

Wanneroo, a candidate for the forthcoming by-election to be held on 24 September, and where possible we will continue to endorse candidates of the calibre of Phil Davenport if those candidates are worthy of bearing the endorsement of the Australian Labor Party.

An example of the foresight of the previous President of the Wanneroo Shire was the commencement of the Wanneroo Tourist Council of which I am a member.

Tourism is a labour-intensive industry as yet barely tapped in Western Australia. The last 10 years have seen the almost total neglect of the tourist industry at the hands of a resource-orientated Government. No priority was given to tourism; in fact it was usually the most junior Minister who held the Tourism portfolio.

Since 19 February this attitude has changed. The Premier recognises the value of the tourist industry and has taken on that portfolio himself.

Despite the fact that a very low priority was given to the tourist industry, Australia has shown real growth in this area, while most industries have been in an economic recession. This is very encouraging when one considers the growth has occurred with little emphasis being given to tourism.

By the year 2000 tourism will be the biggest industry in Australia. Currently it employs 400 000 people throughout Australia, and 35 000 in Western Australia; so the potential is enormous, especially when one considers the major social ill in the community is unemployment.

Unlike the resource industries tourism is labour-intensive. It is not affected by the silicone chip so it can make a major contribution to the economic welfare of this State and its people. To create one job in the mining industry requires a capital investment of \$1 million. To create one job in the tourist industry requires a capital investment of just \$30 000, just a fraction of the cost in comparison with other industries.

In regional areas tourism is turned to only when other industries take a nose dive.

Tourism is not as cyclical as other industries and therefore it should be developed through the good and bad times, and not turned on and off like a tap. Investment in tourism must be an ongoing activity. Provided this is ensured, the flourishing tourist industry will help keep the economy buoyant if the bottom falls out of other industries. But it must be an ongoing commitment. Currently, tourism in Western Australia contributes \$800 million to the economy and the surface as yet has barely been scratched.

By acknowledging the fact that it is a sunrise industry with huge potential for employment growth, we will be on our way to becoming the best tourist State in Australia. It will take courage and foresight for this potential to be realised. Hard economic decisions will have to be made.

In making those decisions we will have long-term perspectives rather than short-term adventures that generate a fast buck for the few and leave misery and chaos in aftermath.

Cutting wages and conditions of the workers at present employed in the industry is not the answer and will not fulfill the objectives of making tourism the largest industry in Australia by the year 2000.

In achieving these goals we will require the co-operation of all members in this Parliament to become involved and enthusiastic about tourism and to support the initiatives instigated by this Government.

In closing Mr Speaker, may I congratulate you on attaining the office of Speaker of this House and thank the people of my electorate who voted for me in such overwhelming numbers, thus enabling me to be here today, to make my maiden speech.

[Applause]

MR D. L. SMITH (Mitchell) (10.41 p.m.): I begin by offering congratulations to you Mr Speaker on attaining your high office. I recall when I first met you in Kalgoorlie when I went there as a young solicitor to practise, I recognised then the qualities which have made you Speaker today. You have the admiration of both sides for the qualities you have retained notwithstanding your period of political office. It is often said that after a period in office politicians lose many of the qualities that first attracted electors who put them there. You are one of the people who has retained those qualities throughout your period in politics and I congratulate you on that and on attaining office.

I also want to say how pleased I am to follow the member for Joondalup who made her maiden speech. It is a noteworthy occasion when maiden speeches are made by women today both in this House and in another place in this Parliament. It is a great occasion because they are not nominal women put up by a political party in order to win women's votes. Nor are they pseudo women who have displayed masculine qualities to enter the hurly-burly of politics. They are real women interested in women's issues and also in the issues that concern us all. The active participation of all the women who have come into this House after the last election in the Caucus committees and

elsewhere can only be a credit for them and a blessing for the constituents they represent.

It is not often a person of my sex gets to be described as a "maiden". It is almost as rare that someone with 16 years' experience in the legal profession is called a "maiden speaker". I am thus somewhat loathe to give up these newly-won virtues by embarking on my speech. However, embark I must, because unless I do, so I am told, I must refrain from barking at members opposite, whether in relation to "Bunbury 2000" or something else. But if we do not bark at members opposite how else will they find their way through the righteous jungle that now painfully surrounds them?

As part of my preparation for this speech I took the opportunity of reading the maiden speeches of some other members who have preceded me in the House, past and present. The first speech I read for some reason was that of Sir Charles Court, made in this House on 20 August 1953. Early in that speech he said—

Human nature being what it is, there are always certain people who are prepared to devote a lot of their time and energy to finding loopholes in the legislation, and having found them they will prey on those who are less able or inclined to circumvent controls.

