportune but, as has already been explained, we had no occasion to know when the Daylight Saving Bill would be introduced.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Not very much! You know when it is to operate, if it is to operate at all.

Mr. O'NEIL: Mr. Speaker, I seek your advice on this matter. The Treasurer is losing control. I cannot understand why.

Mr. T. D. Evans: As a former school teacher, you completely amaze me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'NEIL: Mr. Speaker, in response to the interjection by the Treasurer you will allow me at least to say that in this Chamber we are not permitted to discuss anything that is occurring in another place. In fact, technically—although practically it may not be so—we should have no knowledge of what the Bill contains. That is by the way.

I was also disturbed by an interjection by the Minister for Industrial Development. This is the second occasion during this debate when he has spoken about the debate being a farce. I would remind him that this is private members' day, and that it is your responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to

protect the interests of private members. Nothing that a private member brings forward can be regarded as a farce.

Mr. Graham: You know there is a Bill dealing with this very matter coming before this House in a few days.

Mr. O'NEIL: I agree with the Minister who gave the information that perhaps the motion is inopportune but, on the other hand, notice was given of this motion before notice had been given of the introduction of the Bill in another place.

Mr. Graham: Does that matter?

Mr. O'NEIL: I do not know, but the motion provides an opportunity for private members to express their views, and the Government is in charge of the business of the House at the point where it wants to take over.

Mr. Graham: You know there is a Bill dealing with this matter and you could say everything you wanted to say when it was introduced.

Mr. O'NEIL: Perhaps we will not. As a matter of fact, I, personally, will support the Bill. I have said before that this is not a party political issue but the member for Wellington, in introducing this motion, intended that it should give an opportunity to private members and backbenchers on the Government side to express their points of view and their attitudes as to the form the Bill should take.

Mr. Graham: If the Bill does not come here it does not matter what their views are.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is an assumption by the Minister for Industrial Development. He is probably hoping it does not come here.

Mr. Graham: I was prompted by a member on your side to make that observation.

Mr. O'NEIL: Not by me.

The SPEAKER: The member for East Melville will ignore interjections.

Mr. O'NEIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not reflecting on the Chair, but there seems to be an attitude that when we are on our feet we must ignore interjections and if the Government is on its feet we are told not to interject.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether the member for East Melville is casting a reflection on the Chair but that remark implies that bias has been shown. I ask for the remark to be withdrawn. In all my decisions I have endeavoured to be fair and call to order both Government and Opposition members.

Mr. O'NEIL: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

One needs to look at the basic reason for this State being forced—if I can use that word—to introduce some form of day-

light saving. It has been mentioned that daylight saving of one hour was introduced in Tasmania in 1967. No member on the opposite side has explained the reason for it. I notice, by the lack of interjection, that this matter was not researched.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We know the reason. It was an emergency measure but the emergency did not occur.

Mr. O'NEIL: At least the Premier knows something about the matter. Due to a drought condition which, strangely enough, prevailed in Tasmania, there was a fear that the shortage of water in the hydro-electric system would occasion a shortage of power. Therefore, in addition to purchasing some power ships to operate the aluminium refineries at Bell Bay, the Tasmanian Government decided to introduce daylight saving so that power could be conserved. That was the reason for its introduction. However, because Tasmania is well south of the mainland of Australia the experiment was so successful in conserving daylight rather than power that the Government resolved to continue with it.

At a number of meetings I attended as the Minister for Labour at the time—although I am not too sure how the Department of Labour became involved in it—the matter of whether Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland would adopt the same time as Tasmania was discussed, and up to the time I ceased to occupy that position all the eastern mainland States had decided not to proceed with daylight saving. Why Victoria decided to go along with it, I could not say, but apparently Victoria made the first decision and it followed that New South Wales must do likewise because the border between New South Wales and Victoria runs through some substantial communities and towns and the situation could arise that the hotels on the New South Wales side of the border would close at a certain time and if one decided to imbibe one could walk across the border and continue for another hour.

Mr. May: You could do that in Queensland without daylight saving—at Tweed Heads and Coolangatta.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am sorry; the Minister is wrong. The trading hours for hotels are the same in all the States.

Mr. May: I said you could do it.

Mr. O'NEIL: I make the point that the reason New South Wales had to follow Victoria was concerned, basically, with disturbance along the border area which is fairly heavily populated.

The Premier of Queensland (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) was adamant that he would not follow suit, but adamant only for a short period of time because the same problem occurred when he looked at the situation

of Tweed Heads. In that place one could play poker machines on one side of the street, but not on the other side. As far as general trading is concerned, an additional two hours of trading would have been available had the differential been maintained. So Queensland finally decided to follow suit; but not without a great deal of criticism at the conferences of Ministers. At those conferences the Minister for Labour in Queensland was adamant that his State would not follow suit because of the difficulties which would arise in respect of the northern areas of the State.

The same difficulty does not obtain between South Australia and Western Australia. I do not think there is anything on the border, apart possibly from a karri log.

Mr. May: What about the Ord River?

Mr. O'NEIL: I agree. For obvious reasons the people in that place prefer to be on central standard time which is one and a half hours different. So those who live in the Kimberley would certainly welcome a period of daylight saving.

I suggest that the Government should have considered many alternatives. In fact, three methods of tackling the time differential problem are available. One is to stay as we are and to allow those business houses which have a great deal of commercial communication with the other States to adjust their own operating times. During the mining boom the Stock Exchange of Perth was forced to do just that; it had to open at a different time and finish at a different time in order to allow for business communication between its organisation and the organisations in other States.

I cannot see why that situation cannot prevail in any area. We have a further example on a small scale in relation to the employees housed in the Public Works Department building. Owing to the fact that the lifts in that building are not of sufficient capacity to shift all the workers at one time, I understand that certain of the departments start at different times in order to spread over a longer period the load carried by the lifts. I do not know whether that situation still applies, but it is an example of what can be done.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Has the honourable member given any consideration to the operations of the short-term money market and whether Western Australia would be adversely affected?

Mr. O'NEIL: This more or less appertains to what I am speaking about. It is safe to assume that businesses which are interlocked Statewise could stagger their hours as was done by the Stock Exchange of Perth. I do not know whether that is an acceptable answer to the problem, but this is the sort of thing about

which we are seeking information from the Government to see whether it has carried out any research.

Another alternative is apparently the one accepted by the Government; that is, to proclaim an hour of saving of daylight right throughout the State by way of legislation and to provide for a limited period of coverage during the summer months. As I understand it, the Bill which has been introduced in another place—although I have not seen it—repeals the existing Daylight Saving Act. The original Act is contained at page 22 of *The Statutes of Western Australia* of 1946, and it is still in force. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, will permit me to read the principal section of the Act because it is pertinent to my argument. That section states:—

3. (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act, the Governor may by proclamation declare that, from and after a time and date to be specified in the proclamation, and until such other time and date as the Governor shall by the same or subsequent proclamation so declare, daylight saving time shall within an area having a radius of thirty-five miles from the General Post Office at Perth, be such time not exceeding two hours in advance of the standard time of the State as the Governor shall specify, and any such proclamation shall have effect according to its tenor.

That is a rather restrictive provision. If we were prepared to operate under that Statute—and we can, for it is still in force—then the Government has the right to recommend to the Governor that within a radius of 35 miles from the General Post Office there shall be daylight saving for any specified period, as long as it is not more than two hours a day. So a facility is available to the Government to proclaim daylight saving in respect of the metropolitan area.

It has been pointed out already that whereas those residents to the south of the State can see no merit whatsoever in daylight saving, those in the north can see merit in it. In fact, I think the people in the Kimberley have for many years tried to operate on a time scale of their own which is more appropriate to the sunlight available to them in the normal daylight hours. It is also interesting to note, of course, that Hayman Island off the coast of New South Wales operates on a time differential of one hour from Queensland time. I do not know whether it does so of its own accord, or whether it regards itself in the same category as the Hutt River province of Western Australia. Certainly this holiday resort operates on a time differential of one hour, when compared with Queensland.

I would have preferred the Government to take some action—and this is the third alternative which I think is

available to it—to amend the Daylight Saving Act to give the Governor the power to proclaim daylight saving in prescribed areas.

In other words, we could then say that in respect of the southern areas of the State we will operate on a certain time, in respect of the northern areas of the State we will operate on another time, and the central area of the State shall operate on a further time; or, if it was found to be possible or necessary, all those areas could operate on the same time. But the Bill which is before another place, as I understand it, simply says an hour of daylight shall be saved every day throughout the whole of the State during a certain period of the summer.

Mr. Taylor: Has not that some merit in that it does specify the starting and finishing points and, more particularly, it has merit in that it comes before Parliament so that Parliament can say "Yes" or "No."

Mr. O'NEIL: I am not arguing against the principle of daylight saving. Perhaps I could let members into a secret; my wife has told me that if daylight saving is introduced she will not alter any of the clocks in the house.

Mr. Jamieson: I hope you arrive here on time.

Mr. O'NEIL: Personally, I do not have any objection to daylight saving. I think it will give the ordinary people an extra hour of daylight following their normal hours of work in which to enjoy themselves before the sun sets.

Mr. Jamieson: It might give the S.E.C. a headache. It will not sell as much power.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right, although usually in this connection daylight saving has been introduced in winter rather than in summer. However, that is by the way. I have put forward an alternative, and it is something I would have preferred to see.

With regard to the first alternative of allowing business houses to adjust themselves, another advantage is that we would have—as the member for Floreat mentioned—an opportunity to stagger the services of Government instrumentalities such as the Metropolitan Transport Trust. Members will be aware that all the buses of the Metropolitan Transport Trust in the metropolitan area are committed during the peak hour or hour-and-a-half. I believe they are committed to the point where there is standing room only. I have not travelled on a bus for some time, but I am assured that is the case. Members will be aware also that, as a result of the lack of availability of transport, many high schools the pupils of which are conveyed in buses are forced

to commence later than usual. I believe some high schools commence the day at 9.15 or 9.20 a.m. because not enough buses are available prior to 9.00 a.m. to get the children to the schools by that time.

There is no problem as far as staggering schools hours is concerned because nothing in the Education Department regulations lays down the commencement time for schools. In fact, when I was teaching in the north-west it was not uncommon, because of the heat, to start school at 8.00 a.m. and to finish at 11.00 a.m. and perhaps have two hours off for the lunch recess; we would then return in the afternoons.

Mr. May: That is owing to the climatic conditions.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is right. However, the point I was making is that there is nothing in the regulations to say that all schools must ring the bell at 9.00 a.m. In fact, I made the point that, owing to the full use of Metropolitan Transport Trust buses during peak hours, insufficient buses are available to get the children to school, and so some high schools commence at a later hour. Those facts alone would lead one to believe that perhaps the situation could resolve itself.

I appreciate that there is another problem in respect of staggered times because trading hours laid down in the Factories and Shops Act are the bane of Ministers for Labour—actually the Act specifies the hours when the shops must be closed, and not the hours when they must be open. However, in this place it is not impossible to include in a Statute a clause which simply says that in the event of certain other Acts being affected, the intent is followed and shall have effect "according to its tenor." That may be the reason for the inclusion of such a provision in the Daylight Saving Act of 1946. However, I am told that Parliament can do anything at all except make members love the child. How true that is, I do not know, but certainly avenues are available to cater for this problem which has been brought about by the fact that other States have decided to move to daylight saving. It has been escalating; it started in Tasmania, then Victoria and New South Wales followed suit, and so did Queensland despite violent objections. Then it spread to Western Australia.

It has been pointed out already that we are some minutes ahead of solar time because the meridian upon which time is determined lies somewhere near Southern Cross. We had some research made into this and we had material prepared which indicates the solar time and the meridian time in respect of most places in the State.

Mr. Taylor: Would you like to borrow my copy?

Mr. O'NEIL: We may have provided it for the Minister. I want to make the point again that the legislation is political because it relates to public affairs; it is certainly not party political. I wish to make the point also that I am fairly certain this motion will not be taken to a vote because that appears to be pointless. If we obtain more information from the Government the motion will have served its purpose.

I would like to make it clear that there may be legitimate differences of opinion between members on one side of the House and those on the other side of the House and, indeed, between members on the one side, as to whether daylight saving is in itself acceptable, desirable, or should be forced upon us.

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.29 p.m.]: I support the motion presented by the member for Wellington which asks the Government to explain the extent of its research and the reasons why it has resolved to introduce daylight saving. The member for Wellington also asked whether the problems which will be encountered in various industries and regions in Western Australia were given sufficient consideration.

Unlike some, I believe that Wednesday is a most important day in this House. It is private members' day and, as such, private members have the opportunity to bring before the House items for consideration which otherwise they could not bring forward. I believe this right and privilege ought to be preserved.

The member for Wellington has moved this motion in order to seek some clarification from the Government, and I certainly support it. I understand that in spite of the number of people who have contacted the Government in opposition to daylight saving, it still proposes to bring into operation daylight saving in this State.

I would ask that under the circumstances the opinions of people whose views have not been accorded to be heard.

Mr. Graham: It was a very small fraction of 1 per cent. of the people who took the trouble to let the Government know.

