The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Amendment Bill (No. 3).
2. Metropolitan Water Authority Amendment Bill.
   Bills introduced without notice, on motions by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Water Resources), and read a first time.
3. Fire Brigades Amendment Bill (No. 2).
   Bill introduced without notice, on motion by Mr Hassell (Minister for Police and Prisons), and read a first time.

HUMAN TISSUE AND TRANSPLANT BILL
Second Reading

MR YOUNG (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Transplantation of human body tissue is not a completely new enterprise. Even setting aside the biblical references to Adam and Eve, there is evidence of attempted transplants in very early times. M. F. Woodruff, in his book The Transplantation of Tissues and Organs refers to Indian surgeons using skin flaps in nose construction operations, more than 2000 years ago. Even so, developments over the last two decades demand that difficult and emotive issues concerning human tissue transplantation be addressed by our society and its parliamentary representatives.

The Commonwealth Law Reform Commission issued a report on human tissue transplants in 1977. The report included a draft Bill which was recommended as a model for uniform legislation throughout Australia. Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory, and the Northern Territory have enacted legislation based on the findings of the commission.

I understand South Australia and Victoria are introducing similar legislation and New South Wales has accepted major elements of the Bill.

Our present legislation in this area relies heavily on the Tissue Grafting and Processing Act 1956, and the Sale of Human Blood Act 1963. These Acts have proved useful, but certain shortcomings have developed over the years with the advances in medical and surgical procedures. This Bill provides for the repeal of those two Acts, as well as section 338A of the Health Act 1911.

Some related matters fall within the ambit of the Anatomy Act 1930. It has been decided to keep this legislation separate from the legislation on transplant matters, and so the Anatomy Act will be retained for the present.

The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that a sufficient supply of human tissue is obtained, without offending widely-held community views on the sanctity or inviolability of the human body. Modern techniques enable the transplantation of many types of tissue, both regenerative and non-regenerative. Examples of regenerative tissue are skin, blood, and bone marrow. The kidney is an example of non-regenerative tissue. Clearly, body tissue from living and dead bodies is of great public benefit. At the same time, it is necessary to protect the wishes of the person whose body is involved—whether alive or dead—or his family. I believe these objectives are achieved in this legislation.

The main provisions of the Bill are as follows—

Live Donors: Adults

Persons over 18 years, of sound mind, and on independent medical advice, may give their tissue, after signing a written consent. No action may be taken to commence removal of tissue within a period of 24 hours after the signing of the consent. This gives the potential donor the opportunity to reflect on his decision. Non-regenerative tissues may be given only for transplant. Regenerative tissues may be given for transplant, other therapeutic purposes, or for medical or scientific purposes. Blood is an exception to the requirement for medical advice and written consent.

Live Donors: Children

In this legislation, a child is a person who has not attained the age of 18 years. He may give regenerative tissue if of sound mind, and if he agrees to the removal. A parent must consent. Independent medical advice must be given to the child. The Act will prohibit the removal of non-regenerative tissue from the body of a living child.

Dead Donors

A basic issue in this matter is whether the principle of “contracting in” or “contracting out” should prevail. “Contracting in” involves the idea that transplantation from a dead body should be permitted only if the deceased, in his lifetime, had authorised the removal of tissue; if he had been silent, it should then require a positive authorisation by specified persons, generally relatives.
“Contracting out” expresses the notion that tissue could be taken and used unless the deceased, during his lifetime, had specifically prohibited such use. This Bill rejects the concept of “contracting out” and requires a positive consent before tissue may be removed.

A person should have the right to give his dead body, or any part of it, for the purpose of transplantation or other therapy or for medical or scientific purposes. His wishes should prevail over those of his relatives—but not of the coroner. This Bill provides that tissue may be removed from the body of a person who has died, only on the authority of the designated officer for the hospital concerned. The designated officer will be required to establish whether the deceased had consented or objected to the removal of tissue. If no consent or objection exists or is known, the designated officer will be required to refer to the senior available next of kin.

The Bill establishes a ranking order of priority for relatives—namely, spouse, adult children, parents, and adult brothers and sisters in that order—who may give consent. Removal of tissue for transplantation and other therapy, including medical or scientific purposes, will occur only when there is an express consent by the deceased person or the most senior available next of kin. The authority of the designated officer is subject to the coroner’s jurisdiction to hold an inquest when there is an express consent—who may give consent. Removal of tissue for transplantation and other therapy, including medical or scientific purposes, will occur only when there is an express consent by the deceased person or the most senior available next of kin. The authority of the designated officer is subject to the coroner’s jurisdiction to hold an inquest when there is an express consent or objection—exists or is known, the designated officer will be required to refer to the senior available next of kin.

Post Mortem Examinations

If a designate officer has reason to believe that the circumstances are such that the coroner may wish to hold an inquest into the manner and cause of death, he shall not authorise a post mortem examination.

If the coroner is not involved, the designated officer may authorise a post mortem examination when—

(a) he is satisfied that the deceased person, during his lifetime, gave consent—and had not revoked it subsequently; or

(b) he has no reason to believe that the deceased person expressed a wish—positive or negative—relating to the post mortem examination of his body, and has no reason to believe that the senior available next of kin has an objection—or alternatively, he is unable to ascertain the existence or whereabouts of the next of kin.

It is important to understand that approval for a post mortem provides authority for removal from the body of the person only such tissue as is necessary for the purpose of the post mortem examination.

Scientific advances in recent years, such as artificial respirators and ventilators, have made the diagnosis of death difficult in certain cases.

The model Bill incorporated in the Commonwealth Law Reform Commission report included a definition of death, worded as follows—

(a) a person has died when there has occurred—

(b) irreversible cessation of all functions of the brain of the person; or

(c) irreversible cessation of circulation of blood in the body of the person.

The model Bill suggested also that this definition should have application for the purpose of any other State law, and thus would not be restricted to the transplant legislation.

The suggested definition of “death” has been omitted from the Western Australian version at this stage. This has been done because it is felt that much more public debate is needed on this difficult subject before the definition is embodied in the Statute.

The classical criterion for establishing death has been the cessation of respiration and circulation of the blood, and this is the significant factor in the vast majority of cases. The contentious element in the definition quoted previously refers to the concept of “brain death”. At present, there is no legal authority in this State to clearly establish death by reference to brain function.

In contemplating the concept of brain death many factors must be considered. Relatives, doctors, and hospital staff are all subjected to great emotional stress when they are involved with prolonging procedures on a body they know or believe to be a hopeless case. In these circumstances, the continuation of intensive care and the use of support machinery may serve only to prolong the distress of the relatives and hospital staff involved. In the absence of a statutory definition, these difficult decisions will remain with the individual doctors and relatives concerned with these unfortunate cases. Even so, it would be wrong to introduce into law a definition of “death” which is not known to be accepted by the general public.

There has been little community debate and it is my hope that the passage of this legislation will promote informed discussions of the issues involved. Legislation for a definition of “death” should follow when the community has had a chance to formulate an opinion. It would be precipitant to include a definition of “death” at this stage, although an early amendment could be
called for after the transplant legislation has operated for a short time.

Traditionally, Australians have been firmly opposed to individuals being allowed to sell blood or other body tissue, although the practice is widespread in some overseas countries. The Sale of Human Blood Act 1963 presently prohibits unauthorised trading in human blood. This legislation will repeal that Act and extend the prohibition to include other body tissue, as well as blood.

Part V of the Bill prohibits advertising in relation to the buying, in Australia, of human tissue and provides for a penalty of $500 or imprisonment for three months, or both. A penalty of $1000 is provided for a person who enters into a contract which involves the sale or supply of tissue for valuable consideration. This approach is qualified in the following two regards—

(I) The reimbursement of expenses incurred by a person in relation to the removal of tissue is allowable.

(II) The sale by reputable suppliers of human tissue lawfully obtained and prepared for medical use if the tissue itself was obtained without payment. The Bill provides a mechanism whereby the Governor, by Order-in-Council, may declare that classes of products of this kind may continue to be sold.

The matter of blood transfusions upon children, without parental consent, has been incorporated in Part II. This provision is virtually the same as the existing section 338A of the Health Act, which also will be repealed. As mentioned earlier, this Bill also provides for the repeal of the Tissue Grafting and Processing Act.

The matters raised in this Bill involve deep human emotions, and yet they must be addressed in order to derive the tremendous benefits to the community that advances in medicine make possible. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hodge.