I do not have to tax my mind for any great length of time to work out about whom Sir Charles was talking.

The second speech I turn to is that of Margaret June Craig in this place on 25 July 1974. I wish I could say that she was my predecessor but, in truth, she is not so I cannot say the complimentary things about her that perhaps I could. I will have to leave that opportunity to the member for Murray-Wellington. In her maiden speech, Mrs Craig reminded herself of the modesty all new members are asked to portray, by these words—

I am a mere mortal, and I represent mere mortals.

What chastening words for all those who come into this place for the first time! Mrs Craig then went on to talk about a number of issues dear to her heart, and reached what I regard as the high point of her speech with these words—

It is little wonder, therefore, that the shire councils and local government generally are beginning to concede that the welfare of the people in their areas is important. But these authorities are faced with reduced incomes. Apart from this they are losing their autonomy and are becoming like puppets on

a string, and it seems that there is very little that can be done to help them.

She had some understanding of the reason she had come into the House.

I turn now to a speech given on 18 October 1973 by a person who, apart from my wife, probably has the most responsibility or blame for my being here today. That was a speech given by the Hon. B. T. Burke, the then member for Balcatta. As one would expect, it was the best of the maiden speeches I read in preparing my own. To some extent, it was that speech that I decided to copy.

The then member for Balcatta began by paying tribute to his late father, Tom Burke. On the occasion of my maiden speech, I pay tribute to my parents and my parents-in-law. My father (Bertram John Smith) was born at Fremantle in 1902, and he lived for 71 years. He attained no political office, though he was a branch president of the Waterside Workers Union and a delegate on two occasions to that union's national conference. When I told my father I was going to change my university course from science to law, he threatened to disown me, and described lawyers as greedy leeches on society. My greatest disappointment on 19 February this year was that my father was not present to acknowledge that, in his terms, I had finally done something worth while by helping to give this State a Labor Government.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr D. L. SMITH: My father believed, above all, that the wrongs of this world could be righted by men of goodwill, working for the common purpose of advancement of the whole community, and not individuals in it; and that the important things in life cost nothing.

My mother was Evelyn Joyce Wintle, known to her friends for some odd reason as "Louie". To many Bunbury people, she was known as "the dolphin lady". She was orphaned at 11; and she bore 12 children of whom she raised 10. Would that somehow we could legislate to make all mothers as she was!

My greatest disappointment tonight is that my mother is not here to hear this speech so I could repay part of the huge debt that I owe her by telling of her qualities and aspirations. She is not here, and I could not do her justice, so I will leave those qualities in my heart, to reflect on them.

I mention my parents-in-law, Joe and Marie De Marte. Since my marriage and the death of my parents, they have been as good to me as any son-in-law could wish. I am especially indebted to them for providing me with my wife, Tresslyn,

though I daresay Tresslyn rues the day when Joe gave his approval to our marriage.

The then member for Balcatta, in his maiden speech, went on to pay tribute to the Australian Labor movement, and I do the same. What a great movement it is, and what a great thrill it must be for the old-timers who have worked so hard to find that not only do we have a Labor Government in this State and federally, but also we have Labor Governments in three other States.

I also pay tribute to the many supporters of the Labor movement, and my family and friends, who worked so hard to ensure that I was elected to this House—John and Annette Whitelaw; Chris Evans; Baden Pratt; Geoff and Norah Thompson; Wray Shilton; Alan Cadby; my sisters, Pat Margaret, Maureen, and Roberta; Tom Hutton; Jack Triat; Betty Kirwan; George Baxter; Nola Hill; Lil Scantlebury; Don Odgers; Keren Neilsen; and the hundreds of others I need to mention in recognition of the great job they did—including the girls at my old legal firm, especially Teresa Paul, Valerie Bulman, and Peta Chambers.

I thank the electors of Mitchell for giving me their trust. I accept the responsibility they have given me; and I pledge myself to work loyally, sincerely, and continuously on their behalf, regardless of their own political affiliations.

My final thanks are given to the Ministers of the Burke Labor Government, to my parliamentary colleagues, and to the staff of the Parliament. It is often said that new members coming into this place find it a trying time. The assistance and co-operation given by all members of the staff are something of which we, as Western Australians and as members of the Parliament, should be justly proud. I have received from all of them the utmost courtesy and co-operation. I know I will continue to need that courtesy, co-operation, and assistance if I am to provide the sort of representation that the constituents of Mitchell have a right to expect.