Mr. BLAIKIE: It might be a very small fraction of 1 per cent. who did take the trouble to write, but they did write and express an opinion. In making some research into this matter I find that the newspaper reports on this subject are rather like Dorothy Dix episodes, or possibly it is a case of heads-I-win tails-you-lose; and this I shall illustrate later.

I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 13th July, at about which time this question first arose. It states—

The Chief Secretary, Mr. Stubbs, will attend a meeting of all State Chief

Secretaries in Melbourne on Friday to discuss the implications of daylight saving.

At that point of time the people of Western Australia felt that this was a common-sense move, but subsequent to that the position became different.

It is interesting to note that on the 19th July the Chief Secretary is reported in *The West Australian* as having said—

The people most likely to benefit from daylight saving were those living within about 40 miles of Perth.

In a recent tour of his electorate, the South-West Province, he had heard no support for the scheme.

This is a vast State comprising about 1,000,000 square miles. Are the people living within a radius of 40 miles of Perth the only ones to be given consideration? That is the question I ask, and I believe that is also the question the member for Wellington had in mind when he moved his motion.

I refer to a report in *The West Australian* of the 24th July, which states—

The Chief Secretary, Mr. Stubbs, said yesterday that most of the letters he had received about daylight saving were opposed to its adoption in W.A.

He had received more than 100 letters since he invited people to submit their views on the subject.

He had been disappointed at the response of the business community. So far only one business organisation had made a submission to him.

Is that the consensus of opinion? I believe that when people are affected they will react, and we have seen how some people have reacted in relation to the construction of the power line along the foothills of the Darling Range. I think more than 1 per cent. of the people in that region reacted to the Government's move. I believe the Government has since taken heed; I know the member for Darling Range expects the Government to do so.

To follow on from there, I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 3rd August, in which the following appeared:—

The Chief Secretary, Mr. Stubbs, said last night that a start would be made today on drafting the necessary legislation.

Further on in the report the following appeared:—

Mr. Stubbs said he had received about 600 letters from individuals and organisations—probably representing about 10,000 people—about the proposal.

The opinions expressed ran about five to one against daylight saving.

That is the state of affairs, in respect of a question on which people had been invited to write in. They expressed their opinions, running about five to one against daylight saving, yet the Government still intends to proceed with its move. It is a case of heads-I-win tails-you-lose, irrespective of the consequences.

The attitude in my electorate is quite mixed. In the *Busselton-Margaret Times* of the 12th August, a report appeared under the following heading:—

Hostile reaction to daylight saving.

I earnestly ask the Government to give due consideration to the motion, and special thought to the disadvantages of daylight saving to particular industries in particular regions with due regard for the farming community, especially in these days of problems in primary production.

I support the motion moved by the member for Wellington.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Runciman.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [8.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Under the Bill I propose to have amendments made to the Local Government Act to provide for devices other than fences to be accepted as the safety measure that is required for private swimming pools. I might emphasise that in no way do I suggest there should be a lowering of the standard of protection that is required.

Members will recall that a measure was introduced in another place a couple of years ago to provide for the construction of safety devices in respect of private swimming pools. That was a private member's Bill and it was introduced by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs. He made that move, because he had a very deep concern for the safety of children. It is true that a number of children had drowned in private swimming pools, and I believe his move was supported wholeheartedly by a great percentage of the population.

The Bill which Mr. Stubbs introduced was subsequently discharged from the notice paper, after the Government had indicated that it accepted his proposition and had made certain suggestions for a better proposal to be put forward. Subsequently a Bill was introduced by the Government, which became an Act. This legislation requires fences to be erected around private swimming pools.

In most areas it has been extremely easy to comply with the requirement to construct a safety fence; however, there are many other areas in which such a fence is

difficult of construction because of the topography, and in some cases the fence does not render the necessary degree of safety.

This issue was taken up very early in the piece by the Kalamunda Shire and many other shires which found that they could not ask their ratepayers to comply with the particular by-law. In this respect I refer to a letter from the Kalamunda Shire to the Secretary for Local Government, dated the 7th May, 1970. It states—

Whilst the Council is in agreement with the spirit contained in the By Law it considers that in an area such as Kalamunda where there are large blocks, none of which are fenced, and contours which make fencing either difficult or of little value, the requirements of Clause 4 of the By Law would be impractical.

I have been instructed by Council to formally request that the Shire of Kalamunda be excluded from the Order in Council covering this By Law on the condition that the Council brings in its own By Law to provide for some other form of safeguard. The Council considers that a suitable cover placed over the Pool when not in use or under supervision of adults could be a reasonable alternative.

I have had discussions with other shires on this question; and, indeed, my attention was drawn to the fact that the Bassendean Shire Council had made certain representations to the Local Government Association, as had the Gosnells Shire Council and one or two others.

In Bassendean there is a situation where a swimming pool is located within yards of the river. Under the uniform by-laws that swimming pool has to be fenced, but there is no by-law that requires the river to be fenced. I suggest the river is far more hazardous than the swimming pool. However, I imagine that anomalies arise with every law that is introduced, but I believe the existing by-law has created more than its fair share of anomalies.

The Gosnells Shire is rather concerned, because it finds difficulty in interpreting the Act. Some swimming pools have been constructed above ground level. If they are four feet above ground level it appears that they comply with the by-law. However, that council is still enforcing the provision which requires the construction of a safety fence around a private swimming pool, because it considers that a ladder might be left leaning against the side of the pool and the pool would then be just as unsafe as an unfenced pool at ground level.

The Kalamunda Shire has certain statistics to indicate that the private swimming pools in its district have not been the greatest cause of concern in relation to children drowning. In a period of seven

years there have been three instances of children being drowned in pools, none of which were private swimming pools. One child drowned in the shire swimming pool, and two other children drowned in pools on natural watercourses, several of which pass through the Shire of Kalamunda.

I did ask the Minister for Local Government to visit Kalamunda to look into the various situations, and he accepted very willingly. He came to Kalamunda, and we arranged for him to inspect several pools. Unfortunately, it rained all day, and he saw few of the pools that we intended him to inspect.

While in Kalamunda the Minister agreed we had a problem to comply with the uniform by-law, and whilst he did not say he would agree to the request I made on behalf of the shire, he said he would give serious consideration to it; and his attitude more or less indicated we had more than an even chance of his accepting the proposition. However, after the visit he wrote to me as follows:—

Since our recent inspection of various private swimming pools in Kalamunda with the Shire President, Mr. A. P. Cook, I have further considered the request of the Kalamunda Shire Council for exclusion from the By-laws.

It is pointed out that I have no authority to permit a Council to waive the provisions of the By-laws.

The By-laws are enacted under Section 245A of the Act and it is the responsibility of the Local Authority to enforce them.

I regret I am unable to assist you further in this matter as the Council is bound by the Act to comply with the provisions of the By-laws.

I subsequently wrote to Mr. Stubbs and concluded the letter by saying—

I respectfully ask that you introduce legislation to amend the Act so that safety measures, other than a fence, can be employed.

I am afraid his reply was rather confusing, but perhaps this is because of my inexperience in these matters. The following is a quote from his letter of the 9th July:—

Section 245 of the Local Government Act at present provides that a Council may make By-laws and the Governor may publish Uniform By-laws for requiring the owner or occupier of land on which there is a swimming pool to install or to provide such structures as the Council considers necessary for the protection and the safety of persons who may, with or without the knowledge or consent of the owner or occupier enter upon that land.

He has referred to the section of the Act. To continue—

It therefore seems that there is no necessity to amend the Act to provide for other structures other than a fence.

He then rather perplexed me by saying—

I do not consider, however, that at this time, legislation should be introduced to provide other alternative safety devices.

It appeared to me that in the first sentence of the last paragraph he was indicating that provision existed for other devices to be used, but he went on to state that he was not prepared to do anything about it. This is the reason I have introduced this Bill.

Even if this Bill is passed, it does not necessarily mean that every shire will be given the right to accept some other method in all cases. What I want is to provide for the difficult situations and to give local authorities a certain amount of latitude—not to reduce the degree of safety, but to give them a degree of flexibility. Even if this Bill is passed it will be necessary for the Government to make certain amendments to the uniform by-laws and the Government will have complete control in this regard.

I have inspected a number of devices which would afford protection equal to that afforded by a fence, and I think the most effective form of protecting any waterhole is to provide a cover for the hole itself. If that is done it does not matter whether people enter the property and go near the pool as they cannot fall in because of the barrier which exists between them and the water. That is the most effective protection.

However, it does have some difficulties in application and that has probably been the main objection of the Minister. He also inspected the net and his only criticism was that it dipped into the water. I agree that was not satisfactory, but certain alterations could be made so the net did not dip into the water. Another criticism of the net the Minister made was that the ropes which secured the net to the pool were tied by a slip knot. He contended that a child with very little pressure could release the net and render the pool unsafe.

I have been informed that an Eastern States firm has a device, but unfortunately I have still not received any literature from the firm. The device is similar to a blind roller. Perhaps members can imagine a blind roller set into the side of a pool. It is a fairly heavy canvas or tarpaulin cover pulled across the pool by way of rollers at each end of the pool. It is reinforced by ribbing and would make a very suitable cover for a pool. It could be very quickly whipped over the pool and just as easily removed by an adult.

If passed, this Bill will afford a certain amount of latitude to local authorities and will provide an even safer situation than will exist if councils must enforce the present by-law. I have viewed a number of pools in the hills. The homes on these properties are constructed on land of cut and fill. Fairly steep cliffs have been formed and the pools are constructed adjacent to the cliffs. A fence is quite adequate on the lower level, but completely inadequate on the much higher level. I believe we ought to make some provision so that local authorities can cater for such anomalous situations, and I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Taylor (Minister for Housing).

### ALUMINA REFINERY (UPPER SWAN) AGREEMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 16th September.

**MR. MOILER** (Toodyay) [8.53 p.m.]: In continuing my comments in support of this Bill to establish a refinery in the Upper Swan, I wish quickly to reiterate a few of the main points I endeavoured to make in this House last Thursday.

The first point I emphasise again is that those members who have taken the trouble to read and study this Bill must surely be impressed with the obvious work which has been put into it by the officers of the various departments which will have some connection with the industry. Some I am referring to are the Forests Department, the section of the Water Supply Department which deals with water catchment areas, and the Department of Agriculture. These departments can reasonably be expected to have an interest in the effect the refinery could have on the industries under their control.

From the size of the Bill and the additional coverage it provides compared with all other previous Bills introduced for the establishment of refineries, members must surely realise the officers concerned have taken into account every conceivable pollution aspect which can be reasonably expected.

Another point I made was that the refinery will be constructed after the environmental protection legislation—which has now been introduced—has been passed. It is reasonable to assume that with the support of the other parties in this House, the environmental Bill will pass and be proclaimed before construction of the refinery is commenced. This is something completely different from trying to raise the present substandard conditions of factories already established.

**Mr. Rushton**: What is achieved by just proclaiming it before you sign the document? It does not achieve anything.

**Mr. MOILER**: It means the construction will have to be carried out, as stated in the Bill, and in accordance with the requirements of the environmental protection legislation; that is completely different from trying to raise the standard of establishments such as the Midland brickworks. I suggest that many of the groups interested in environmental protection would be better engaged if they endeavoured to raise the standard of present industries.

**Mr. Lewis**: Will the environmental protection authority have anything to do with the siting of the refinery?

**Mr. MOILER**: Possibly not with the siting, but obviously a standard will be set and the industry will be required to work according to that standard. Surely that is logical.

With regard to air pollution, I endeavoured to explain that the technical officers in the Public Health Department connected with the clean air council had estimated that the chimney stack would require to be in the vicinity of 400 feet high. This was calculated on a throughput of 1,200,000 tons of alumina a year, using fuel oil. When introducing the Bill the Minister stated that the refinery will possibly not reach more than approximately 800,000 tons a year, and that in the initial stages it would operate on 300,000 tons a year. Consequently it must be reasonably clear to anyone that even if the refinery uses fuel oil the sulphur dioxide emission from the smokestack would be much lower than that for which the stack has been constructed, and still come within the requirement of the Clean Air Act. I imagine that by the time the refinery is producing more than 300,000 tons a year, it would be operating on natural gas.

With regard to the ground water supply in the area I am confident no pollution will occur. I understand that farmers in the immediate area are at the present time concerned that the drag from the ground water the refinery might make would be of such an amount that it would reduce the supply available to the farmers in the immediate vicinity. At the conclusion of my remarks last Thursday I said—

... it is obvious to me that the officers of the Water Supply Department have taken care to ensure that if the establishment of this refinery should prove to be detrimental in any way to the farmers who are adjacent to the works they have the authority to make recommendations for compensation to be paid to those farmers.

This is obviously referring to a depletion of the supply available to them. I would like to qualify my statement "to be paid to those farmers." I did not intend to imply a financial payment would be made by the authority or by anyone else.



In clause 35 (9) it states, "Any reference in this Clause to a licence is a reference to a licence under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act." Under this provision the body controlling the use of underground waters will have sufficient authority to control the amount of water extracted from underground sources.