ALUMINA REFINERY (WORSLEY) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Primary Industry) [2.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to obtain parliamentary ratification of the agreement between the State and the Worsley joint venturers made on 21 October 1982 to amend the provisions of the existing alumina refinery (Worsley) agreement.

The amendments primarily provide for the Worsley joint venturers to apply for and be granted, in accordance with the procedures under the Mining Act 1978, an all-minerals mining lease over areas within the “blue picture frame” area of the agreement special mining lease with the areas so leased to remain under the provisions of the Worsley agreement in the long term. They also update the principal agreement to—

reflect the changes introduced by the 1978 Mining Act;

preclude the joint venturers from mining bauxite other than under the conditions imposed pursuant to the principal agreement;

enable the joint venturers under certain circumstances to extract other minerals from bauxite mined, subject to conditions and safeguards imposed in the interests of the State; and

provide the authority for the State to grant a lease which it already is obligated to grant under the agreement.

Apart from the last-mentioned item, these amendments have been made to cover circumstances in bauxitic areas within the “picture frame” area over which a mining lease for bauxite is to be issued pursuant to the principal agreement.

The genesis of these amendments was the joint venturers’ application, under the Mining Act 1978, for an all-minerals mining title over parts of the agreement mining lease “picture frame” area. That application was not under the Worsley agreement, but the surrender of those areas is permitted under the agreement, and thus, subject to such surrender, the joint venturers could be granted the mining lease applied for under the Mining Act 1978 for all minerals, including bauxite.

The 1982 agreement contains an amendment which will stop this by preventing the joint venturers from mining bauxite under a Mining Act title, except with the approval of the Minister for Resources Development, and then only under certain conditions. This amendment, which ensures that bauxite within the “picture frame” area of the Worsley agreement will be mined only under the terms of that agreement, will not affect the existing rights of third parties within that area. Third parties still will have the right to apply for Mining Act titles over parts of the “picture frame” land, and to be granted those titles, if the Minister for Resources Development determines that the grant will not unduly prejudice or interfere with the joint venturers’ bauxite mining operations. That condition is already contained in the existing agreement.
The 1982 agreement contains provisions also to be incorporated in the principal agreement so that the joint venturers, if need be, may place themselves under the terms of the 1978 Mining Act to develop minerals other than bauxite within the Worsley agreement "picture frame" area.

In regard to the lease matter mentioned earlier, the amendment to the principal agreement definition of "Crown land", and the complementary amendment to the clause whereby the State is empowered to grant leases to the joint venturers, are the amendments necessary to enable the State to comply with its lease obligations under the principal agreement. These amendments are in the nature of enabling amendments only. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

RESERVES BILL (No. 2)
Second Reading

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne—Minister for Lands) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now before the House is similar to measures dealing with variations to Class "A" reserves which come before Parliament usually towards the end of each session. The purpose in presenting the Bill late in the session is to ensure that as many variations as possible to Class "A" reserves can be embraced in the one Bill. Sixteen separate proposals are contained in this Bill.

Class "A" Reserve No. 25276 containing 2.8456 hectares is set apart for "public park and protection of natural flora" and is under the control of the Kalamunda Shire Council.

The reserve, created in 1946 to retain the "attractiveness of the rural and suburban countryside", now stands in the centre of the Kalamunda townsite and is used mainly as a short-cut to the business area. Because the purpose includes "protection of natural flora" the reserve is classified under the Wildlife Conservation Act as a nature reserve controlled by the Western Australian Wildlife Authority. However, as no significant flora occurs on the reserve, the Wildlife Authority has requested the purpose be changed to simply "park".

The Shire of Kalamunda agrees with the proposed change and requests the reserve be formally vested in the council. As the reserve is of Class "A", parliamentary approval is required to change the purpose, and this Bill seeks that approval.

Class "A" Reserve No. 14289 situated between the Shires of Capel and Donnybrook-Balingup, is set aside for "re-afforestation" and is not vested.

In 1928 the Forests Department revoked a number of reserves and dedicated the subject land as "State Forest No. 27". It has been discovered subsequently that one of the reserves—No. 14289—is of Class "A" and cannot be cancelled without parliamentary approval.

To avoid duplication of purpose, the Forests Department has requested formal cancellation of the reserve, and this Bill seeks approval to do this.

Approximately 25 years ago, the lessees of several hay locations near Irwin Inlet cleared and cultivated about 40 hectares of Crown land in conjunction with their own properties. Despite a number of requests for alienation of the land being received, it was decided that the area should be retained and allowed to regenerate, and accordingly the land was included within the adjoining Walpole-Nornalup National Park. Continual applications for release of the area have been submitted at various times and the National Parks Authority has resolved now that the land be excised from Class "A" Reserve No. 31362 and made available to adjoining holders. As parliamentary approval is required to amend a Class "A" reserve, this Bill seeks that approval.

Class "A" Reserve No. 27004, Kalbarri National Park, is vested in the National Parks Authority for the purpose of "national park". The Shire of Northampton, supported by the MLA for Greenough and local business groups, favours the release of part of the reserve for a tourist equestrian centre.

The report of the west-coast working group, subsequently endorsed by the Environmental Protection Authority, recommends a number of changes to the reserve, changes which ultimately will increase its area. The report makes provision for an equestrian facility, defining the most appropriate site and suitable management conditions to minimise environmental disturbance.

To make the land available for release, an area, surveyed as Victoria Location 11493 containing 21.7313 hectares, will require excision from the reserve. The balance of the working group’s recommendations affecting the reserve are being processed and will be presented to Parliament in a subsequent Reserves Bill. The importance of the planned equestrian centre as an adjunct to tourist development at Kalbarri warrants a separate submission at this stage.

As Reserve No. 27004 is of Class "A", Parliament’s approval for the excision is required. A clause seeks that approval.
Class "A" Reserve No. 11681 is set apart for "parklands" and is under the control of the City of Gosnells. The reserve, which adjoins the eastern boundary of the Gosnells granite quarry and operated by the ReadyMix Group (WA), is the subject of a land exchange proposal whereby ReadyMix will swap about 255 hectares of freehold land for about 143 hectares of Crown land.

The Government will benefit by the proposal, receiving nearly twice the area of land which it surrenders and, in addition, will gain several natural features contained on the freehold land and considered of high conservation value.

An environmental review and management programme commissioned by the company examined all aspects of the exchange, and following consideration by the Environmental Protection Authority, the Government approved the exchange.

In order to effect the exchange, an area of about 113.2976 hectares will need to be excised from Reserve No. 11681, but as the reserve is of Class "A", the approval of Parliament is required. A clause seeks that approval.

Class "A" Reserve No. 1814 situated at York is set apart for "parklands" and vested in the Shire of York. The reserve known as Centennial Park has an historical association with the pioneers of York and because of this the York Shire Council wishes to build a frail-aged home on the reserve. To achieve this, portion of the reserve, now surveyed as York Lot 596 is to be excised and the remainder landscaped to form a backdrop to the development. As parliamentary approval is required to vary a Class "A" reserve, this Bill seeks approval to effect the excision.

Class "A" Reserve No. 6922 situated in Dardington is vested in the Shire of Mundaring for the purpose of "public park". The reserve containing about 41 hectares is largely virgin bush except for a small portion adjacent to Great Eastern Highway which contains the Bilgoman Olympic Pool and associated facilities.

The shire has been approached by several firms interested in developing water slide facilities adjacent to the pool. Council has agreed in principle to a lease of land for the development provided that a suitable area which includes the swimming pool and facilities is excised from Reserve No. 6922, the subject area reserved for the purpose of "aquatic centre", is vested in the council, and the council is given power to lease for up to 21 years.

A suitable area containing about six hectares and identified as Greenmount Sub Lot 556 has been surveyed. However, as parliamentary approval is required to vary a Class "A" reserve, this Bill seeks approval to effect the excision.

Class "A" Reserve No. 29977, containing 71.7741 hectares, is situated near the Meenara townsite and is vested in the Western Australian Wildlife Authority for the purpose of "conservation of flora and fauna". The Main Roads Department, as part of a Commonwealth-funded programme to improve the national highway, proposes to realign Great Eastern Highway, east of Northam. Part of the realignment encroaches onto Reserve No. 29977 necessitating the excision of an area of 7.2170 hectares from the reserve. The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife is satisfied that the excision will have no significant impact on the reserve and accordingly has agreed to the proposal. As the reserve is of Class "A", approval of Parliament is required to amend the boundaries. This Bill seeks that approval.