Turning from the thanks and quotes from other people's speeches, I address myself to the matters on which members can expect me to speak from time to time in this House. They are not the matters which I, personally, regard as the most important; but I regard them as important to the electors of Mitchell.

The first matter I wish to raise is the need for State and Federal Governments to decentralise Government expenditure and employment. The percentage of Western Australians living in metropolitan Perth continues to grow year by year. In 1971, it was 68.8 per cent; in 1976, it

was 70.11 per cent; in 1981 it was 70.58 per cent; and today it is estimated to be 70.69 per cent. The total increase in the last 12 years has been 1.89 per cent, which may seem a small percentage; but if we had held to the 1971 percentage, we would have 25 363 extra Western Australians living in our rural areas. To put it into perspective, if all those people had remained in the country, we could have duplicated Bunbury City somewhere else in the country areas of Western Australia.

In the south-west statistical area, the picture is slightly more encouraging. That area is covered broadly by "Bunbury 2000". In 1971 we had 76 633 people resident in the south-west. They made up 7.34 per cent of the total State population. By 1981, the population was 97 834, or 7.53 per cent. Today it is over 100 000. To put that into perspective, one in every four country Western Australians lives in the area covered by "Bunbury 2000"; and one in every 16 lives in Bunbury itself, including the suburbs of Eaton, Gellorup, and Australind, in adjoining shires.

Over the next three years, members will hear me repeating time and time again those figures and those percentages. At every opportunity, I will ask that the Government expend in the south-west not a proportion of the Government expenditure based on our area, but one based on our population. If we could receive eight per cent of the Government expenditure in the south-west, we would be more than happy. On those occasions, I will seek to demonstrate that while the resources boom has brought private employees into the south-west to work, more and more of our public employees, and the expenditure of the Government, is being centred in Perth. I have a strong suspicion—as yet, not proved—that the increasing percentage of our population living in Perth is related directly to the fact that public sector employment is an increasing proportion of total employment.

In 1946, the public sector employed 16.6 per cent of the total workforce. By 1975, the proportion had increased to 22.2 per cent. I do not want to be seen as a knocker of big government or growth in the Public Service; but it is important that, if that sort of growth is to continue, the country receives its fair share of the public sector jobs and expenditures.

At the time when the technological revolution should mean that more and more clerical work can be done in country areas, in fact the tendency is to centre it more in Perth. I hasten to add that the former State Government was not the only Government at fault in this sense. The Federal Governments have done the same thing.

In 1974, despite having approximately 7.5 per cent of the population, only four per cent of Commonwealth public servants employed in Western Australia were employed in the south-west statistical division.

If one takes the example of perhaps the most decentralised of the Government departments, that is, the Public Works Department, and looks at the 1982 annual report of the engineering division of that department, one will see it had a total staff of 815. Of that staff, 389 were professionals and 26.2 per cent of them worked in country areas. There were 298 general staff and 55 per cent of them worked in the country. Clerical staff totalled 128, but only four per cent of them worked in the country.

One often hears it said that the reason the Government cannot force decentralisation of public sector employees is that professionals need the resources of other professionals and institutions to keep up their standards. However, in truth, when we look at the figures of departments such as the PWD, we see it is the clerical sector—that is, the people involved in administration and collection of data—who are concentrated in Perth. In this day and age, with the availability of computers and various means of telecommunication, no justifiable reason exists for such a concentration.

One of the problems experienced by country members is that when they leave their electorate offices they do not have the benefit of a typist. At this time of the night, even my handwriting becomes difficult to read.

In relation to the expenditure of the Government dollar, I refer now to the operating loss of the MTT which, in 1982, amounted to approximately \$43.7 million. In 1982, it carried a total number of approximately 62 million passengers. Therefore, the subsidy for each passenger journey was approximately 70c.

If that expenditure from Consolidated Revenue on public transport in the metropolitan area had been spent in the country area, it would have amounted to \$100 for every Western Australian who lived in the country.

Looked at in another way, it can be seen the loss incurred by the MTT last year was equivalent to the amount allocated to new capital expenditure on education in all of Western Australia, plus another \$14 million.

The expenditure of the Main Roads Department in the south-west statistical division does not indicate any better treatment of the area I represent. The total expenditure on roads in the south-west, whether through local authorities or

the Main Roads Department, in relation to the percentage of population was extremely low.