As water is one of our most precious resources I can believe that in years to come it will be controlled by a Government department. It is quite conceivable that a water control body will take over the control of all pumping from underground sources.

Members may be interested to know that the water table in the Adelaide Plains in South Australia has dropped to 100 feet below sea level due to uncontrolled extraction of ground water used mainly for agricultural pursuits.

In the area under discussion ground water will be extracted to a maximum depth of something like 200 feet. The depth varies, but 200 feet is the maximum. A clay base separates ground water from artesian water. A great number of farmers in the area receive their water supplies mainly from the artesian level, but the works would draw mainly on water which is closer to the surface.

With regard to the effect the project may have on forestry and water supply, it is quite clear both departments have set down conditions under which mining will be permitted. I accept that in the Jarrah-dale area and in the lower part of the State, jarrah has been removed and it will never be replanted. The jarrah has been lost to the areas. However, there are no jarrah forests in the area where it is proposed that mining shall take place. No great tracts of forests will be destroyed. In fact, 75 per cent. of the reserves in the mining area are privately owned and I assume that most of this land would be cleared already. Consequently the question of destroying great tracts of forests does not arise.

The measure makes provision for something which I imagine has never been included in any Bill previously; namely, for the rehabilitation of privately-owned land in accordance with the requirements stated by the Minister who, I imagine, will be guided by his department, the Conservator of Forests, and others.

Another provision in the Bill covers mining in areas which may affect water catchments. It is obvious to me that the officers in charge of the departments concerned have gained sufficient experience to know the things to look for and to safeguard against so far as mining is concerned.

I shall briefly mention a few of the minor benefits that could flow from the establishment of the works. At present properties within 13 miles of the G.P.O., Perth, on main thoroughfares, such as West Swan

Road and the Great Northern Highway, are without scheme water. I have received petitions from many people—right out to Bullsbrook—requesting the extension of scheme water. I assume the works would establish a 14 or 15-inch main or would certainly provide finance to install a main. The Government could obviously install a larger main to cater for the needs of the people in the area.

Mr. Thompson: Will the Government do this?

Mr. MOILER: I imagine the electricity required for the mining area could come from Muchea. It is quite conceivable it would be supplied by the longest practical route and, in consequence, many farmers who would otherwise be deprived of electricity could receive some fringe benefit from the development.

When the project gets under way—and I certainly hope it will—housing may be provided in Toodyay and people encouraged to live there.

Mr. Thompson: Where is that provided for in the agreement?

Mr. MOILER: It is not provided for in the agreement. Had the honourable member been listening to me, he would realise I said that I hope the project gets under way and that housing may be provided in Toodyay. If the member for Darling Range had listened to the Minister's introductory speech he would know the Minister said some housing could possibly be required, but it was not intended the company would undertake the provision of housing on a large scale. I suggest it is quite feasible that some housing could be established in a town like Toodyay and the people could travel to the mining area. I say "the mining area" because people going to the works would be more likely to come from the metropolitan area.

Those are a few possible fringe benefits apart from having \$15,000,000 injected into the economy annually and an export trade of \$50,000,000.

It has been stated that the Pinjarra refinery, which is being built at present, has a buffer zone and is on an area of 12,000 acres. It has also been said that the area in the Swan Valley therefore does not seem very large. In my opinion the company has 12,000 acres at Pinjarra—a very large area—because it has not even been able to estimate the reserves of bauxite held. To obtain 12,000 acres at this stage is only good business. There is no implication that 6,000 acres proposed for the project at West Swan is not anything but adequate.

A further suggestion was made that the works should move 10 miles further north. If the works were shifted 10 miles further north, what effect would this have on mining? The answer is "none" because the

mining would still be carried out in exactly the same areas. Wherever the works are situated, the mining will be carried out in the same location.

It has been claimed that the water may become polluted. In this respect I refer to an article in *The West Australian* on Thursday, the 8th July, 1971, in which reference was made to the proposed refinery. The article mentions Ellen Brook. It has been claimed that if the underground waters are polluted these could gravitate down to Ellen Brook. However, the article states that Ellen Brook originates near Gingin, 50 miles north.

If there is any danger that pollution may come from the red mud ponds, would not the same danger be present 10 miles further north? To shift the works this distance would not ensure anything safer so far as waters are concerned. It would merely shift the problem. Apparently it is the principle, "out of sight out of mind."

People who oppose the establishment of the refinery grasp at everything as a reason for its not being placed in the proposed locality. I consider their main fears centre around air pollution but they grasp at everything else to bolster up their case. I concede there must be some degree of air pollution with combustion. However I have already stated that so far as air pollution is concerned, any emissions from these works will be well within the limits laid down by the clean air council. For my part I do not propose to be embarrassed or moved from supporting the establishment, or to sit idly by, simply because industries already established have problems of pollution. Constructed in accordance with the Clean Air Act an industry like this will be of benefit to the State and to the people I represent. As I have said, with the introduction of natural gas, even the small degree of pollution would be eliminated.

A group of people simply do not want the refinery and anything they can put forward to oppose it is to their advantage. One objection which seems to be stated fairly regularly now is that it will mean the development of another dirty, heavy industrial complex.

I cannot see that the development of these works would have any bearing on whether the area would develop into a heavy industrial complex. The broad gauge already goes through the area as does the Geraldton railway line. The ground water supply is already in the area. The works could produce and carry on operation whether or not there is any other industry. I quite believe it would not want any other industry around it, but even if the works are not established there is nothing to stop an industrial area from being established if this is the wish of the Government. I accept that at this stage it is not the wish of the Government. I believe we

should study the case on the facts before us; the works, on their own, would bring nothing but benefit to the State and their establishment should be supported.

I would like to conclude my remarks by once again indicating to you, Mr. Speaker, and members generally, that having spoken to a good number of people in the electorate both for and against the establishment of the works, I am convinced that the majority of these people and, I would say, the majority within the State, want this refinery to develop subject to environmental protection which I am sure will be afforded by the legislation which was introduced into Parliament tonight. If members opposite do not move to water down the environmental legislation, I am sure the provisions provided in this Act will be adequate and accepted by the people of this State and particularly of the Toodyay electorate, which I represent.

**MR. LEWIS (Moore)** [9.16 p.m.]: As a large part of the area over which it is intended to mine this bauxite lies within my electorate, particularly in the shires of Chittering and Victoria Plains, it is pertinent that I make a few remarks about the Bill.

I regret I do not share the impressions of the member for Toodyay of the amount of work that has gone into the preparation of the Bill and the Minister's second reading speech. Nevertheless, I do appreciate that this is a proposal to set up an industry which we are told is to cost some \$190,000,000 to establish, and would probably inject some \$15,000,000 annually into the economy of this State. That is not an insignificant amount. To quote the Minister, it is estimated thousands will be employed in the construction and thereafter some 700 people—150 in the actual mining and 550 at the refinery.

**Mr. Graham:** And probably very many more indirectly.

**Mr. LEWIS:** That could well be. Looked at by itself as a project, it appears to be attractive and something which we cannot lightly discard. However, I am by no means satisfied with the environmental aspects of the proposition. Parliament has received innumerable petitions, the last of which was presented today. From what I could gather from the honourable member who presented the petition, it includes the names of many people from your own electorate, Mr. Speaker. I do not think we can assume that all of these people object from a purely emotional viewpoint. True it is with any petition, some people can be whipped up into an emotional state. Nevertheless, many are genuinely worried about the effect of the establishment of a refinery so close to Perth. It will create problems, not only for the people already living in the metropolitan area, but also for those who will gradually extend into the less-populated parts.

As I stated in the Chamber the other night, I am no expert in this field. The first people to express their fears to me were from the Wanneroo area, and I repeat this tonight because the Premier is in his seat. On the 12th July last I led a deputation from the Wanneroo area to the Premier. These people expressed their fears on various matters concerning the environment, water supplies, vegetation, etc. I do not have the Premier's reply in writing and I would not ask or expect it to be given, but I remember the Premier's words ringing loud and clear. He said, "You have nothing to worry about." Those are the exact words he used.

Mr. Graham: I can say that equally emphatically, as the Minister in charge of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: All right, let us take one thing at a time. The Premier said, "We will set up an environmental protection authority, and it will look at this matter before Parliament deals with it."

Mr. Court: That is the crucial thing.

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot quote the exact words now, because, as I say, I have nothing in writing. However, that is the clear impression I obtained and I checked on this a few days ago with as many members of the deputation as I could contact. Amongst these was an Anglican priest. I did not say, "Did the Premier say this?" or "Did the Premier say that?" I said to them, "What is your impression of the Premier's remarks on that day?" I left the story to them and they all confirmed my impression that nothing would happen until the environmental protection authority could adjudicate in the matter.

Incidentally, the television people were waiting outside—not at my behest—and as I was the member who introduced the deputation, I was asked whether I was satisfied with the Premier's reply. I said, "Yes, the Premier has satisfied me; he has given the deputation an assurance that nothing will be done before he sets up the environmental protection authority and it has a look at it." This is my impression and the impression John Citizen would have got had he been there. The next day this article appeared in *The West Australian*—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said yesterday that Parliament would not pass legislation to establish an alumina refinery near the Swan Valley before it had dealt with proposed legislation to protect the environment.

The rest of the article is not pertinent to the issue.

We have now had the first reading of a Bill to set up the environmental protection authority, but I do not think by any stretch of the imagination it can be claimed that Parliament has now dealt with the proposed legislation and we can go ahead

with the alumina refinery. I do not think that is anywhere near the spirit of the undertaking which the Premier gave to the deputation.

I repeat, the deputation was told that the environmental protection authority would be set up, it would examine the proposals, report to the Government, and Parliament would have the benefit of any recommendations or reports which it made. Perhaps my impression goes too far in that respect, but whether it does or does not, the matter has aroused so many fears amongst the people that the Government of the day would be wise, even at the expense of some delay, to set up the environmental protection authority and have it examine all of these aspects. Let the environmental protection authority come up with a report or recommendations and then bring the matter before Parliament. It would be a pity if we had here a repetition of what has happened in America and Tokyo. The people there had the benefit of expert advice, works departments, health departments, and that type of thing.

Mr. May: Did you express these fears when Kwinana was established?

Mr. LEWIS: No, we did not. However, many of these fears are now being expressed by people who did not have them earlier. As time marches on people are becoming more sensitive about what is going to happen to their children, and whether we are creating another Tokyo or another Los Angeles. These fears may be quite groundless; I would hope so because we are very proud indeed of our fair city of Perth and its surroundings. I think I can fairly say none of us, irrespective of which side of the House we sit on, would willingly do anything to foul the atmosphere. The establishment of the refinery is a very serious move to make, and I think we want to be assured no harm will result.

We have been told by the Minister that the refinery is a marginally-viable proposition, or words to that effect. The refinery will be dealing with a low-grade bauxite, and because of the economics he tells us the refinery could not be shifted further north. This causes me to wonder what will happen. If a proposition is only marginally viable now because of the low-grade bauxite, what will happen if the world price of alumina takes a downward turn, and what will happen if the costs escalate as they are doing? Is a marginally-viable proposition today going to become microscopically marginal or even go into the red within a few years? Again I repeat, I am not in a position to judge this but we have not been given sufficient information about it. Perhaps we could not expect to be given the whole economics of the proposition—let us be realistic. However, I would need further information before I can be satisfied that it is not possible to site the refinery further north.

I do not know whether it is possible to site the refinery in the electorate of Toodyay, somewhere perhaps north of the spur line where it is proposed to put a crushing plant. I do not care whether it is in the electorate of Toodyay or the electorate of Moore; I would look around to see what alternative could be suggested—anything to get it further away from Perth. We have the Pinjarra refinery, I suppose roughly 50 miles from Perth.

Mr. Graham: How far from Pinjarra?

Mr. LEWIS: Only a few miles.

Mr. Graham: How far did you, as a Minister of the Crown, agree that the refinery should be from Bunbury?

Mr. LEWIS: It was not very far away.

Mr. Graham: Only four miles. You did not adopt the same attitude then.

Mr. LEWIS: Probably some of the factories in Tokyo today would not have been put up if they had the knowledge they have today.

Mr. Graham: The Alwest agreement was made only the day before yesterday virtually.

Mr. LEWIS: It is all right to say what we did in the past six years.

Mr. T. D. Evans: This was five years ago.

Mr. Court: The Minister overlooks one thing. The Bunbury agreement was only signed after consultation with the people of Bunbury.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Bate-man): The member for Moore.

Mr. Graham: They do not get polluted down at Bunbury.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Bate-man): Order! The member for Moore.

Mr. LEWIS: I have not studied the economics; I do not know the costs involved. We are told it is low-grade bauxite and that it will be mined and carted by road to crushing plants. From what I can gather there are about four tons of bauxite to every ton of alumina. I have yet to be satisfied that it would be cheaper to cart four tons of bauxite by road than it would be to cart one ton of alumina by rail, even allowing for the railway to be built. I do not know what costs will be involved. We are merely told that the refinery site is to be on such and such a location and there is nowhere else for it to go. That might satisfy the member for Toodyay, but it does not satisfy me.