Hamersley Range National Park comprising Class "A" Reserve No. 30082 is vested in the National Parks Authority for the purpose of "national park".

The Main Roads Department, pursuant to an agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments, proposes to construct an 18-kilometre section of the national highway between Newman and Port Hedland through the northeast corner of the reserve. The National Parks Authority has agreed to the proposal provided that a number of environmental safeguards are implemented during and after construction. As Reserve No. 30082 is of Class "A", parliamentary approval is sought to excise an area of about 400 hectares from the reserve.

Class "A" Reserve No. 21054 situated in East Perth is set apart as a "disused burial ground" under the control of the National Parks Authority. A small portion identified as Perth Lot E113 is separated from the bulk of the reserve by Government requirements Reserve No. 23812. A recent inspection revealed that Lot E113 is not being used for the reserve purpose and in fact now forms part of the police vehicle testing centre located on Reserve No. 23812. Consequently the National Parks Authority has requested excision of Lot E113 from Reserve No. 21054 as it is of no further use to the authority. As parliamentary approval is required to vary a Class "A" reserve this Bill seeks approval to effect the excision.

Class "A" Reserve No. 11710 situated west of Waroona is vested in the National Parks Authority for the purpose of "national park". The reserve comprising about 9079.1184 hectares is known as Yalgorup National Park. As part of an ongoing programme to increase national parks and nature reserves, the Public Works Department on the recommendation of the Environmen-
tal Protection Authority has negotiated the purchase of freehold land now surveyed as Wellington Location 5334 for subsequent inclusion in Reserve No. 11710.

The subject land was transferred to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, vested, and removed from the operation of the Transfer of Land Act; however, it cannot be included in the reserve until parliamentary approval is given to amend the boundaries of the Class “A” reserve. This Bill seeks that approval.

Class “A” Reserve No. 27575, known as Neerabup National Park, is situated at Quinns Rocks and is vested in the National Parks Authority for the purpose of “national park”. Due to isulation of portion of the reserve and portions of adjacent freehold land by the Mitchell Freeway alignment, the National Parks Authority and the freehold landowner—Mindarie Property Company Pty. Ltd.—have negotiated a land exchange.

The Shire of Wanneroo and the Department of Conservation and Environment have agreed to the proposal and the land purchase board has recommended the exchange proceed on an equal value basis. The excision of portion of the Class “A” reserve has received parliamentary approval in a previous Reserves Act. To complete the exchange, approval of Parliament now is required to include in the reserve the land formerly held by the company. This Bill seeks that approval.

Class “A” Reserve No. 25141 at Cape Leeuwin is set apart for the purpose “recreation” and is vested in the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council. Following negotiations between the shire council and the National Parks Authority, the shire agreed to surrender control over 7.0919 hectares of Class “A” Reserve No. 25141 so that the land could be included within adjoining Class “A” Leeuwin National Park Reserve No. 32376. The Lands and Surveys Department has effected survey of the portion of reserve involved and authority is required to exclude the land from the reserve to enable its inclusion within the adjacent national park. This Bill seeks that approval.

Class “A” Reserve No. 29713 located east of Ravensthorpe is set apart for a “stopping place”. The freehold owner of Oldfield Location 995 wishes to exchange the eastern part of the location which contains several sections of non-arable land for the southern portion of Reserve No. 29713 on an equal value basis. The portion to be surrendered from Location 995 is to be included in Class “A” “parklands” Reserve No. 29715 which will provide extra protection to the banks of the Oldfield River. Parliamentary approval is sought to effect this exchange.

The Shire of Bayswater must relocate the Municipal Dog Pound to make way for the Beechboro-Gosnells controlled access highway. A suitable replacement site comprising Class “A” Reserve No. 20956, vested in the shire for the purpose of “recreation” has been located in the Bayswater industrial area. The reserve which is undeveloped, appears to have been used as a sand quarry and is of minimal value as a recreation area particularly as it is divided by a feeder road connecting with the controlled access highway. In order to make the site available to the shire, the present “A” classification must be cancelled and the purpose changed to “municipal purposes”. This will necessitate parliamentary approval and this Bill seeks that approval.

Class “A” Reserve No. 13375 situated near the Causeway, East Perth, is set apart for “roads, park and public recreation” and is partly vested in the City of Perth. The Perth City Council wishes to establish a helicopter landing site on portion of the reserve adjoining the council’s No. 4 car park. In the past, the area has been used as an emergency landing area due to its close proximity to Royal Perth Hospital and the council now seeks to provide a permanent facility which can be used by commercial, general, and emergency traffic.

The Minister for Tourism supports the proposal and the Department of Aviation has no objection subject to a satisfactory inspection of the completed site. In order to excise the area surveyed as Perth Lot 947 and containing 2580 square metres, from the Class “A” Reserve, the approval of Parliament is required. The Bill seeks that approval.

As is desirable and in accordance with usual procedure, the Leader of the Opposition in the House has been provided with copies of relevant notes and plans applicable to each variation. Further copies are available for any other interested members.

I commend the Bill to the House.
Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Evans.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from 26 October.

MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie) [2.54 p.m.]: My speech is in three parts. The first part deals with the Budget in general, the second with perhaps the more technical sides of the Budget itself, and the third with the economies of both Western Australia and Australia.
I consider the Budget as a whole probably is more remarkable for what it did not do rather than for what it did. I will deal firstly with the health area. The Opposition is very concerned that the Budget provided no indication of cutbacks in the health area, nor did it mention the number of jobs that will have to be done away with. We suggest the number of jobs which will have to be terminated could be in the vicinity of 200.

To give some indication of the concern felt by hospitals throughout the State, and particularly in the metropolitan area, I will read a statement from the Administrator of King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women. It was sent out to all heads of department. It is headed "Budget 1982-83." The administrator says—

Details of this Hospital's allocation for 1982-83 have now been received.

The year will be an extremely difficult one despite indications to the contrary conveyed through the press.

It is obvious that the Administrator of King Edward Memorial Hospital is disgusted with the indications that have been conveyed through the mouths of the Ministers of this Government and also by the Premier in particular, that the Budget itself is one of job creation because, certainly, that is not true of the health area and it is not the situation at King Edward Memorial Hospital. The administrator goes on to say—

The Budget provides a negative growth situation. Salaries have been cut $450,000 below last year's expenditure.

That probably represents something like 40 jobs. The administrator goes on to say—

The following immediate strategies have been introduced:

All Staff posts to be reviewed at the time of vacancy.

No relief for Annual Leave or Long Service Leave.

Absolutely no overtime other than that related to out-of-hours call-back situations.

Gynaecological Clinics to be reduced in number on 1st November 1982.

Bagot Road Clinic building to be closed with transfer of activity to other areas.

Many other measures are at present under consideration by the Executive. Individual discussion will take place with Heads of Departments over the next week in respect of the details pertaining to their Department.

In the meantime any thoughts which may contribute to economies will be appreciated.

Of course, the Minister for Health would be aware that not only King Edward Memorial Hospital is experiencing those difficulties; the Mt. Lawley Annex of Royal Perth Hospital, which is to be closed and that involves something like 76 beds and the loss of 89 jobs. Most metropolitan teaching hospitals have been badly hit with job cutbacks, at a time when the Government admits it has real difficulty recruiting people to staff the hospitals in this State. I know from my own experience in the eastern goldfields that Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital currently is facing those difficulties.

Mr Brian Burke: But the Minister said the Budget made allowance for wage increases.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Yes, the Minister did say that the Budget made allowance for wage increases; all I can say is that it does not make sufficient allowance for wage increases. Of course, it makes allowance for wage increases, but the allowance is not great enough.

Mr Young: They are sufficient for the wage increases that occurred in February this year. Are you aware a drop of 28.5 per cent occurred in outpatient admissions to King Edward Memorial Hospital this year?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: A drop in outpatient admissions occurred and that probably is because of the restrictions the Government has placed on that hospital and other hospitals throughout the State. It is more expensive for people to go to outpatients now.

Mr Young: I think what you are saying is that the money should be increased regardless of the demand and the actual output.

Mr Brian Burke: On the hook again!