If one looks at the total subsidy paid for the large metropolitan hospitals in 1981-82, one finds that the total subsidy was of the order of \$202 million. The total subsidy for Albany, Bunbury, Derby, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie, and Port Hedland was \$20.4 million. The subsidy for Royal Perth Hospital alone was approximately 3.5 times the total subsidy expended on all these country hospitals.

Another area of concern to me apart from decentralisation is the increasingly small percentage of total State expenditure which is allocated to capital works. I understand the reason given for that is a notion which exists—I am not sure whether it is based on a rule or a convention—that Consolidated Revenue funds should not be used for capital expenditure and that capital expenditure should be limited to what can be financed out of the Loan Fund programme.

In my view, that is a concept which must be looked at, because if one examines spending in the two principal expenditure areas for the State—that is, education and hospitals—one finds that the percentage expended on capital works is a very small percentage of the total expenditure in those areas. For instance, in relation to education, in the 1981 annual report—for some reason that appears to be the latest annual report for that department—the total gross expenditure on education is given as \$526 million. Of that sum, only \$35 million was set aside for new capital expenditure of all kinds, including land acquisition, construction of institutional buildings, and grounds. That is, only 6.6 per cent of the total budget was allocated to new capital works.

In 1980 the figure was 9.1 per cent. Therefore, members can see the percentage is reducing. However, worse still, only \$21 million of that sum was spent on primary and secondary school construction; that is, only 4 per cent of the total budget.

In other words, we could almost treble the capital expenditure on primary and secondary schools, but only incur a total increase in expenditure on education by the State of something of the order of eight per cent.

I come from an electorate which has many old and small schools. Many of those schools could be brought up to the standards now expected in new schools and very little capital expenditure would be required.

In my view, most of these outdated and poorly equipped schools throughout the State could be brought up to the standard of modern schools

with a very small increase in capital expenditure allocated to education.

Smaller class sizes and more free periods for teachers are desirable, but the first prerequisite for a good education is a proper building in which to teach and learn and when one realises that more and more is being spent on education for what is a rather static school population, one is left wondering why so many of the country schools are left in such a substandard condition.

Although the position is somewhat better in regard to hospitals, of the total amount expended in this area by the State in 1982, only \$34 million was allocated to new construction. This was out of a total budget for hospitals of something of the order of \$344 million of State funds.

Again, by a relatively small increase in the funds available for capital works, many of the necessary improvements to health facilities in country areas could be put into effect. This could in fact be done by a one-off substantial increase in the capital expenditure programme for hospitals which would only have a minor impact on total State expenditure on health and hospitals.

Despite the knocks that John Maynard Keynes has taken over the past few years, I believe that expenditure on capital works in country towns could be a major boost to employment and we should be looking to increase that capital expenditure and making sure we create employment by using some of those Consolidated Revenue funds for capital works.

Mr Speaker and members of the House: I should like to have included many other matters in my maiden speech, but the two areas to which I have referred are of most concern to me at this time as far as my electorate is concerned.

In one of the speeches tonight a petition containing approximately 40 000 signatures was mentioned. That is something of the order of the number of people who were put out of work in the last few years of office of the State Liberal-Country Party Government. I hope that in the course of the next three years, we can accelerate the improvement in the economy that has been signalled to us by the improved position on the stock market.

It has been said that somehow or other there has been a vote of no confidence in us as a Labor Government on the part of the business sector, but if one looks at the way in which the economy is picking up and the stock market is improving, one sees that as the best indicator of business confidence. By and large business is saying that it is happy with the State and Federal Labor Governments and whatever minor mistakes they have

made on the way, it is believed that those Governments can best lead this State and the nation back to the healthy economic situation we have a right to expect.

Government members: Hear, hear!

[Applause.]

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill.

FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STOCK: CATTLE

Computer Selling

60. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What progress has been made in implementing computer selling of cattle?
- (2) Is it the Government's intention to extend this method of selling to other livestock?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), when will other livestock be covered?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) A market co-ordinator has been appointed. Advertisements have been placed for four livestock assessors and most of the equipment is in place or ordered. It is planned to hold the first sale in October.
- (2) Not at this stage. The system has been developed for cattle selling and will need to be evaluated before any decisions are taken to provide such a service for other livestock species.
- (3) Not applicable.

69. *This question was postponed.*

AGRICULTURE

Initiatives: Expenditure

75. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Could he please itemise all the new initiatives within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which were not planned by the previous Government and for which