Mr. Moller: Perhaps you did not take the trouble to inquire.

Mr. LEWIS: There is an area between Gingin and Bindoon where the railway from Gingin runs eastward to Moollabeneie siding. If the refinery were established there there would be far less risk to the people living in the vicinity.

Also, there is unlimited fresh water at Cullalla siding, 12 miles further north, which could be used by the refinery. This would save the cost of using 1,500,000 gallons of water that would have to be drawn from the metropolitan water scheme. This will have to be done under the proposals that are now before us. All of these factors spell out to me in large, bold letters that this matter should be examined more closely and more information should be given to the Parliament before we are asked to give a final decision on the merits of establishing this refinery in the Upper Swan area.

Mr. Graham: First of all you should look at the plan of the mineral leases; because, believe me, the position of the bauxite has a great deal to do with the position of the refinery. You have forgotten about that factor.

Mr. LEWIS: I have seen the plans and the mineral leases stretch from a few miles north of Upper Swan almost to Koojan siding, which is about 15 miles this side of Moora.

Mr. Graham: And how far south?

Mr. LEWIS: They stretch south beyond the great eastern railway. Two long legs run down south. I am not putting in a plug that the refinery should be established in the electorate of Moore. I could not care less whether it is established in the electorate of Toodyay or somewhere else. Here again, it may not be necessary to think of either of those alternative sites, but we are not yet satisfied that by putting the refinery where it is proposed to put it will do everything to protect the way of life for the people in the metropolitan area, and that is what I am concerned about.

Apart from the question of environmental protection I have not a great deal to say about the Bill itself. I notice that the joint venturers have 12 months in which to have a look at the undertaking and to place an acceptable proposition before the Government. Surely this does not require something to be done next week or next month. Some time is allowed, and surely the Government has time to have a thorough examination made of the position by the environmental protection authority.

So with those few remarks I can see some merit in the Bill if I could be satisfied that the refinery site will not cause any harm to the community. If that is proved to be so it would break down my reluctance to accept the Bill. I realise that this project will possibly help farmers financially and will create some employment at a time when farmers are looking for other avenues of employment. Provided this can be done without unduly upsetting their way of life, I am quite agreeable to the passing of the Bill.

However, I am not so easily misled. The member for Toodyay has said that all kinds of protective provisions are written into the Bill to rehabilitate properties, and so on. That may be so but it is not sufficient merely to replace the topsoil. Some of our country has been taken over for the purpose of gravel pits which, in some cases, are only a couple of feet deep.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You people were prepared to let that happen.

Mr. LEWIS: We had no option. It will be found, however, that these holes will be more than a couple of feet deep.

Mr. May: Have you looked at the re-afforestation at Jarrahdale?

Mr. LEWIS: Yes, I have.

Mr. Hartrey: What did you think of that?

Mr. LEWIS: When I saw it I was not in a position to say whether it was acceptable or not. All I can say is that it was promising. I saw many patches of young trees of different varieties and some looked to be better than others. When I saw them last they were about eight to 10 feet high and they looked to be quite all right.

Mr. May: They are about 20 feet high now.

Mr. LEWIS: That could be so. I am conscious of the remarks of one or two people who have changed their minds since then. One or two forestry people have expressed some doubts. The re-afforestation of Jarrahdale looks promising, but let us wait a few years to see whether it will develop.

Mr. Hartrey: Supposing the project we are discussing now were to plant trees?

Mr. LEWIS: I will not have any fears about that in the bush areas. Such trees would grow of their own accord. There may be some open paddocks where the bauxite is mined. I do not know, because we have not been told about this. There could be lush pastures that could be mined to a depth of 10 to 12 feet. The topsoil could be replaced which could, perhaps, grow subclover. This could involve an area of 10 or 20 acres. I do not know. This is due to lack of information. We are merely told that the mining will be done on a selected area.

We can understand this, especially if the bauxite is below average quality. It is only natural that the company will select the best pockets to mine the bauxite. What about the rehabilitation in these areas? Are we to say, "The Department of Agriculture will take care of this to ensure that the topsoil is replaced; subclover will be sown there and so everything will be dandy afterwards"? The farmer, however, will be left with paddocks in which there are great holes. Some of these fears may be groundless but I have had experience in the

Muchea area where the Midland brickworks operate. The brickworks had a clay pit on top of a hill. When it rained, red flood water from the pit ran down the road until it found its way into a clear-water stream that ran through a farmer's paddock. He used this stream to water his cattle. However, the red water from the clay pit turned the clear water red and the cattle refused to drink it. As a result the farmer had to make other arrangements to water his cattle.

In fairness to the Midland Brick Company I say here and now that it could not have been more co-operative. The company sent its top men to the spot to examine the problem and went to a great deal of expense in an attempt to retain the water in a settling pit to avoid it running into the freshwater stream in the farmer's paddock.

Mr. Moiler: Under the Bill this company will be required to do that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not saying it will not. These are events that could happen on a large scale and we want to be satisfied in regard to all these contingencies. It is all very well to tell me what is in the Bill. When the Minister introduced the measure I asked him, "At what stage will it be referred to the environmental protection authority?" The Minister replied—

Already Dr. O'Brien has carried out some investigations. He has been in touch with the various departments and authorities, whether it be the Public Works Department, the Water Supply Department, the Clean Air Council, the Public Health Department, and so on. However, it is anticipated he will have a further look at it in the light of legislation to be introduced shortly which will govern this matter of environmental protection.

The Minister did not say whether Dr. O'Brien was thoroughly satisfied after making some investigation. The Minister did not give us any indication of Dr. O'Brien's thoughts on the matter after he had had these consultations. He said it was anticipated that Dr. O'Brien would have a further look at the matter which, in itself, might imply he was not satisfied with it.

Mr. Graham: That is part of his job; to look at it at any time.

Mr. LEWIS: Of course it is, but what is the use of his doing the job unless other people have the benefit of the results he obtains?

Mr. Graham: He would do his job in respect of existing industry in the same way as he will with this one.

Mr. LEWIS: Surely Parliament is entitled to have some report on the development on the refinery site, because it is very serious development. I repeat that perhaps my fears are quite groundless.

Mr. Graham: I'll say!

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to have the assurance of the Minister on that, but I would be more satisfied if I had the assurance of the environmental protection authority after it has made a thorough investigation into the many aspects of this environmental question. With those reservations I conclude my remarks on the Bill.

MR. McIVER (Northam) [9.43 p.m.]: It gives me great pleasure to support the Bill that is now before the House. I support it in its entirety. I have no hesitation in saying that I congratulate the Government and the Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation not only for the research they have conducted into this project, but also in giving the people of Western Australia an industry at a time when it is so badly needed.

The time has come when we in this House have to look in proper perspective at the situation existing in this State. Only a few nights ago we heard the Budget presented by the Treasurer and it was quite obvious from his remarks that he has had to scratch and scrape for money from every source to obtain sufficient finance to conduct the affairs of this State. One has only to travel through the rural areas of Western Australia to realise the economic situation of the rural community. The finance at present available in this State is rapidly drying up.

I am not an economist, but one does not have to be one to realise the serious situation in which we will be placed if we do not have sufficient finance injected into the economy of the State from one source or another. At the moment our hospitals are full; our classrooms are overcrowded, and our gaols are bursting at the seams.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They were bursting at the seams last year, too.

Mr. McIVER: From where are we to obtain the finance to alleviate this position? Is it going to float down from the heavens? It is quite apparent from the attitude of the Commonwealth Government we are not going to get any money from it.

Mr. Court: You have had a record vote from it!

Mr. McIVER: All of a sudden the Opposition has become expert in the field of ecological environment.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was not too keen last year.

Mr. McIVER: The only regret I have concerning this Bill is that the project is not going those few miles further into the Northam electorate where it would be welcomed with open arms.

Mr. Williams: That is why the people of Bunbury readily accepted their proposition.

Mr. McIVER: There is no doubt about that man. After he was made they broke the mould!

Mr. T. D. Evans: I wonder why!

Mr. McIVER: We have heard many speeches, and not only from members of Parliament, in relation to this legislation. People have set themselves up as authorities on environmental protection, and we know that such protection is necessary. This point does not need to be impressed upon us. However, what these people fail to realise is the importance to Western Australia of this industrial enterprise. This is the point we must keep foremost in our minds.

Who would be more versed in the matter than the Minister who has given much of his time to it? I am sure former Ministers will agree that they never have enough time. Nevertheless the present Minister has attended meetings upon request and has given an assurance—and this is the main point—that the environment of this State will most certainly be protected.

At a distance of 40 miles from here is the industrial town of Wundowie. From the inception of the industry there, the smokestacks have been belching smoke and dust. What have the people of Western Australia, including the conservationists, said about that? Was the Opposition, when in Government, concerned about pollution at Wundowie? One has only to drive around the streets to become covered in dust and soot; but the people of the district accept this because the industry provides their livelihood and they are prepared to remain there and, if it is possible, to have the industry expanded.

Mr. Rushton: Do you want that situation perpetuated?

Mr. Court: It is amazing how the attitude of members opposite has changed since they have been on that side.

Mr. Graham: No it has not. That is why we have this Bill so that it will not happen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McIVER: All of a sudden this fear has been forced on the people of Western Australia in an endeavour by the Opposition to make political capital out of it.

Mr. Court: You are wrong. Your Premier made this an issue at the election.

Mr. McIVER: I feel this is irrelevant.

Mr. Court: I'll say it is in your mind.

Mr. Graham: We have not gone back on one word concerning our environmental attitude—not one word.

Mr. Court: We are only asking that it be covered in connection with this project.

Mr. Graham: That is precisely what we are doing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McIVER: The main point is that we have been given an assurance by the Government and the Minister that what they have reported to the people of Western Australia will be carried out. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

Mr. Blaikie: There are one or two doubts over here.

Mr. McIVER: That may be so, but after having listened to the tripe and humbug the other night over a little fiddling amendment moved to delay this Bill, I feel members opposite have nothing to offer.

Mr. Thompson: That was a very responsible step.

Mr. McIVER: I was disgusted to listen to the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because all members in this House know that when he was the Minister for Industrial Development no-one approached industry more conscientiously in an effort to have it developed than he did.

Mr. Court: He still does.

Mr. McIVER: He had the tenacity of a fighting Spanish bull, but all of a sudden he wants to re-enact the part of Ferdinand. He wants to sit down and smell the flowers.

Mr. Court: You'll learn. You are not helping the Bill much. How about talking about the Government's policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Northam will continue.

Mr. Court: It is very interesting to know your Government has changed its policy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McIVER: It is interesting to note that at no stage have the people responsible for an investment, not of thousands of dollars, but of \$190,000,000, been at variance with the conservationists. They have accepted what they must do and they have agreed to it. However, if by some chance some slip-up occurs and the company does not comply with the legislation now coming before the House, the Minister can stop production by lifting the telephone.

Mr. Court: He cannot.

Mr. McIVER: They must comply.

Mr. Court: How hypocritical can you people get after your attitude towards the previous Government's legislation, and the attitude to the smelter in Kalgoorlie?

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graham: When did the then Opposition vote against one of those Bills?

Mr. T. D. Evans: When did the then Opposition vote against the smelter?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McIVER: When members have finished, perhaps I can continue.

Mr. Court: How about coming back to what your Premier said during the election?

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has gone from bull to dust.

Mr. Court: The Treasurer will have a nervous breakdown in a moment. He will get catalepsy before long.

Mr. McIVER: I do not want to leave the point regarding Wundowie, so to answer the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member can get away with Wundowie. We are on the alumina refinery.

Mr. Court: You know we did a lot about Wundowie.

Mr. McIVER: There is a parallel about environment generally about which everyone is more concerned than with what will actually occur in the State. The unemployment rate in Western Australia is increasing.

Mr. Rushton: Since when? Since February?

Mr. Williams: Since this Government came into office.

Mr. Graham: Since Billy McMahon.

Mr. McIVER: This refinery will provide further employment opportunities. Most important of all it will provide these opportunities for our young people—our school leavers—in many facets appertaining to the industry. The subsidiaries of this refinery will be most extensive indeed.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIVER: The company must provide the rolling stock to transport the product to Kwinana. It must provide the roads, and also the standard gauge railway to the site. This brings me to another point, and surely we must be fair about this. An investment of \$190,000,000 is involved. The member for Moore said that surely the refinery could be established at Nannamoolan—or rather, Moolabeenie. If it were to be established at Nannamoolan I would be very satisfied because it would then be right in the heart of my electorate.

Those prepared to invest \$190,000,000 in such a mammoth project must certainly have had their experts study the overall economic situation of the industry. They would have been into this with a fine tooth comb and, for economic reasons, they

decided this is the site they desire for their refinery. Surely, to reciprocate, the Government of the day must agree to their request because we must in comparison consider what they are providing for the people of the State, in the opportunities I have already outlined.