Mr Young: That is a good comment from an ex-Treasury officer.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Government has prevented people from using those facilities by increasing their cost.

Mr Young: Is this part of the efficiency order? You have a 28.5 per cent drop in outpatients, but you have to keep spending the money?

Mr Brian Burke: On the hook again!

Mr Young: What are you saying then?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am certain the shadow Minister for Health will be dealing with this situ-
ation in detail when we come to the individual items or the departmental estimates under this Budget strategy.

Mr Young: If he doesn't do better than you, he will not get anywhere.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Premier announced that money would be made available for welfare housing for the construction of a large number of houses. It was suggested there would be constructed this year 426 family housing rental units, 124 pensioner rental units, and 250 purchase homes. The shadow Minister for Housing, the member for Dianella, has asked a number of questions on this subject.

The Opposition has done a little delving into this matter and found that 426 units are to be constructed under family welfare accommodation at a cost of $12.2 million, which is $28,638 per unit. However, the average cost per family unit, as given by the Minister in reply to a question, is $37,526. With this cost per unit, the $12.2 million will provide only 325 units, not 426 units. So, we have 101 units fewer than was stated by this Government in its Budget speech.

This Government said it would build 250 purchase homes at a cost of $4 million. That would be a total of $16,000 per unit. The average cost per house, as given by this Government, is $21,250, which means that the $4 million will provide 188 houses only, not 250 houses as was stated. Altogether there will be about 160 fewer houses than was stated in the Budget. That means that this Government allowed for houses to be built in 1983-84. Again, it has misled us and the Minister for Housing has not said a word about it.

Mr Young: If anyone does, you just keep shouting.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Brian Burke: The Minister for Health has to find out what is going on in his portfolio. The member for Melville keeps him informed.

Mr Shalders interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Minister is not capable of answering. When the member for Dianella asks a question without notice, the Minister complains that he has not been given sufficient notice.

Mr Brian Burke: Are you saying that there will not be 800 houses built this year?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am saying that 163 houses fewer will be built, based on the information that this Government has given us in answer to questions in this place.

Mr Brian Burke: The Premier said they would build all these houses and shift that closer to the beginning of the financial year.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is most misleading. I do not think the Premier understands the budgetary processes sufficiently to come to these conclusions or realise what is happening. It is not the Premier's fault he is not capable of grasping the situation.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Budget contains no strategy at a political or financial level and does not explain how we will come to grips with the problems referred to by the Premier in relation to Commonwealth-State relations. In Budget after Budget we have seen complaints that the Commonwealth has not done the right thing.

Mr MacKinnon: What would you do about it?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The member was here the other night when the Leader of the Opposition said exactly what we would do.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I have no intention of wasting my time repeating what has been said.

Mr MacKinnon: What would you do if they said "No"?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Before the Commonwealth Government can say "No", it must have a proposition before it.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: This Government is not capable of putting a proposition before the Commonwealth Government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: No reference was made in the Budget as to how this Government, at a State or Federal level, would approach the problem of the economy today in Western Australia. Last year I said the Budget was an historical document and I say again this year that the Budget is an historical document. It tells us what was done in 1981-82 and makes no attempt to give an indication as to what this Government will do and what the people of this State can do to make sure the economy is back on the road.

The people in the State Treasury are more than capable of giving this Government some indication as to what it should be doing or the way in which it should be moving.

Mr Young: You were pouring buckets on them before.
Mr I. F. TAYLOR: On a number of occasions the Premier has floated the comment that the Leader of the Opposition made things difficult for him at the last Premiers' Conference by saying all we needed was $903 million to get things going. That is not the truth of the matter. The Leader of the Opposition said that this State needed at least $903 million—

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR:—to provide a sufficient level of services.

Mr O'Connor: What a joke!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Premier was quoted in Hansard of 23 March 1982 as saying that there would be no way in which his Government would be prepared to accept a cut of $162 million by the Grants Commission in funds to this State, because we could not afford it.

Mr O'Connor: Correct.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: If we refer to the transcript of the Premiers' Conference, we note the Premier said, "I support the views that have been expressed by the three major States for the implementation of the Grants Commission report, but also for a top-up of the three smaller States".

He told us he was not prepared to accept a cut in funds from the commission, but in the transcript he says he is prepared to support the Grants Commission report.

Mr O'Connor: You are misleading by quoting a section out of context.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is not out of context.

Mr Rushton: You should not have it.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Premier cannot back away from that.

Mr O'Connor: Yes I can.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I would like to see him try.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKinnon: Why don't you read the rest of it?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is a thick transcript and if the member wishes me to read it I suggest there are much more embarrassing pieces in the report in relation to this Premier.

Mr Rushton: What is your source?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is a transcript of the Premiers' Conference.

Mr MacKinnon: Is that a public document?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I just received a copy of it.

Mr Rushton: Off the back of a truck! Another stolen document.

Mr MacKinnon: I am giving an example of the levels to which you will stoop.

Mr Wilson: Is it true or not?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Grants Commission recommendations at the Premiers' Conference meant that Western Australia has agreed to a phasing in of the recommended relativities over the three years ending 1984-85. It guaranteed Western Australia would receive a real increase in 1982-83 of two per cent and in each of the following two years a real increase of one per cent. Our actual tax share was $914.9 million. It should have been an increase in the vicinity of 17 per cent which would have meant an additional $32.5 million for Western Australia.

That is the situation as taken from the Premier's Budget speech. Prior to the Premiers' Conference the Leader of the Opposition said we needed at least $903 million this financial year to maintain the real value of Federal funds. The Premier has not grasped this because he does not read everything in detail.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the State's share of the total personal income tax was put at 20.73 per cent by the Commonwealth and what we should do is go back to a situation where the Commonwealth Government would agree to 39.87 per cent of net personal income tax collections to comply with the personal income tax collections for 1981-82 and share that total amount as a proportion of the total taxation payments. On that basis the total collection would have gone from 20.73 per cent to about 21.34 per cent. It would have meant a $358.9 million share between all six States.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: If all six States had got together and put forward such a proposition there is a possibility that it might have occurred.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: What we had was a division between the States. We had the three less populous States versus the three more populous States and as a result the Commonwealth was in a perfect position to divide and conquer. That is what the Commonwealth did—it divided the States and conquered them.

Mr O'Connor: Again you are wrong.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Before the Premier went to the conference he had a meeting—
Mr O'Connor: The Treasury is lucky it got rid of you.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Treasurer may be fortunate to have me here.

As a result of the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition, this State should have ended up with $922.9 million and not the $914.9 million that the State received in the end. That is the factual situation. Had the Leader of the Opposition's suggestions been accepted, this State could have received in the vicinity of $923 million and that does away with the suggestion of the Premier so he can forget about it from here on.

Mr O'Connor: We received more than the figure suggested.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The State did not receive more from the tax-sharing arrangements.

Mr O'Connor: Again you are wrong.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I might be at a disadvantage against the Premier's photographic memory for figures!

I refer now to a less controversial aspect of this Budget and suggest that this State should look towards the implementation of programme and performance budgeting.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The South Australian Government has introduced what it terms programme and performance budgeting which has led to increased public accountability in that area. It specifies the areas of public expenditure being dealt with by the Government and it records the results of that expenditure.

Programme and performance budgeting is no panacea to Budget problems in any State. No less an authority than the State Under Treasurer (Mr McCarry) said the following at a lunch-hour meeting of the WA Group of the Australian Institute of Public Administration earlier this year:

The public expect a high standard of management and efficiency in the public sector, because they are paying for it and they are entitled to the best we can produce.

It is, therefore, not surprising that proposals for the implementation throughout the public sector of modern management tools are being put forward as a means of achieving more efficient public administration. Techniques such as programme budgeting and performance monitoring, discounted cash flow and analysis, benefit cost analysis, and zero based budgeting are all being put forward as desirable aids to improved accountability for the expenditure of public funds.

Although management tools of this kind are used with good effect in a number of areas in the State public sector, they are not as widely used as they should be. There is much to be gained from an intelligent and discriminating use of such analytical techniques as an aid to proper evaluation of expenditure proposals and as a means of monitoring benefits realised against costs.

The Under Treasurer also said—

... the Commonwealth and other States of Australia are moving away from the more traditional departmental and expenditure type classification of expenditure for purposes of Parliamentary appropriation and towards programme, budgeting and evaluation.

He concluded part of his statement by saying—

It has for long been the view of the Treasury that programme budgeting and evaluation could provide a superior means for Parliament and executive government to assess the effectiveness of functions and activities and to determine priorities. However, the decision to make the change to programme budgeting must rest with Parliament because quite substantial changes could be involved in the form of presentation of the budget estimates, in government accounting and in the presentation of the public accounts.

Further on he said—

Moreover, it is not simply a matter of deciding to change to programme budgeting as other governments have found. If it is to be done efficiently and the information obtained is to be meaningful, the basic accounting data must be available in a form which permits appropriate identification of programme components and their correct aggregation.

The South Australian Government has set about implementing programme and performance budgeting. Public servants in that State have come to grips with budgeting and the public are aware of what is happening. We have before us a Budget which deals with salaries, contingencies, and capital works, but it does not tell us very much and it can be confusing. If programme and performance budgeting were introduced, the public could be told what the programme would be, how much would be spent on it, not only now, but also in the future, and whether the programme was achieving the ends for which it was designed.
Programme and performance budgeting was originally introduced in the United States Department of Defence in 1961 and since 1974 a number of States have been using that system. Canada the UK and New Zealand also are involved in a system of this nature.

I understand that the Western Australian Treasury is in a position to implement such Budget proposals and, in fact, it has undertaken a major development study and its computerised accounting system will include information about programmes and their budgets. I hope this Government will set about introducing some form of programme and performance budgeting—the Opposition, when it becomes the Government next year, certainly will.

Another more technical aspect of the Budget that should be dealt with relates to an item shown in "Miscellaneous Services". This matter has been pursued by me since the Budget was introduced. Last year the former Premier advised that $26.1 million would be set aside to be used for unexpected payment of wages and salaries. This year an amount was set aside, but there was no expenditure set against that item. I raised this matter with the Treasury to try to ascertain a sensible conclusion for this action. Unfortunately, it has been to no avail because I have not received a conclusive statement as to where the $26.1 million was spent and what happened to the $7 million that was left over from the last financial year. The Treasurer, in reply to the last question I asked him and after a rather political first paragraph, said—

The procedure adopted to ensure that an adequate provision was made for salary and wage increases in circumstances as uncertain as last year was to make a central lump sum provision accepting that particular votes could be exceeded up to the total of that provision.

He continued—

While admittedly this procedure is clumsy it does mean that adequate allowance is made overall in the Budget for salary and wage costs and it records outlays against correct votes. However, it has the disadvantage of showing the global provision as apparently unspent at the end of the year.

That certainly was the case. He continued—

The Treasury advises me that it is not entirely satisfied with the procedures adopted in recent years for handling the budget provision for award increases and is considering possible alternative approaches.

In the meantime, the Opposition will continue to pursue the matter because it would like to get to the bottom of it and find out on a department-to-department basis what money was spent on salaries and how much was set aside in the 1981-82 Budget.

I turn now to a more important part of my speech and that deals with the Australian economy and the Western Australian economy. There is daily evidence of—and everyone in this House would be aware of—a very rapid decline in the economic situation in Australia. The Commonwealth Budget forecast that there would be no growth in the non-farm product, a decline in farm production, and a fall in the total production of goods and services in this country, no growth in employment, an increase in the recorded level of unemployment, and a rate of inflation in the vicinity of 10½ per cent.

I can suggest only that those predictions given to us in August this year have now turned out to have been rather optimistic predictions. In that short period we have seen retail sales seasonally adjusted in money terms, and in real terms, fall; building approvals compared with those of last year are down 34 per cent; factory production is down; motor vehicle sales are down; inflation is climbing; the unemployment figure stands at 500 000 and is climbing; and retrenchments are continuing in the manufacturing, construction, and mining industries and other industries that are most important to the economic welfare of Australia.

This country is in severe economic difficulties. In 1973, the former Premier of Western Australia said to the people of this State, "Give us the chance and we can beat both inflation and unemployment on a State-by-State basis." I suggest that this State has done nothing whatever since then, and is doing nothing now, to try to beat unemployment or inflation on a State-by-State basis.

Mr Shalders: We have the second lowest rate of inflation.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The third lowest rate of inflation.

Mr Shalders: We have the lowest growth in unemployment.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Our inflation rate is one per cent below the Australian rate. There is really no difference; Ministers should not kid themselves. If the Government wants to hide behind statistics like that, it is not coming to grips with the problems.

Mr Carr: Perhaps the Minister thinks it is good enough.
Mr Shalders: The fact that it is one per cent below means nothing to you?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is of little consequence.

Mr Shalders: Then do not criticise us if we are above the national average.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: If the Minister is happy with an inflation rate of 11.3 per cent he should say so. Is he?

Mr Shalders: No.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course not! It is about time this State Government and the Australian Government came to grips with the situation. They are not doing so.

Mr Shalders: What about the New South Wales Labor Government?

MR I. F. TAYLOR: On Tuesday the member for Mr. Hawthorn asked the Premier to identify the main features of this Budget aimed at curbing and reducing inflation. This is the stupid answer he got—

There can surely no longer be any question that in the present economic circumstances the dominant factor in maintaining inflation at its current level is unreasonable and excessive wage demands. The pressure for wage increases must be moderated if Australia is to reduce unemployment and sell its products on world markets. If the Member can advise me what action might be taken in the budget to get the Labor Party and union leaders to face the obvious facts of economic life and help this country pull out of the recession they have helped to make, I would be glad to consider it.

Do not tell me that is not a Government acting like an Opposition. It is asking us for ideas—we will give it some if it is bereft of ideas; I would be more than happy to do so. This Premier, more than any other Liberal Premier in Australia, or any leader of a Liberal-Country Party coalition, has supported Fraser and his economic policies. Time and again he has made it clear that he supports Fraser's economic policies. If he does not support those policies, now is the time for him to say so.

Mr Clarko: Are you trying to suggest the Western Australian Government can have a major effect on the inflation rate?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course, the Premier supports those economic policies—the monetarist policies of Fraser—

Mr Clarko: Are you suggesting the Western Australian Government can seriously change the inflation rate in this State?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course it can; look at the increases in taxes and charges from 1 July. The Leader of the Federal Opposition has suggested the answer. In liaison with the Commonwealth Government, a 12-month freeze should be imposed on taxes and charges, and the Commonwealth Government should make up the shortfall. That is one of the answers.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Fraser's economic policies are the greatest act of economic bastardry ever imposed on Australia.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Those policies are destroying this nation and the Federal Government cannot come to grips with that fact. Mr Fraser follows the Milton Friedman school, the sadomasochistic school of economic thought, which suggests that if it hurts and is painful, it must be good for you. If that is the case, it must be good for a few nations around the world because it is hurting many people, particularly those who matter; that is, the poorer people. Fraser also has suggested that Reagan and Thatcher, and people of that ilk, have the answers to our economic problems. They are following the same economic strategies as this Government and they are all going down the gurgler. They are not prepared to come to grips with the situation and to see that the answer to the world's problems today is economic growth. Governments must spend money and give a lead so that the world can get going and jobs will be created.

Mr Shalders: Whitlam did that and we had the highest inflation rate.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That may be, but we can make sure that it is done better this time, and when we are in Government and Mr Hayden is in power we will make sure the economy is going again. We will make sure economic growth is a No. 1 priority. We will provide jobs for people that way; we will not just provide schemes. School leavers do not want to go into a scheme to get training; they want jobs, and they want lasting jobs. We will not achieve that by following the policies of the present Government or its friends in Canberra.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I ask the Premier to deny that he is the greatest supporter of Fraser's economic policies.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: He refuses to deny it.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is totally inappropriate that while a member who has a
legitimate right to be addressing the House is making a speech he should be subjected at the same time to a continuous barrage of questioning. It is obvious the member has no intention of responding—he cannot, he is in midsentence. I suggest that interjections cease.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: If you wish, Mr Speaker, I will slow down and listen to the inane interjections.

It comes back to the fact that this Government supports Fraser's economic policies and it is quite happy with the situation of almost record inflation and unemployment.

Mr Hassell: Do you acknowledge that when Mr Hayden proposed his freeze on increases and charges, he also proposed that the Commonwealth should put out such revenue as was necessary to reimburse all the States for the losses they would incur?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That is right. The Minister was not listening.