In supporting the Bill, the member for Toodyay referred to water supplies. Water is a very necessary commodity and it is one to which we should be giving consideration. Particularly is this so in regard to the conservation of water. I most wholeheartedly agree with the member for Toodyay that the people in the area involved will welcome with open arms the establishment of this refinery at the site the company has chosen in order to have available the necessary commodities of water and electricity. These were not supplied under the former Administration although plenty of money was available to do so.

To continue talking would only be a reiteration of what has already been stated by the member for the district—the member for Toodyay. However, I feel it should be announced and highlighted as much as possible that the people of Western Australia have nothing to fear in relation to environmental protection. They have nothing to fear in regard to the pollution of water supplies, and so on, because, as has already been stated, these matters have been adequately researched.

Admittedly a certain amount of discharge into the atmosphere will occur, but this is a world problem and I am sure the people who supplied the 15,000 signatures to the petition would not be able to provide a method by which it could be eliminated. This will certainly not be achieved by saying "Yea" or "Nay" to the establishment of this refinery. This will make no difference to the world problem because scientists with the best brains in the world have been studying this matter for years.

I say in all sincerity, and especially for the benefit of members of the Opposition, that we should allow this Bill to pass as quickly as possible. We should expedite its passage because more opportunities will arise later on to make political capital out of some other issue. I am sure of this. The establishment of this refinery is important and necessary to every man, woman, and child in this State and this is what we must keep in mind.

I will close by repeating what I said at the outset: I congratulate the Government and the Minister on their foresight in negotiating with this company. I congratulate the directors of and investors in the company for choosing our State in which to establish their industry—

Mr. Court: I do not know how they would get on if they didn't. Take their bauxite to Victoria!

Mr. McIVER: — and I wish them every success for the future.

Mr. Court: Amen and glory alleluia!

**MR. THOMPSON** (Darling Range) (9.59 p.m.): We live in an age when protection of the environment has never been so foremost in the minds of so many people right throughout the world.

Mr. I. W. Manning: It has never been such an issue at an election as it was on the last occasion, either.

Mr. THOMPSON: The honourable member is quite right. Frequently on television we see documentaries and other items relating to the protection of the environment, and I recall seeing one programme fairly recently in which some eminent scientists said that at the present rate of pollution of the water supplies, air, and soil, within 200 years we could create a situation under which human life on earth would not be possible. In terms of the life of this world 200 years is chicken feed.

Mr. Moiler: How is another 10 miles going to make any difference to that?

Mr. THOMPSON: Have I said anything about shifting it 10 miles?

Mr. Brown: No, I did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not want to interrupt my thoughts at the moment; I will give some reasons a little later.

Mr. Jamieson: Are you in favour of or against this? That used to be the question which the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition always asked us.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not in favour of the establishment of the refinery on the proposed site because not enough reasons have been advanced for putting it there. I will deal with that situation a little later. We are extremely fortunate in this State because we still have a great deal of development before us. We have an opportunity to learn from the mistakes which have been made by many countries throughout the world.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Only during the last 12 years.

Mr. THOMPSON: A few nights ago I had the privilege of being at a Rotary function at which there were a number of American exchange students. Each student addressed the meeting, and one who particularly interested me was concerned with reafforestation. He was employed by an environmental body in the United States. Every one of those young men said how pleasing it was to come to a city like Perth which was so free of pollution. Those young people came from a country which has been developed in such a way that it is becoming intolerable for people to live in some cities. Some



people claim it is almost impossible to live in some of the cities in America. I have even heard it said that the climate in Perth is like that of California without the smog.

One thing concerning the Bill which perturbs me is the lack of information which has been provided for members to consider in connection with this particular debate.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Our members are expected to have some initiative. When we were in Opposition we were expected to exercise initiative, and we did.

Mr. THOMPSON: I have done as much research as I was able to do. I asked the Minister to table the report from Dr. O'Brien, but that was not done. I asked for some reasons to show why the company could not select another site. I was told that could not be done, but I was given no explanation. The Government has not given any explanation, anyway.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Have you tried to seek information elsewhere?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes: I wonder what the attitude of the Department of Air is towards the establishment of the refinery in this particular location.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You should have asked the Department of Air.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would be interested to know its opinion.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Why didn't you ask?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: We have not been told what Dr. O'Brien has done in this regard. I do not think it is fair for the Government to deny us access to the material. If the Government has nothing to fear in connection with this proposal it should lay the information on the Table of the House.

Mr. Graham: What is this fear?

Mr. THOMPSON: Well, why is the information not there? We have also been told that the details of the surveys carried out by the company are not available. We are expected to accept what the Government has said. The Government is not prepared to say how marginal the proposition is.

Mr. Graham: In your endeavours to knock this Government you are prepared to knock Western Australia.

Mr. THOMPSON: Not at all.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, you are, you are the biggest knocker of them all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: I have heard this refinery project referred to as the northern industrial complex.

Mr. Graham: Who invented that?

Mr. Jamieson: That is your great imagination.

Mr. Graham: Housewives' tales.

Mr. THOMPSON: I can imagine that an industrial complex could be the case. In the future people will be attracted to this State to develop atomic power stations for the generation of electricity which is now too expensive. At the present time we cannot attract an industry for the smelting of aluminium. Such industries will become interested when we are able to provide nuclear power, or when we develop our great tidal power potential in the Kimberley.

Mr. Williams: The price of power is going up.

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, the price of power is going up.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I suppose you would be against that.

Mr. THOMPSON: When we are able to provide cheap power aluminium will be produced in this State. We will see our bauxite become alumina, and then aluminium.

Mr. Graham: You will have to change your attitude towards industries if you expect them to come.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Your Government set Western Australia back 10 years.

Mr. THOMPSON: In the area of the alumina refinery there will be other large undertakings such as water supplies and electricity supplies. If some day aluminium is produced at the refinery we would already have an embryo of a great industrial complex. Wherever aluminium is produced we see great industrial complexes. The world is using more and more aluminium and we have prodigious deposits of the right material from which to produce it. We are asked to consider this matter prior to the introduction of the Bill to set up a department of environmental control.

The SPEAKER: Do not get too far off the subject. This is one of the points I made the other night in regard to tedious repetition. Almost every speaker has got onto the environmental legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON: I will not traverse the ground which I believe has been adequately covered previously. However, this is a vital matter which is now before us. I wonder what the members who now sit opposite would have said had the previous Government attempted to do the same thing.

Mr. May: You did, time and time again. You don't know what you are talking about. No wonder they threw stones on your roof.

Mr. THOMPSON: If we had brought a draft agreement to this Parliament within days of setting up a department to control environmental protection we would have met with opposition.

Mr. Jones interjected:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: I believe the people of this State would also have objected.

Several members interjected:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Interjections are highly irregular in Parliament. As will be found, if members care to look at Standing Orders, interjections are permitted only to seek information on a point. If we refrain from unnecessary interjections our speeches will be better, and the decorum of Parliament will be maintained. The member for Darling Range may proceed.

Mr. THOMPSON: Thank you for asking members not to interject, Mr. Speaker. Although I agree entirely with what you have said I welcome the interjections. I believe the interjections improve the debate.

The SPEAKER: Do not invite them; they will come without invitation.

Mr. THOMPSON: The fact that members are prepared to interject indicates to me that we are starting to touch some tender spots. I do not need interjections to make my speech.

Mr. May: People who live in glass houses!

Mr. THOMPSON: Last night I had the opportunity to present to this Parliament a petition containing more than 15,000 signatures. A total of 15,000 people considered the petition important enough to sign, because it requested this Parliament to consider the matter seriously.

Mr. McIver: Half of them would not know what they were signing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already made his speech.

Mr. THOMPSON: I wonder whether the member for Northam adopted that attitude when he presented his petition relating to the closure of the Wooroloo Hospital. The petition on this refinery was signed by 6,000 people on one Saturday morning. At Midland 850 people signed the petition and the rate prepared to sign was something like 80 per cent. Nobody puts his name to anything which he does not wholeheartedly support.

Mr. May: You are joking.

Mr. THOMPSON: We were told that the Swan Shire Council was completely in accord with the refinery, even though it originally expressed its opposition to it. I have also been told that although the

official opinion is in favour of the establishment of the refinery, some members of the council were against it. I believe the ratio was 7 to 5.

Mr. Graham: When a vote was taken at the council meeting there was not one dissentient voice.

Mr. THOMPSON: My information is that the feeling was not unanimous.

Mr. Graham: More housewives' tales.

Mr. THOMPSON: We were also told that most of the people in the electorate of Toodyay were in favour of the proposal, but that has not been my experience. Many people in the electorate have contacted me and have said that they oppose the establishment of the refinery.

Mr. Graham: What would be the number from the Toodyay electorate?

Mr. THOMPSON: About 20 or 30 people.

Mr. Graham: There are more than that number of people in the Toodyay electorate.

Mr. THOMPSON: Those were the people who took the trouble to contact me. There would be a great many more.

Mr. Graham: They know you as a rabble-rouser. That is what probably attracted them.

Mr. THOMPSON: That may be the opinion of the Deputy Premier, but I would like to believe he did not think that of me. I suggest that although the opinion of the people in the shire is extremely important, the ramifications associated with the construction of an industrial complex of this size are far wider than immediately envisaged.

Mr. Brown: That is why I took the trouble to get all the information before making up my mind to support the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON: I suggest the complex will affect a far wider section of the community. The shire is wholeheartedly supporting the proposal, apparently, but it will affect a far greater number of people than those living in the shire.

We have been told this is a marginal project on a low-grade deposit, and that it is not as economically interesting as it might otherwise be. I suggest that because it is so marginal, and because of the stringent restrictions imposed on the project by the Government with respect to the protection of the environment, this, in itself, could create a very difficult situation.

Consider what would happen if the world trend reduced the margin of profit to the extent that the company had to approach the Government and request that some of the stringent measures imposed to protect the environment be lifted so that the plant would not have to close

down. The Government would be looking down the barrel because 700 people could be put out of work.

The Minister told us that the refinery could not go to another location but we were given no factual information to indicate why. Contrary to what members opposite think, I have researched this matter because I am interested in it. I cannot see why the cost of production would not be reduced if the refinery were established closer to the deposits.

Mr. Graham: You talk to your deputy leader about that because he would know the extra cost involved in moving the refinery from the original site.

Mr. THOMPSON: On this point we differ but that does not alter the fact that I now hold the point of view I do.

Mr. Brown: Even if you are wrong?

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not know that I am wrong. It is necessary to cart three or four times as much of the raw material to the refinery to refine it and then transport the refined material to the port and despatch it from there. Caustic and oil have to be taken back to the refinery from the port. There is not anywhere near the same quantity of backloading, I would suggest, and, for the life of me, I cannot see why the overall cost of production would not be reduced if the refinery were located closer to the deposit.

I know there would be increased costs in providing water supplies. One and a half million gallons will be taken from the metropolitan water supply scheme and the refinery will have access to another 1,500,000 gallons from underground water supplies. If the refinery were located elsewhere, it is possible there would be adequate water from underground supplies and there would be no need to construct a pipeline.

Another aspect is the transportation of workers to and from the refinery.

Mr. Moiler: Are you not forgetting one point? In an area where there is an advantage as regards water supplies, there are additional costs. You are conveniently forgetting that.

Mr. THOMPSON: What additional costs?

Mr. Moiler: Transport, light—

Mr. THOMPSON: I am coming to that. The R.A.A.F. considers it is a reasonable proposition to transport workers from Koongamia to Pearce. Not all the workers are housed at Pearce and I believe there is no intention to do so because it is considered to be economic to transport workers from the established area of Midland out to Pearce.

Mr. Moiler: I think it is proposed to have them all established at Pearce.

Mr. THOMPSON: All of them?

Mr. Moiler: All the R.A.A.F. personnel.

Mr. THOMPSON: That has not been the practice in recent times, as the honourable member well knows.

Mr. Moiler: Three hundred houses have just been built out there.

Mr. THOMPSON: But the R.A.A.F. is still pursuing the policy of transporting people from Midland. What it does in the future is another matter. I am pointing out what it has done up to now. If the R.A.A.F. considers it is a reasonable policy, why could the refinery not adopt it?

Mr. Moiler: Do you think the R.A.A.F. does it at a profit?

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not know. I would like to thank the Minister for Industrial Development for giving me the opportunity to have a look at the established mining operations at Jarrahdale, the refinery that is under construction at Pinjarra, and ultimately coming back and having a quick run around the plant at Kwinana. One of the things that struck me about the mining operations was the reasonably successful planting of trees in the areas that had been mined.

Mr. Williams: The Minister for Lands did not think so last year.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is the point. He is not here. I took the trouble to look at *Hansard* to see what had been said by various members opposite in relation to other similar agreements that have come before this House. I believe what was said—particularly by the present Minister for Lands—supports the stand I take in relation to reafforestation. Not all foresters agree that the reafforestation of those areas will be successful.

Mr. Graham: Are you speaking about the Jarrahdale locality?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes.

Mr. Graham: Only about 400 acres of State forest are affected by this agreement.

Mr. THOMPSON: I appreciate that, but this is another aspect of the matter and I think it is reasonable that I should deal with it.