Mr Hassell: He proposes to spend more money with no return.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Not spend more money; we are going to maintain services at a real level. The States should freeze taxes and charges because they are restricting the economy.

Mr Hassell: What about the Commonwealth increasing its deficit? Does that add to inflation?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: We have to come to grips with the fact that sooner or later we have to get the economy moving. If the Commonwealth has to increase its deficit in order to do that, so be it.

If Ministers are prepared to sit there and accept the sort of economic thinking that says deficit budgeting is unacceptable and that balanced budgeting is the be-all and end-all of economic thinking, we will remain in this situation. Things will get a lot worse because the Government will not come to grips with the fact that inflation and unemployment are the main problems. We can overcome unemployment only if we get the economy moving. I am prepared to live with deficit budgeting to make sure that school leavers have jobs.

Mr Hassell: It did not work in Gough Whitlam's time. He spent more than any Prime Minister in history and still unemployment rose.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Except for Fraser. On 22 January 1975, Malcolm Fraser spoke about what was happening throughout the world. At that time he addressed an ANZUS conference. Fraser and the Premier of this State have suggested all our problems lie with overseas factors and they cannot do anything about it. Mr Fraser said in 1975—

When political leaders say the present situation cannot be helped, it is part of a world situation, they are expressing the futility of their own leadership.

What does that say about Fraser now, because he, Mr Howard, and the Premier of this State are saying, "Do not blame us, blame overseas factors." At the same time as they are doing that, they are clapping their hands with glee because Reagan and Thatcher are adopting the economic policies that are getting us into the problems we have today.

I would like to say something about unemployment. This Government sought to blame wage and salary earners for the increase in unemployment in this State, just as at Federal level the Fraser Government sought to blame unemployment on increases sought by wage and salary earners. The State Government has sought to blame unemployment on increases in wages and salaries when, over many years, it has attempted to destroy the arbitration system in this State. I must say, with some sadness, that I witnessed part of the destruction of the arbitration system federally. Along with other people from the State, I went to Melbourne and Sydney to put forward this State Government's quarterly and half-yearly proposals to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in regard to wage indexation. What happened at those hearings? Representatives of this Government, along with representatives of the Commonwealth Government, would stand up and say, "We support wage indexation, but we do not think there should be any wage increases at this time." How nonsensical.

Mr Rushton: Were you carrying the bags?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The people who were actually putting forward the submission on behalf of this State Government held competitions to see how few words they could use in the submission. I believe the record was 16 words.

Mr MacKinnon: Was not the Leader of the Opposition saying the other evening that we are losing our international competitiveness?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course we are losing our international competitiveness.

Mr MacKinnon: What do you put that down to?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am just telling the Minister that. The destruction of the wage indexation system has encouraged people to go outside the system.

Mr Brian Burke: That is dead right.
Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The second reason is that the Fraser Government imposed tax increases on wage and salary earners that were beyond the imagination of any elector back in 1975. In fact, no less an authority than Russell Matthews had this to say about our taxation system—

The Australian taxation system discriminates in favour of speculative activity and against enterprise and thrift; gives preference to foreign taxpayers over Australian residents, redistributes income from the poor to the rich, consciously discriminates against wage and salary earners and provides a major stimulus to wage inflation and industrial conflict.

That is what the taxation system did, right up until this Budget. It forced wage and salary earners to ask for increases over and above what they would normally expect because they knew full well that every increase they obtained would be taxed at exorbitant levels. Therefore, once again, the Fraser Government must accept some of the blame for the increases over the years.

Mr MacKinnon: If we are to get more money from the Commonwealth, from where is the Commonwealth to get it?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: If the Commonwealth Government wanted to try, it could recoup $10,000 million to $15,000 million which it lost through bottom-of-the-harbour schemes.

Mr MacKinnon: You are living in a dream world.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is amazing how Mr Fraser seems to bring forth profound positive statements prior to elections, and I would like to refer to the statement he made just prior to the 1980 election. Fraser created the myth of a resources boom and one of the things he said was that the development would add greatly to our national product, our income, and our wealth, and that Australians stood to benefit by being members of a wealthier society. Fraser created the myth, and the people believed the country could afford to give them whatever they wanted. Fraser created the cargo cult mentality which is still pursued by the Treasurer and which was pursued by the former Treasurer—the mentality that this State could afford whatever the people wanted.

Mr Clarko: Has the standard of living improved in WA over the last 20 years?

Mr Brian Burke: Over the last three years it has not.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course it has improved over the last 20 years.

Mr Clarko: Over the last five?

Mr Brian Burke: Over the last five years it has not.

Mr Clarko: Of course it has.

Mr Brian Burke: It has not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Education will desist from cross-Chamber interjections.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: In concluding, I would like to suggest that this Premier has failed to come to grips with the real problems that face this State. He is leading a Government that has no idea where it is going—a Government that is out of control. In fact, it is so far out of control that when the Premier takes to State Cabinet submissions on industrial legislation, his Cabinet rolls him, and when Cabinet takes submissions to the joint parties in the party room, the party people roll the Cabinet. What is going on in this Government? Who is in control?

Mr Brian Burke: Nobody—they are all out of touch.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Certainly one person is not in control, and that is the Premier of this State. Time and time again he has proved to this State that not only is he not in control of the politics of his party, but also he is not in control of the economy. He has no idea what is required of him as the Premier to get this economy going again.
Mr PEARCE: I would like to get the situation clear. That seems to be the procedure that has been followed in this House, in the same way it is followed in regard to the withdrawal of words.

Mr Clarke: The tabling is sought at the end of the speech.

Mr Brian Burke: The tabling is sought at the time the document is quoted from, and the document is then tabled at the end of the speech.

Mr PEARCE: I am sure the member for Kalgoorlie does not mind tabling the document, but I believe the precedent needs to be very clear for other members. My understanding of the situation is that a member must ask for the document to be tabled at the time it is being quoted from and then the Speaker, or his deputy, orders the document to be tabled at the end of the speech and if it is not ordered, the document is not tabled.

Mr Herzfeld: What are you trying to hide?

The SPEAKER: It is within the ability of any member to seek the tabling of a document from which a quotation is made during the course of a speech. The Treasurer has requested that the document be tabled at this point, and I see no reason that it should not be tabled. I ask that the member for Kalgoorlie make the document available to be placed on the Table of the House for the balance of this day's sitting for the information of members.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am more than happy to table the document. Could I suggest to the Premier that he could make a copy of it available for all members of his Government? I am sure, after reading it, they will be more than surprised about the incapability of their Premier at a Premiers' Conference.

The SPEAKER: The document will be tabled for the information of members.

(The document was tabled for the information of members.)

Debate Resumed.

MR BRIDGE (Kimberley) [3.38 p.m.]: I rise to enter the Budget debate. Over the weeks of this debate I have had the opportunity to listen to the comments advanced so far. Government members devoted a considerable amount of time to the fact that this is a balanced Budget and that benefits and merits will accrue from such a result. Under normal circumstances, of course, the bringing down of a balanced Budget is an achievement about which we could be very happy. However, we must consider that this balanced Budget has been brought down as a result of the discontinuance of services in a number of areas, and I refer particularly to essential public services.

A wide range of topics has been covered by speakers from both sides of the House, and, indeed, the whole State has been referred to. Of course a member's own electorate is of particular concern to him, and we have heard from members representing the goldfields, the southern parts of the State, and the northern parts. We have been told how this Budget will affect particular electorates and members have referred to its good and not-so-good features.

I will not canvass the Budget in terms of its general application to the State, because that is an unnecessary exercise. I would rather confine my comments to the specific areas relating to the electorate of Kimberley that concern me.

It is fine for the Treasurer to bring down a balanced Budget—this comment stems from my experience in local government—as long as he is able to maintain essential services to the public along with the benefits of a balanced Budget. However, if those things do not happen, I question the value of a balanced Budget. The Treasurer may say, "Money is tight and it is not easy to find money." I know that. We are all affected in that way.

I am prepared to give credit in the areas where the Government has recognised the need. I support Government initiatives in the Kimberley. Where such things have occurred, I am happy to compliment the Government. As a matter of fact, I am happy to say that I have helped the Government to achieve those results. I have played my innings as well; and I am prepared to say that.

Mr Rushton: Could you list all the items you are happy about?

Mr BRIDGE: However, in the areas where the Government has not been wise enough to listen to my advice, I withdraw my services.

Mr Herzfeld: Do you admit there might have been times when your advice was wrong?

Mr BRIDGE: Not when it comes to the Kimberley; but on a State basis, the member for Mundaring might be right.

In the areas where the Government has not been prepared to listen to what I have said, I will give it a bit of a tongue lashing in the next few minutes. I hope that at the end of this time, the Government might change its mind and think that my advice is worth considering.

Mr Rushton: But we have done more good things than bad ones, so you ought to be fair.
Mr BRIDGE: I made that point. Where the Government has done good things, I am prepared to congratulate it—

Mr Rushton: You would not like us to stop doing the things we have done right?

Mr BRIDGE: —so long as it recognises the part I have played.

Mr Rushton: You would not want us to stop?

Mr BRIDGE: No. The Kimberley is too valuable for that.

Earlier in the year we had a problem with the discontinuance of the Kimberley air service to remote areas in the northern part of the Kimberley. That was of great concern to the residents of the area. Members of the House will recall that on several occasions I raised this matter by way of questions on notice, questions without notice, and a grievance. Ultimately, the service was reinstated for the people in the northern part of the Kimberley.

What we need to bear in mind is that the service should not have been stopped; and it was reinstated only because Australia Post rather than the Western Australian Transport Commission came to the party. That was wrong, as the Transport Commission had an obligation to ensure the continuation of the service.

Mr Rushton: We should not be subsidising it. We are subsidising it now; but if the subsidy had been paid at that time, everything would have gone nicely. The Commonwealth has an obligation for Australia Post. It is not the State's responsibility.

Mr BRIDGE: For freight and passengers as well?

Mr Rushton: I am talking about Australia Post. That is what you are criticising.

Mr BRIDGE: That is not true. I am criticising the wrongful decision of the Transport Commission not to keep operating that service.

Mr Rushton: They are paying dearly for it now. If they had put that subsidy in, it would have been a very easy operation; but they would not do it at that time.

Mr BRIDGE: Who is “they”?

Mr Rushton: Australia Post. The Transport Commission invited it to do it. Now it has to pay the lot.

Mr BRIDGE: A service such as the Kimberley air service is an essential part of the communications for the people in the area. Surely the State Government has a measure of responsibility to ensure that a service of some kind is provided. That was not the case. The Transport Commission argued against that proposition, arguing that Australia Post ought to pick up the tab. Ultimately, that was done by Australia Post, and the service was restored. I do not think that clears the Transport Commission of the criticism being levelled against it.

People can say correctly that in other parts of the State the Transport Commission is responsible for the services, and it is meeting that responsibility. No-one can question that.

Mr Rushton: Australia Post is required to provide that service right throughout the State. What is more, I think you should pay credit to the Transport Commission for organising the air service the way it has. The commission did it very creditably; and you have got a good service running there now, which is due to the good organisation of the Transport Commission.

Mr BRIDGE: We are looking at two different services. The Minister is talking about the Kimberley RPT service; I am talking about the station service.

Mr Rushton: The station service was related directly to Australia Post.

Mr BRIDGE: Not really. The Kimberley RPT was set up on the initiative of the Transport Commission. The Government of Western Australia had nothing to do with the Australia Post situation.

Mr Rushton: Apart from subsidies from the Commonwealth, which have been withdrawn, we are picking it all up now.

Mr BRIDGE: The Minister has raised the RPT; and I am quite happy to talk about that situation. I am happy to say that the present operators are providing an excellent service to the areas covered by the RPT. However, I make it clear that I have been referring to two separate services in the House today. I have no criticism about the RPT.

Mr Rushton: Thank you.

Mr BRIDGE: The Transport Commission's role in that has been commendable, and I am quite happy to say that. That is not so in the case of the Kimberley air service.

Mr Rushton: You could even go as far as saying the Government's part was commendable.

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, if that suits the Government. The member for Kimberley did his part, too. He helped the Government.

Mr Brian Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr Rushton: We will share it.

Mr BRIDGE: We will share it, and all be happy.
I turn now to another matter of concern to the Kimberley; and I would be happy if the Minister would debate this one with me. Recently we have seen the discontinuance of that bus service between Kununurra and Wyndham. To put the record straight, I indicate that previously the service was operated by MacRobertson Miller Airline Services, and more recently it has been operated by Airlines of Western Australia.

Because of economic factors and the running costs, AWA made a decision recently that it was no longer in a position to maintain that service, and that it would be terminated at the beginning of October. That has happened; and at present a very unsatisfactory service operates between the two towns.

Mr Rushton: The person working to replace you has represented it to me on the basis of what can be done; and we are looking at it on that basis.

Mr Bryce: Are you playing politics?

Mr Rushton: There is already an alternative there which is being tried at this moment.

Mr BRIDGE: Let us consider the present position. The north-bound service of Airlines of Western Australia arrives in Kununurra roughly at lunchtime—either an hour before or an hour after. Previously, a bus always was available to meet the north-bound service.

Mr Rushton: Paid for by AWA.

Mr BRIDGE: That meant that passengers disembarking from the aircraft, or passengers travelling from Wyndham to Kununurra to catch the aircraft to Darwin, had the benefit of a bus service. Previously no delay occurred and it was unnecessary for passengers to stay overnight at Kununurra, because a good connection was available.

However, that is not the case now. According to my information, a small, cab-type utility is used to provide a service from Kununurra to Wyndham three times a week. It leaves Kununurra at 2.00 p.m. and takes approximately one hour to one hour 20 minutes to get to Wyndham and returns to Kununurra by about 5.00 or 5.30 p.m. Therefore, frequently the return service is too late to connect with a south-bound flight out of Kununurra.

The people of Wyndham no longer have a south-bound passenger service available to them, because if they use the bus service which operates only three times a week, they have to stay overnight in Kununurra in order to connect with a flight south. This means people must use their own forms of transport or meet the cost of staying overnight in Kununurra.

The situation is even worse in relation to north-bound services, because no suitable connection is available. The people in Wyndham must either use the bus service which operates three times a week from Wyndham to Kununurra, stay overnight there, and travel north on a flight next day, or use their own transport to get to Kununurra. The situation is similar when they are returning from Darwin, because no suitable connection is available.

Mr Rushton: Is it your understanding that some subsidy is given at the present time from Ansett or somebody like that?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes.

Mr Rushton: Is it somebody by the name of Wright?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes.

Mr Rushton: Do you think somebody else should be doing it?

Mr BRIDGE: I do not suggest for a moment someone else ought to do this and in no way do I intend to reflect on the ability of that person to operate the service. The point I am making is the service is not adequate for the needs of the people.

Mr Rushton: In any kind of suitable connections with north or south-bound flights from Kununurra. The connection factor is a great problem there.

Mr Rushton: I think you are right in saying the present service is not as good as that which existed previously, but apparently too few people use the service.

Mr BRIDGE: That might be the case. It is not disputed that one of the reasons Airlines of WA decided to withdraw the service was lack of use, but surely a better service should be provided to meet the needs of Wyndham passengers than that which exists presently.

Mr Rushton: I do not detract from your point of view, but it is an awkward situation when a private firm walks away from a service and leaves it for the State to pick up. It is not a simple matter.

Mr BRIDGE: That is right; but we have to start thinking about it now.

Mr Rushton: We have been thinking about it.

Mr BRIDGE: I believe the Minister needs a little of my advice in relation to the matter.

Mr Rushton: I suggest you write a letter to me indicating your suggestions on it.

Mr BRIDGE: My main concern is to restore an adequate passenger service so that the people of Wyndham who wish to travel north or south may
do so without having to deal with the problems caused presently by the restricted nature of the service.

On some of the days that the bus operates from Wyndham to Kununurra a flight is scheduled to depart from Kununurra after 5.30 p.m. so a connection can be made. However, that occurs less than three times a week. Therefore, that cannot be regarded as an adequate passenger service. The Government and the Transport Commission should examine this matter.

The transport policy of this Government enables a subsidy to be paid where it is necessary to maintain a service to the community. Where a private operator is experiencing problems providing a service, especially in remote areas, under this Government's transport policy, it accepts its responsibility to provide some sort of subsidy.

Mr Rushton: Under its legislation the Transport Commission has a responsibility to monitor services and prices and make recommendations in relation to the quality of those services. This matter is with the Commissioner of Transport at the present time for evaluation and recommendation.