Mr. Graham: I think you are tilting at windmills.

Mr. THOMPSON: Why did the Minister take us there and why was emphasis placed upon the trees that had been established?

Mr. Graham: That was an exercise, from start to finish, in an endeavour to quell some of the false stories that have been circulated. You have seen it for yourself and you do not have to accept anybody's word for it.

Mr. THOMPSON: I thank the Minister for giving me the opportunity to look at it. I hope we will have the opportunity

to look at some of the other projects in this State because, being a new member, I would like to know about some of the other developments taking place from top to bottom of this State.

Mr. Court: Do not be sidetracked. Let us hear what the Minister for Agriculture said about this work last year and the year before.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister for Agriculture had very grave doubts about the success of reafforestation in the mined areas. I would like to know what his attitude towards this project is now.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The situation is somewhat different.

Several members interjected.

Mr. Graham: This virtually does not affect forests.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We were dealing with some of the fine jarrah forests in this State. In this instance, are you dealing with some of the fine jarrah forests?

Mr. Williams: Do not listen to him.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Are you dealing with the forests in this instance?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not troubling with that aspect. I say that nowhere in the world has a forest been successfully established on an area that has been mined.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But are you dealing with forests in this instance?

Mr. THOMPSON: No. This is not as valuable a forest area as some of the others; I will grant that.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We were dealing with the last of the top jarrah in this area.

Mr. THOMPSON: Quieten down! I admit the value of the trees up there is probably not great. I am saying it is a fact that commercial crops of trees have not been successfully established on areas that have previously been mined, and I do not think that because we saw some fairly successful developments in the Jarrahdale area we should accept that as the be-all and end-all of reafforestation.

We were told at Pinjarra that the fuel to be used there is gas and the gases emitted from that area will not be as noxious as those from oil. We were also told quite elaborate steps would be taken to provide a reserve of some very high-grade fuel oil in the event of the gas supply being interrupted. That would be on a temporary basis. I think that is a desirable step but it also indicates to me the danger of using fuel oils. If there were no danger, why would the trouble be taken to use the very best of oils in that situation?

Mr. Graham: Because of our policy of environmental protection. It is implicit in every line of this agreement.

Mr. THOMPSON: I suggest it was because of our attitude to environmental protection, because this was set up under the previous Government.

Mr. Graham: Your Government would not even proclaim its legislation.

Mr. Court: Don't start that.

Mr. THOMPSON: Pinjarra is so near that instead of using trucks, and the like, as at Jarrahdale, a conveyor belt has been installed. I believe it will be a very efficient operation. At Pinjarra it was also noticeable that there is a very extensive buffer zone, and I suggest it was not intended only to provide room for expansion; I believe it is a buffer zone in the true sense of the word, and it is considerably larger than the area that will be available at Upper Swan if the refinery is established there.

Questions were asked about the discharging of red mud and how it would be handled. We were shown the area in which it would be put, and the member for Mirrabooka asked whether the operation would be monitored. The company representative said it was not the intention of the company to monitor it but it would do so if the Government insisted upon it. I think that indicates that it will be monitored wherever the refinery is ultimately established, but it could not be monitored 24 hours of the day, and if there was an escape from any of those areas, no matter how soon it was detected, it would not be possible to retrieve the material that had escaped. That is one aspect that should be closely watched. It may well be that it has been adequately covered but we have not seen the report and no environmental body has been set up to examine this matter before the Bill passes through this House.

Mr. Graham: I think you would be surprised if you knew when the last tests were carried out at the mud ponds at Kwinana. It is not weeks or months; it is years.

Mr. Rushton: We are still waiting for a review of this.

Mr. Graham: I will give you the exact date presently.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: In any industrial development or private enterprise the underlying interest of the company is to make money. That is why the company is participating. We attract money to this State because money generates employment and benefits the whole community, but I think it is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that the interests of the people are safeguarded for many years—not just for now but for ever.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. THOMPSON: Decentralisation is one of the responsibilities of the Minister who has introduced this measure into this

House. I believe the establishment of a refinery at Upper Swan will not contribute to decentralisation at all. I believe it will only create a situation where the metropolitan area will continue to grow. I think the encouragement by the previous Government of the establishment of a refinery at Pinjarra was decentralisation in action, and I hope that will be the attitude of future Governments, whatever their political affiliations are.

We want to see more ports established so that we will not be carrying all our eggs in one basket.

Mr. Graham: Strangely enough, professional advice is against you there.

Mr. THOMPSON: This is my opinion. I believe industry should be established away from the metropolitan area.

Mr. Graham: You are speaking about establishing more ports.

Mr. THOMPSON: Do they not go with it?

Mr. Graham: No. The advice is that there should be no more ports.

Mr. THOMPSON: That appears to me to be contrary to what the situation should be.

I oppose this measure because I believe sufficient information has not been made available to us. I do not think we should be expected to consider the measure before the environmental protection legislation is introduced, and before the three bodies that are provided for in that legislation are established. We should not be expected to consider the measure before we know the degree of protection that will be afforded by that legislation. We have been repeatedly told by the Government that it will be the "big teeth" legislation, yet we are expected to examine this proposal before that measure has been introduced.

**DR. DADOUR** (Subiaco) [10.28 p.m.]: At the risk of repetition, I have one or two points to make, if I may be permitted. To my way of thinking, environmental protection does not stand in the way of progress or industry. We have an industry and we protect our environment. However, there is one point that worries me a great deal; that is, the siting of the alumina refinery in the Swan Valley.

When we stop and ask ourselves what natural beauties — apart from the two-legged ones — we have around Perth, we find we have very little. We have our beautiful Swan River, and the foresight of our forefathers gave us King's Park. We have lost Cockburn Sound; the foreshore has been lost; Garden Island will be lost. The Swan Valley is one of our natural beauties. If we site an industry in that very place, there is always the hazard that something might break down.

That can happen, no matter how good the protection might be. As the member for Darling Range said, once we give it away we cannot get it back. This is the point that concerns me a great deal.

The Deputy Premier has told us that the margins are very slim, but this is a \$190,000,000 project. Surely the project could be moved from the Swan Valley area. This is my only argument, apart from what other members have said. I believe, and I will not be convinced otherwise, that the refinery should be established in some place other than that contemplated at present. If we establish the industry in the Swan Valley, other industries will probably follow. Why is it necessary for the industry to be established there?

The profit margins of other operations are slim, so is there some other reason behind the siting of this establishment? Is a housing project to be located there? I am worried that maybe we have not been told as much as we should be told on this matter. Most of the people to whom I have spoken do not want the refinery to be established in the Swan Valley, and most of my friends in that area do not want it there.

Mr. Moiler: Both of them?

Dr. DADOUR: I would prefer to wait so that we may consider all the data which has been collated to see just how slim the profit margin is. Let us put the refinery at Northam.

Mr. Jones: What about Collie?

Dr. DADOUR: O.K., take it to Collie. Better still, let us take it to Northam where there is a beautiful regional hospital which is empty.

Mr. McIver: It is overflowing.

Dr. DADOUR: I apologise. I thought the honourable member said it was empty. That is my only argument against the measure—that we stand to lose another of our natural beauties and we have few indeed as it is. For this reason I intend to vote against the Bill.

**MR. RUSHTON** (Dale) [10.32 p.m.]: This legislation is of vital interest to the people of this State. The ramifications of the measure and the many subjects dealt with in it allow us to range far and wide on the various aspects. However, I will limit myself to one or two points and when the Bill is considered in Committee I will have an opportunity to give further detailed consideration to the various aspects.

The Government and its supporters have failed to make a case for bulldozing through this alumina refinery legislation ahead of an investigation by the environmental protection authority. We have been made fully aware of this by

members who have already spoken and it is clearly understood by the people in the community. Therefore, one does not need to stress it in great detail.

We can ask ourselves a number of questions. What is the economic viability of the project? What margin is available to build in the many protective measures which are necessary? Where is the fully documented evidence to support the siting of the refinery in the Swan Valley in preference to other sites? Not one of these points has been demonstrated. The Brand Government gave an assurance that this project would be fully investigated by the environmental protection authority so that the information could be presented along with the legislation.

Mr. Graham: Do you know where and when that assurance was given?

Mr. RUSHTON: It was given on a number of occasions.

Mr. Graham: Where and when?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have not the exact date but it has been given.

Mr. Graham: I am wondering whether I could put my finger on it.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will make it available to the Minister a little later. Perhaps some other member may obtain it for him but, if not, I will get him the information if he likes.

Mr. Graham: I would like it.

Mr. RUSHTON: There is no doubt about the fact that the assurance was given. It has been said already that the public understood that the Tonkin Government also gave a similar undertaking. This was clearly understood and the public are amazed at yet another 180 degree change in direction by the Government in regard to this legislation. I am amazed also; I could not imagine that the Government would present this Bill ahead of its much enlightened legislation to deal with the environment.

The SPEAKER: Do not go too far with this; as I have said before, this has been mentioned about 57 times.

Mr. RUSHTON: Clause 39 of the agreement deals with environmental protection and it contains full information on the subject.

The SPEAKER: I hope this is not repetition.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is of the utmost importance in relation to the legislation. With respect, Sir, I ask your indulgence so that I may touch on the matter because it is dealt with in clause 39. It is of the utmost importance to my electorate because the Kwinana area is involved.

The SPEAKER: I said the other night that I did not want tedious repetition, and almost every member has mentioned this point so far.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not wish to indulge in tedious repetition. I merely want to deal with the facts concerning this legislation. Certainly clause 39 of the agreement has full regard for environmental protection. A little later I wish to cover the aspects relating to the Kwinana area.

Generally speaking the presentation of the Bill at this time brings forward some intriguing thoughts and considerations. Why should not the Government uphold its promise in relation to this legislation? That has not been demonstrated. Why does not the Government prove its worth and ability by presenting practical environmental protection legislation which will enable all these sorts of things—these industrial matters—to proceed? Surely the Government does not think that when it brings in its big teeth everybody will be so frightened that industries will not continue to be established in this State?

Mr. Graham: The way you people are talking is likely to have that effect.

Mr. RUSHTON: We have been told already that the Government will use its numbers to force this legislation through the House. We have the right to present our case as we see it, and we are endeavouring to protect the people of this State.

Mr. Graham: Don't talk nonsense. There is more protection of the people of the State in this legislation than in any agreement your Government brought down and you supported.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why run away from the facts?

Mr. Graham: Nobody is running away; we are appalled at what is going on.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to enlarge on a question which is being used as a bogey and as a threat to those on this side of the House: that we are not performing in the way the Government would have us perform. It comes back to the question raised by the member for Boulder-Dundas the other night regarding employment. This is an interesting question and falls squarely on the shoulders of the Government. The Government had opportunities six months ago to proceed with this business. It had legislation available it could have used and we could now be in possession of reports relating to this proposed industry. If that had happened this legislation would be going through without any fuss and bother provided it was proved to be in order.

Mr. Graham: You are interested more in political tricks than in anything else. You do not care what you do to Western Australia in the process.

Mr. RUSHTON: These are not political tricks. That is an incredible interjection. I have just proved and demonstrated that the Brand Government undertook to do certain things.

Mr. Graham: I am talking about your performance in this House on this Bill.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not know why this touches the Minister so deeply. The other night it was demonstrated that we prefer to do things in a businesslike way as against the back-to-front method in which we are asked to approve this legislation. Why not do it in the logical way and we will come to the same conclusion?

Mr. Graham: What is to be lost? If you finish up the same way, does it matter which course you take? The only difference is that the firm and overseas people with whom it is negotiating are anxiously awaiting a decision of Parliament. This is urgent.

Mr. RUSHTON: Acknowledging the urgency of every decision that is made—

Mr. Graham: For this one, as part of \$200,000,000.

Mr. O'Neil: It is because you chickened out of signing the agreement.

Mr. Graham: You were a little bit upset because you were put in a spot to declare yourself. We have declared ourselves.

Mr. O'Neil: We now know who is playing political tricks.

Mr. Graham: You make up your mind whether you are for or against.

Mr. Court: If you had done what you promised to do you would not be in the predicament you are in now. If you held this up for a while you would be doing something to help this project get through.

Mr. RUSHTON: I had better continue with my remarks. It is quite clear that the Government had the opportunity to get on with the business of presenting this legislation to Parliament in a way that people expected it would be done; that is, research made beforehand and all the ends tied up before a decision was made to present the legislation to Parliament. It would then be in a position to consider the matter in full and so make its decision. In this presentation we are asked to make a decision without the facts and this is totally unacceptable to the House. We are certainly not jeopardising the future of the State; we are protecting the future of the State.

Mr. May: Oh, yes!

Mr. RUSHTON: We would certainly not be considered as being a worthy Opposition if we did not carry out our undertaking. At least we do carry out our undertakings and our undertaking on this issue was that the matter should be fully investigated by the environmental protection authority.

When this point is related to the Bill it presents an opportunity to the Government to prove its worth and show that the legislation it has presented will stand up to the test of time. This will be the first

Bill of this kind that will be considered by the environmental protection authority. It is totally unfair to expect the director to be the sole arbitrator. He needs counsel and the advice of other officers to prepare his reports and present them in due course to the Government. The Government will then be in a position to present them to this Parliament in support of the legislation that is now before us.

Mr. O'Neil: And they agreed the environmental protection authority's staff should be increased by one clerk.

Mr. RUSHTON: We have been told a great deal and we have great expectations about that in the near future. However, that is another issue. I did begin to speak on the question of employment, but the Deputy Premier seemed to be touched on some sensitive point which caused him to interject at great length.

The question of employment is vital to our State. It is tied up with this legislation and cannot be disregarded. As I have already mentioned to the House, the question of employment reflects upon the Government very strongly, not only on this issue, but also on many others. The Government has dilly-dallied and procrastinated and has not squarely faced up to its responsibilities. In fact, it has created additional unemployment and this is certainly something that cannot be put in the court of the Opposition in relation to this legislation.

Other points that are closely related and have been mentioned in the Deputy Premier's speech include the question of development that will occur around the alumina refinery in the future. I am certainly apprehensive of the progress that will be made without knowing anything about the town planning requirements of this area. Surely the Parliament should be fully acquainted in regard to these matters.

I am one who can visualise that other industries will be attracted to the area by the development of an industrial complex 14 miles from the centre of the city on the site proposed. The case for the project will certainly need to be presented in a much more authentic, documented form before we can give it serious thought. Therefore there is not much point at this time in delving into the many clauses contained in the schedule when the whole case is badly presented to Parliament. The project should have been fully investigated and all the facts placed before us.

I will now deal briefly with what could be expected to happen at Kwinana. There will be a stockpile of ore at Kwinana from where the conveyor belts will be constructed and I think the Minister has acknowledged that the real problem environmentally could be the loading of the ships at Kwinana. The stockpile, of course, would be covered. This would be

necessary because the value of the alumina could be lost. The covered conveyor belts would also need some protection. As I acknowledge at this point of time, I appreciated being given the opportunity to visit parts of my electorate to see the operations at Jarrahdale, Pinjarra, and Kwinana. I am fully aware of the operations at these centres, the development that is taking place, and the worth of the previous Government in the way it presented to Parliament the facts in relation to these operations at the time.

I think it was said that at Kwinana the CSBP jetty could be used, and that perhaps another jetty may be required. It is acknowledged that there are plans for the building of a bulk jetty from which all commodities could be shipped. It could be constructed a little to the south of the Western Mining Corporation refinery—that is, travelling in a direction due west and a little south from the bulk handling storage silos. The jetty could be erected in front of them. In due course the wheat would be conveyed to the loading wharves. From the Minister's remarks I am not certain where the jetty would be built. I believe that the volume of wheat to be shipped would require a separate wharf to be constructed, and other bulk cargoes would be handled separately from this.

If one has regard for what is experienced at Kwinana now it is realised that this is a dusty operation. Because it is a dusty operation and would close in the third leg of the Kwinana Beach residential area, I am greatly concerned about the project. Previously, when the Brand Government introduced legislation for the establishment of the nickel refinery by the Western Mining Corporation, the member for Cockburn and other members who are now on the Government side of the House were very perturbed about the resumption that would take place in the area, the detrimental effect the refinery would have on the people living in the vicinity, and other relevant aspects.

Since that time we have seen property acquired by the Department of Industrial Development on a priority basis. Recently we saw the announcement that Western Mining is to purchase another section of this residential area. Now we come to a further development that will encroach more on this old holiday resort.

I would certainly like this aspect to be vetted by the environmental protection authority, to see what should be implemented at this point of time. I was given to understand that the stockpiles, although covered, will be on the western side of the existing railway line and that the conveyor belt will be located alongside a residential area where a few houses will have to be demolished to make this possible.

Provision is made in the Bill to enable the purchase of houses in certain circumstances, but in the case I have just mentioned it is an example of encroachment on a residential area. In the first speech I made on this matter I did project the thought that every opportunity should be taken to acquire the houses so that the occupants could be removed to a more suitable area. We know that serious consideration has been given to the implementation of this policy as quickly as possible; therefore it was encouraging to read the recent announcement that certain houses are to be purchased. Perhaps in his reply the Minister will tell us how the houses will be acquired, and by what means the occupants will be removed from an area which suffers from disabilities arising from the dust and noise emanating from industry; and this will increase in volume as time goes on.

I suppose the greatest detriment to the environment would be the dust factor. I have made these facts known to the Minister in the hope that he will give me an assurance in due course. It is my intention when we deal with this legislation at a later date, after we have considered the measure which should have been introduced before this one, to vote in such a way as to leave no doubt of what the future of the people in this area will be.

It is rather ironical that the Opposition is being asked by the Government to put its promise into effect. This is not a very acceptable practice, because a clear-cut undertaking was given by this Government in respect of environmental protection. We on this side are therefore unhappy that we are being asked to approve this legislation under the threat that failure to do so will prevent the State from making the progress that it should.

It is not unreasonable for members on this side to ask the Government to defer the passage of this legislation until after we have received a report from the competent body I have mentioned as to how this project will stand up under full investigation.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta—Minister for Industrial Development and Decentralisation) [10.54 p.m.]: I had hoped that playing politics with this Bill would have concluded last Thursday, but apparently there are some members in the House who are prepared to go on and on in this manner. All I want to say in connection with that aspect is this: As all members are aware, two stages have to be passed through before the agreement becomes effective. One is the acceptance of the Bill by Parliament, and the other is the signing of the agreement by the State—and the signing is usually done by the Premier.

It matters very little which one goes before the other, except on this occasion as there has been some controversy, etc.,



we felt that Parliament should, first of all, decree its viewpoint; and if it were the will of Parliament that the agreement should be accepted then the Premier would sign it.

Although different words were used, because the circumstances and procedures were different, what the Premier did was to give an undertaking to those who waited on him that the final act of making the agreement effective would not be consummated until the environmental protection legislation had been passed by Parliament, if that be the will of Parliament.

Mr. Court: That is not quite the point.

Mr. GRAHAM: As far as I am concerned it is quite the point. I repeat that it matters not whether the environmental protection legislation was passed last month, is passed this month, or will be passed in six months' time, because the operations of the proposed new industry will be subject to that Statute, in addition to the restrictions that have been imposed under the agreement.

All of this political byplay is good fun; and I must admit that in the past I have participated in it, and no doubt I will enjoy doing it again in the future. This is party politics, and we are entitled to have our fun, but then we have to come to the serious consideration of the Bill. It is serious, because it has a tremendous impact on the State and, as has been pointed out, this happens at a time when the State is in dire need of some impetus and opportunities for its people.

Mr. Court: That is not the question. The vital point you have conveniently overlooked. You should concede this and save yourself a lot of bother. The Premier has said we will not have to consider the agreement until the environmental protection legislation has been passed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not aware of that. Suppose for the purpose of this argument the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a point, but I am not conceding he has, this is merely a debating society exercise.

Mr. Court: The important thing is that the member for Moore said the Premier gave him an assurance.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The member for Moore reported on the deputation; he did not read out what you have just suggested.

Mr. Court: What I heard him say was that you gave him an assurance.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It was not what you have just said.

Mr. Court: I also have your Press comment. Are you disputing that?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am disputing what you said a moment ago.

Mr. Court: You are disputing your own statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will continue.

Mr. GRAHAM: The important feature is that an undertaking has been given, regardless of the words used, that the final act of consent of the State will not be performed until the environmental protection legislation is passed. That is the important aspect. Let us argue about the little details and other things later. I repeat: The passing of this Bill is more important than that.

Mr. W. A. Manning: That superimposes another decision of the Premier on what we decided.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does nothing of the sort.

Mr. W. A. Manning: It does.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I cannot make myself plain to the member for Narrogin, I do not intend to occupy any more of my time endeavouring to do so.

In regard to this matter being of no consequence and to the fact that we can go on playing fun and games, I am in possession of information from the company which is vitally concerned, and I quote part of it as follows:—

I would like to stress to you . . . that there well could be an unrealised degree of urgency for completion of the Agreement if further delay was likely to affect the completion of long term contracts for the sale of alumina. I feel very strongly that this is precisely the case.

Our potential participants have understood that there would be no difficulty in the Agreement being passed by the W.A. Parliament by the end of September at the latest. They are aware that we have been attempting to negotiate its completion since October 1970 and that we are most anxious to finalise it. I feel I must say, with respect, that a further substantial delay must raise doubts in the minds of these overseas companies as to the advisability of investing in W.A. with so many other opportunities available to them.

In that connection inquiries have been made and it has been ascertained that opportunities are available in other countries. I maintain this, but I do not want it to be construed that the company might be threatening Parliament or anything else. I merely mention it to indicate that the company is expressing some concern because of discussions it is shortly to have with those who, it is hoped, will be partners in the very important element of providing a marketing outlet, a point which has been raised by quite a number of members who have addressed themselves to this Bill.

Mr. Lewis: Would the opportunities in other parts of the world be of minimal economic viability?

Mr. GRAHAM: I could not say. Let me add that I have made it a policy to meddle as little as possible and make statements as infrequently as possible relating to matters I regard as being the business of the firms concerned, because I am aware of one, if not two instances in Western Australia, but one in particular, where the prospect of an industry in a certain locality has, to say the least, been severely jeopardised because of too many words having been spoken too soon; and I do not want to be a party to that sort of business.

Ample opportunity will be available for members to say what they want when we discuss the schedule, which is the agreement and the meat in the sandwich. However, I wish to refer to one or two points.

Mr. Court: Before you continue, may I make one observation?

Mr. GRAHAM: Make one observation? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made 1½ hours of them the other day.

Mr. Court: Just a moment. Be sensible. If you want help from us, for goodness sake grow up!

Mr. GRAHAM: The responsibility is on the Opposition in connection with this Bill.

Mr. Court: The company wrote to the Opposition in exactly those terms. I conveyed to it that I was sure this Parliament would resent having to consider this Bill in that atmosphere—of almost a threat—and the company has acknowledged—

Mr. GRAHAM: The company is making no threat.

Mr. Court: I am making the point that we have been informed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am endeavouring to indicate to members the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. Court: We know that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could have brought along two substantial files to quote very many lengthy minutes to the then Minister for Industrial Development in respect of many of the points raised by his colleagues and supporters this evening, but no time is available in which to do this. However, before I conclude I wish to refer to one or two remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

First of all, in order to make the position clear I must repeat some of what I have said before both in my speech and by way of interjection. Tremendous concern has been expressed regarding the establishment of an industry some 14 miles from Perth. It has been said that this is too close and that it is likely to have all sorts of dire effects. Yet we find that the Alcoa Kwinana refinery—the same type of industry—is situated one mile from the Naval Base beach shack area, 2.4 miles

from the Medina-Calista housing area, and 5.1 miles only from the Kwinana beach housing area.

The Alcoa Pinjarra refinery is situated a distance of 3.7 miles from the Carcoola housing area—the brand-new township being constructed—and 4.5 miles from the centre of Pinjarra where, I am informed, it is anticipated the population will before long reach 25,000. The Alwest refinery near Bunbury is 4.1 miles from the Bunbury town centre.

All these refineries are within earshot, and the shadows of the buildings almost fall over the townships. Yet no protestations were made by those who have spoken so loudly tonight, the public generally, those who feel they are suffering, or those who desire to save Western Australia from a tragedy. This subject has been puffed up out of all proportion, and I am afraid it is not doing Western Australia a great deal of good.

This Government is pledged to a policy of environmental protection, and more and more it will be realised that the Government has a practical policy. Members will find that what have been industrial areas will become open space for the public. Already some of this has been done.

This legislation is in conformity with our outlook and concept and no industry already established in Western Australia has been subjected to the restrictions imposed upon this one.

I will now turn directly to some of the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He has expressed concern about the mud ponds and the amount of testing which is to be undertaken. We members were assured—and 33 of us were present—by the Alcoa refinery people that the clay had been subjected to most rigid tests and no doubt or query whatever existed. Someone asked whether they intended to put plastic sheeting under the clay lining of these ponds. They said, "No, why should we? There is no necessity for it." We were given information in regard to these test holes and I think it might be interesting if I gave the particulars in order to demonstrate how very careful this Government is—to the nth degree—in marked contrast to its predecessor.

Mr. Rushton: Rubbish!

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the original Alcoa agreement, it was provided that the company would ensure the residue would not contain any material which might be, become, or cause a nuisance, or be or become dangerous or injurious to public health. That was the sum and substance of the provision, in a pretty general sort of way.

Under the more recent Alcoa Pinjarra agreement, a clause was included to the effect that the company would take action to prevent the pollution of rivers and

underground water as might be agreed between the parties from time to time. In other words, if Alcoa did not agree, then no action would be taken.

Mr. Court: That is not so.

Mr. GRAHAM: However, notwithstanding the rather loose wording of the original agreement, in October 1969—that is two years ago—seven bores were sunk around the periphery of the residue disposal area at Kwinana. None of these bores showed any evidence of pollution of underground water; and no testing has been done since that time. I underline those last words.

Mr. Rushton: Why not? I have asked for a check.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know. For 18 months of that period the Government supported by the member for Dale was in office.

Mr. Rushton: For the last six months I have asked for this information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know anything about asking for information. What has that to do with it? The fact of the matter is that no provision was made in the agreement for tests to be undertaken, and no tests have been carried out in the last two years.

Mr. Court: You are overlooking the fact that these projects—as you should know—are all subject to proposals approved by the Government. That is where the fine type comes in.

Mr. GRAHAM: Exactly. I think we had criticism by the interjector's own leader. If I am wrong I apologise in advance.

Mr. Court: I never said that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said, your leader.

Mr. Court: I cannot recall his interjection.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said that if I am wrong I apologise in advance. It was said we were loose in our approach because the agreement stated that the tests would be only once every three months. However, the present agreement states that the tests shall be every three months, and as frequently in between as the Minister may require. Under the agreements entered into by the parties protesting so much tonight no testing whatsoever was carried out during the last two years. This gives some idea of the credibility of what has been submitted to us by way of interjection.

I hope to put the record straight in connection with the Swan Shire Council. I would like to know who draws up all these vapourings and all these imaginary things which might happen and could happen, and so on. It has been said, and I think it was repeated, that the Swan Shire Council voted in favour of this project by the barest majority. I repeat: Two

officers, one from the office of the Coordinator of Development, and one from the Department of Industrial Development and Decentralisation, spoke to the Swan Shire councillors. Whilst those officers were there a vote was taken and there was not a dissentient voice.

Mr. Court: All members have received a letter saying there was a seven to five majority. I requested a clarification. That is all I was asking.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have checked on the point as late as today and that is what I was told. This is from a council which originally was opposed to the project because it did not understand it. When the situation was explained the council was satisfied.

Mr. Lewis: Was it opposed to the industry or the site?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was opposed to the site. The original site was much closer.

Mr. Court: It was the site they were opposed to and quite vehemently.

Mr. GRAHAM: The protests have ranged from one end of Western Australia to the other, although they tell us they are protesting on account of the site and not the industry. One particularly naive woman suggested the proper place for the establishment of the refinery was on the Nullarbor Plain. As a matter of fact, I think there was a little of that element tonight.

It does not seem to be appreciated that this tremendous capital outlay must have some relationship to the disposition of the mineral deposits. It is important that that point is realised.

Markets were also mentioned and it is obvious that the company is anxious to proceed. The company is not embarking on the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars to complete a refinery without a market for its wares. However, until it has a signed agreement it is unable to negotiate. Therefore, the company is waiting for Western Australia to provide it with the document.

By September of next year the company is obliged to come forward with a detailed scheme of operations—that is to say, establish their organisation and everything that goes with it. Of course, there could be an extension of the time.

Mr. Rushton: Would you not be in trouble if the environmental body ruled that the Swan Valley should not be the site for the industry?

Mr. GRAHAM: Would not anybody be in difficulties? In Japan, at the present moment, there are scores—indeed hundreds—of industries in great difficulty because of the fact that it is almost impossible for them to conform with what is required and still be economic propositions.

Tests have been carried out. I do not know whether it is thought that this legislation is just something put up by anybody. We have sought all the professional advice which is available to the Government, whether it be from civil engineers, hydraulic engineers, doctors, chemists, the Forests Department, or the Water Supply Department. All those people have been consulted in turn.

Mr. Rushton: Why could we not have had this information?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have supplied the information and it was quoted tonight. This matter has gone to those people, including the Clean Air Council. That is why the height of the chimney will be 370 feet. That height will give sufficient dispersal well within the limits of the Clean Air Council requirement whether the wind is blowing north, south, east, or west.

Mr. W. A. Manning: What other advice do you want? Why do you require the advice of the environmental people?

Mr. GRAHAM: Very largely to meet the wishes of those who sit beside the member who has interjected.

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister seems to be leaning towards the opinion that there is no need for environmental legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have already indicated there are some very stringent controls, and that is part and parcel of the policy of this Government. The company is subject to existing legislation and any legislation enacted in the future. If the environmental protection legislation goes out of the window next week, and another Bill is introduced in October of next year, this company will be subject to the provisions of that legislation.

The viability of the industry was raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I would say that is very rightly the business of the company. It would hardly be spending the best part of \$200,000,000 unless it felt it could be a successful proposition.

Mr. Court: No it is not; it is very much the concern of the Government. If the Government approves this proposal without satisfying itself about the viability of the project it is failing in its responsibility. If the Government is not responsible why include the proposals clause?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Did you satisfy yourself about the viability of the Amax proposition?

Mr. Court: Yes.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You did?

Mr. Court: Up to that point.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Yes, up to that point.

Mr. Court: But we did not reach the stage of finalisation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You had a number of proposals.

Mr. Jamleson: Reapproved.

Mr. Court: You have to approve them.

Mr. Jamleson: I know.

Mr. GRAHAM: I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that we must not forget the concern involved. We must not forget it is Hancock and Wright and their respective companies, the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company—which is a mining company in its own rights apart from producing food-stuffs—and some international connotations as well. Is anybody to suggest that any of those companies would be prepared to write cheques to the tune of \$200,000,000 without the prospect of the venture being a success?

Mr. Court: Of course they do not, for that very reason.

Mr. GRAHAM: Precisely. The honourable member knows perfectly well they will come to us with a concrete case by the 30th September, 1972, as provided in the agreement. Everything will be in its proper place and in its proper sequence.

Mr. Court: That is the point we are making.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not accustomed to sitting on the left side of the Speaker because now he has to do his own homework and he was off beam in quite a number of different directions.

Mr. Court: Tell us what they are.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I suffer less by way of interjection I will come to them much more quickly. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated the Minister would not know the company was mining private property unless he read it in the newspaper. If the honourable member cares to look at clause 20, subclause (1) on page 22 of the Bill, he will find the answer to that, because it is clear and unmistakable.

Mr. Court: That is not the question I raised with you. You have not read what I said.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid I did—several times.

Mr. Court: I hope you will give a better answer on private property than that, because there is another factor.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suggest the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should raise it at the appropriate time. All I can do is read what he said. He also stated that Crown land, and all other lands, are virtually under the Conservator of Forests. In this respect, I again commend him to clause 20, subclause (3), on page 22.

The honourable member also wondered whether the Metropolitan Water Board or the country water supply would have any jurisdiction. He said it appeared other

people would have jurisdiction and these bodies would not. In this connection I draw attention to clause 30 at page 47.

Mr. Court: You are skipping over the clause dealing specifically with Crown land.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the honourable member will read the clause and subclause I have mentioned, he will be better informed than he gave evidence of the other day.

Mr. Court: Don't pull that. I have been through the agreements often enough.

Mr. GRAHAM: The honourable member seemed to be a little concerned about the company running all over the place and gathering bauxite from private property because the great bulk of the area which is the concern of the company is private property land, and in many cases the minerals are the possession of the owner of the land. In other words, the minerals are not reserved to the Crown, but belong to individuals. If my land were in the area of a company that was not prepared to mine for 20, 30, or 50 years I suppose I would not be particularly amused, having regard for the fact that the consideration to the farmer can reach almost fantastic proportions.

I understand it is proposed to pay farmers \$250 an acre for the right to operate on the land, plus a royalty of 8c a ton on the bauxite that is removed. It is not unusual, I am informed, for there to be up to 20,000 tons of bauxite removed from an acre of land. Little ability in mathematics will show that farmers—many of whom if not in desperate straits are certainly not flush—would gain a return of \$1,850 an acre. In certain cases their land would be cleared for them if they want this done. The land would be restored under the control of the Conservator of Forests. If farmers desire a water-hole somewhere for stock it will be left. Surely this will be seventh heaven for the farmers.

I do not indicate this is a major or substantial reason for passing the Bill, but I do indicate that a great deal of benefit will be derived by people in the locality.

Mr. Court: That is understood.

Mr. GRAHAM: I indicated before that those engaged with vineyards are having a rather rocky existence and there would be the opportunity for them, or members of their family, to obtain employment only a short distance away.

I wonder whether those who proclaim in favour of private industry and the freedom of the individual really believe we should incorporate in the agreement that Farmer Smith, Jones, Brown, or Robinson, who have bauxite deposits on their properties, should not be allowed to sell to this company—or indeed to any company that comes along and wants bauxite perhaps

next week, next month, or next year—because their property falls within a line shown on a plan and within the area of another company which may not be interested at the time because the area is in the wrong location measured against the works programme. Should we write in that the individual farmer will be denied for 10, 20, or 50 years from obtaining a return from minerals which, in terms of the law, are his?

I wish to mention only one other point in reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I shall skip the politics and come to the stockpile. I repeat that when we are in Committee we will go into the various elements of the schedule, which virtually is the Bill.

Mr. Court: Will you go into Committee tonight on private members' day?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Opposition has had fun with us in recent weeks in dictating the terms and keeping us as long as it wanted.

Mr. O'Neill: We had that experience for 12 years.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be appropriate to reciprocate.

Mr. Court: If you are going to be childish you will not get anywhere.

Mr. GRAHAM: In connection with the proposed Kwinana stockpile area, at the present time it is not known where it will be.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should talk. What about last Thursday afternoon?

Mr. GRAHAM: Originally it was proposed that the company would use the bulk unloading jetty which is adjacent to CSBP's fertiliser works, and if this does not come to pass then the stockpile area shown on plan "B" will be used.

However, the port authority has plans for the construction of a wharf further south, which would provide a deep-water berth for ships loading grain. The location of this berth would be to the west of the bulk grain storage area at Kwinana. If a decision is made to proceed with the construction of a bulk wheat loading berth, then the Fremantle Port Authority will possibly use the funds provided by Pacminex to assist with the total cost and provide the necessary facilities for loading alumina. It is for this reason that the agreement has provided flexibility as to site.

Whatever area is used by the company for bulk storage at Kwinana, it will be on the basis that it fits in with the overall plan which is at present being considered by an interdepartmental committee and it is envisaged that the area immediately south of CSBP's fertiliser works will ultimately be developed with rail sidings and

stockpile areas for materials which would be either exported or imported over the wharf complex which will be developed in the area.

Those facilities, of course, would relate to the whole host of activities completely removed from, or in addition to, the industry which is the subject of this Bill.

The hour is reasonably late and presently it will be later still. This is a Bill to make possible the establishment of a most important industry and I repeat that every safeguard possible has been undertaken. Any one of us can become emotive and excited in the matter of protection of the environment. We know perfectly well there is an effect when we walk over grass in a paddock; when we clear for the construction of a road; when we build a house upon a site; when we light a barbecue fire; when we turn on the ignition key of our motor vehicles; when necessary power lines are erected; when parking areas are provided. I could keep on and on. The activities of man—virtually every activity of every sort—have some detrimental effect upon the environment. Either we go back to nature 100 per cent. or we allow industrial development, but at the same time take every care possible—every precaution of which we are aware—and this, of course, is the spirit, the essence, and the ingredients of this legislation.

I am extremely sorry that so many people have become, I suggest, quite genuinely concerned and perturbed over what they envisage is likely to happen to the beautiful environment of the city of Perth, or the metropolis generally, if this industry is established. However, I think that some of those who have been stirring up trouble should examine their consciences in the light of the economy.

I well remember an occasion when some representatives of the Government and representatives of those who speak so freely of their concern for the protection of the environment visited a certain local authority. One of the shire councillors concluded the evening by saying, "I am fed up to the back teeth with you. I have listened to nothing all the evening except what might happen, what could happen, and perhaps it would happen, and all these illusory, imaginary things, whereas on the other side facts, evidence, and argument were given to show that every precaution has been taken."

In the establishment of this industry, to the nth degree we have dotted every "i" and crossed every "t" in an endeavour to ensure there will be an absolute minimum of grounds for anybody to have concern. One of our prime concerns is the protection of the environment. This goes hand in hand with our desire to provide, with the downturn of our primary industries, opportunities for employment and continued progress in the State of Western Australia.

I hope and trust that the large, broad, and sensible view will be taken by this Parliament and the legislation will be given as speedy a passage as possible to enable the principals of this firm to get on with the job of carrying out their negotiations with those who will no doubt be their partners in other parts of the world.

Mr. Court: You have brought this problem on yourself.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 11.34 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 23rd September, 1971

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

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE LAND

#### *Timber Rights*

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Can the Leader of the House inform me on what date the letter which referred to timber rights—signed by the Minister for Agriculture and the member for Warren—and dated the 20th August, 1971, which I quoted to the House on the 21st September, 1971, was actually posted?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

First of all, let me thank Mr. Willmott for giving me prior notice of this question. I was able to take it to the Minister concerned in an endeavour to clarify this important matter which I think is the key to the whole argument. I am advised that a letter was written on the 20th August, 1971, and posted on that same day.

### QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

#### 1. EDUCATION

##### *Annual Expense per Child*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What is the relative annual expense of educating—
  - (a) a child in a suburban school;
  - (b) a child involved in a country school on a school bus network;
  - (c) a child on the School of Air network; and
  - (d) a child purely on correspondence?