Mr BRIDGE: Reference is made to subsidies—

Mr Rushton: It is not an automatic subsidy. For example, you would be aware of an air service that is operated without a subsidy which has proved this can be done without the necessity to call on the taxpayer to subsidise it.

Mr BRIDGE: It will be interesting to see how long that service can continue without a subsidy. I always have expressed my concern about it. For the operator's sake, I hope that he is able to continue the service, because I know he wants to do it on his own. It will be to his credit if he can maintain that service.

Mr Rushton: From what I understand he is doing a good job.

Mr BRIDGE: Aviation in the Kimberley is a very costly business.

Mr Rushton: It is very essential, too.

Mr BRIDGE: It is very essential and costly and I certainly would see that as a permanent situation.

Although the significance of a balanced Budget is emphasised and members opposite remind us of how much this benefits the State, I have outlined problems which exist in relation to essential transport services to the people of the Kimberley. They are very important matters and cloud any consideration one may have for the fact that the Budget is balanced. While the Government recognises the importance of a balanced Budget, at the same time it must address itself to these vital areas of public need.

I shall turn now to some of the increases in costs which have occurred in the Kimberley over the last 12 months. Firstly, I shall direct my comments to health services and indicate that if one attends a hospital in, for example, Halls Creek or Fitzroy Crossing, the normal consultation fee is $25. I understand that in the metropolitan area the standard consultation fee is approximately $12.50 and the fee recommended by the Government is about $10.60.

There again we have an instance of people in the north having to pay a considerable amount of money for a basic need. I am sure that even if the service is provided by a nursing sister the fee is still $25. This is another example of the imposition of high cost burdens being passed on to residents of remote areas such as the Kimberley.

In our deliberations in this Parliament, we should give thought to the need for such things as tax-free holidays to attract tourists to the north, something that was mentioned in Port Hedland on the weekend. We would all support that proposition, but we must realise that no assistance would be provided to the local permanent residents of the regions.

Mr Bryce: The small businessmen.

Mr BRIDGE: They are the people who are chopping the can. They are subjected to all these increases, but, as they do not fall into the category of tourists, any concessions or benefits designed to help the travelling public do not flow on to them. They live in the north year in and year out; they are the backbone of the area. It is nice to have people visiting the area, but the local residents are the people who are there today, tomorrow, and the day after. Our policies must be directed towards helping these people and we must give them more consideration in our deliberations when discussing a wide range of matters such as small business, pastoral matters, and I imagine also the mining industry, because we have a lot of permanent companies now in the north in the sense that they have been there for many years and have many permanent workers residing in the area. Generally the Government has been shortsighted when considering needs and services to take care of local people in the north. Without the local residents there would be no stability in those regions.

People often say of northern residents that the decision has been theirs to live in the north and that it is their choice to remain there, but that is not the point. These people provide a very valuable contribution to the prosperity, security,
strength, and growth of the region. The men on the stations—and I will have more to say about these people when we have a chance to talk about pastoral areas—the small businessmen who struggle to improve their businesses, the working men, and the family men are all very important to the region. I have been speaking mainly of the Kimberley, but this applies to all areas outside the metropolitan area, whether they be down south, east, or up north. These people have been neglected in most of the Government’s policies.

At the northern seminar held the other day, we spoke about the significance of development and the need for us to promote development in the north. That is fine, we all support that; but I ask members to consider what is in it for the little man in the Kimberley.

Mr MacKinnon: Is that not why my colleague, the Minister for Lands, set up such an exhaustive inquiry into zone allowances and why we have been so active trying to increase zone allowances?

Mr Bryce: How long have you been working on zone allowances—10 years?

Mr MacKinnon: Probably.

Mr Bryce: You have had good Press statements for nine years.

Mr MacKinnon: That is your leader is saying we should be doing with Federal financial relations.

Mr Bryce: But you are not achieving much success.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tubby): Order! The member for Kimberley has the floor.

Mr BRIDGE: Although the Minister expresses a degree of enthusiasm about the progress made, I have not seen any evidence of that progress. If progress has been made, that is fine, but the matter still needs to be addressed to a far greater extent because it is so important.

The type of people to whom I referred are important to the area; they are important to the stability of all rural areas, whether they be north, south, or east, helicopter country, or otherwise.

Mr Laurance: They are getting plenty of land now.

Mr BRIDGE: It is true that over the last 12 months a lot of land was made available in the Kimberley by the Lands and Surveys Department over the last 12 months, but it was not before time. The response from people in the area to the availability of land vindicates what I am saying. What concerns a lot of people in the area is the high cost of that land. The point has been reached where land prices in the north are virtually equivalent to land prices in the metropolitan area, which is very wrong. There are logical reasons to explain the high price of land in the metropolitan area and land in reasonable proximity to the metropolitan area. This is premium land because of the degree of development around it; therefore we can expect the cost of such land to be high. However, in places like Kimberley there are millions of hectares of undeveloped land, yet the price of land there and in the metropolitan area is fairly equal. Although the Minister might argue there are good reasons that this is so, it does not alter the fact that something is wrong.

Mr Laurance: The cost of servicing the land is very high. The total cost of land is almost completely made up with the cost of servicing it. I don’t like that any more than you do, but, as a community, we have decided that, from one end of the State to the other, land coming onto the market should have all the services available. If you don’t do it that way, and you provide cheaper land without the services, there is a clamour for the Government to provide the services, so it is better to provide them first.

Mr BRIDGE: The Government must tackle this problem because the present situation denies a lot of small people the opportunity to buy land in the north. About 60 blocks were sold around Kununurra recently, but, if we look at the successful bidders, we find they were mainly large companies such as CRA and Ashton Joint Venture.

I acknowledge that the geographical factor creates inbuilt disabilities for people living in the north, and nothing will change this. Because of the distances, the cost of getting things there and the cost of providing services always will be an imposition.

Mr Laurance: It is beautiful country, though.

Mr BRIDGE: It is the best; most things that come from the Kimberley are the best, not just the land!

In summary, I remind members opposite that when they express words of praise for the Budget they should do so as long as they remember it is necessary that essential services for the north are maintained. That is being fair. I am not saying all services should be provided; I am saying essential services should be provided. The comments I have made today relate to the provision of essential services—nothing beyond that. People in the Kimberley have the mentality to know that they should obtain only a fair crack of the whip—no more than is reasonable.
Mr Laurance: They don't want frills; they want the basics.

Mr BRIDGE: I have not claimed beyond that point; the people of the Kimberley want only a fair crack of the whip. They need essential services, and are entitled to them. The provision of those services is something to which all Governments must address themselves at all times.

I am glad the Minister for Resources Development has returned to the Chamber because I want to refer briefly to comments he was reported to have made during the last few days. He made a speech at the northern seminar held at Port Hedland in the weekend. I am not sure that the report of his comments was accurate; he is the best person to answer the question. However, if the report is accurate, it is rather sad that the report is accurate, it is rather sad that the Minister made those comments.

Mr P. V. Jones: You know those words weren't used though, don't you?

Mr Bryce: Are you denying that you said that?

Mr P. V. Jones: It is what the media will say.

Mr Bryce: Have you said that to the Press or released a statement?

Mr P. V. Jones: I think the member for Kimberley is doing very well.

Mr Bryce: Yes!

Mr BRIDGE: I was present when the Minister delivered his speech, and certainly I do not remember the words reported being uttered by the Minister.

Mr Jamieson: It might have been in the Minister's handout.

Mr BRIDGE: The words may have been in the Minister's handout, but I cannot comment beyond the point I have made. I hope my observations were correct, because the words reported do nothing at all towards settling the land rights situation in Western Australia. If this situation is handled with good sense—approached practically—not a great deal exists about which we should be concerned.

The Aboriginal people seeking land rights seek something to give them a basis of tenure greater than that which exists today, and these people can provide evidence to indicate that proper land tenure does not exist for them today. Their wish to have this proper land tenure surely is no threat to anyone. Even in this House within the last year we adopted measures designed to give farmers a greater degree of land protection. The legislation introduced at that time could be described, for want of a better term, as land rights legislation.

Mr Cowan: Are you talking about the Mining Act?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes; I am talking about amendments to the Mining Act. Both sides of the House quite rightly supported strongly the measures introduced. The farmers and pastoralists of this State are entitled to proper land protection. A request for similar protection from Aboriginal communities such as Balgo, Beagle Bay and Oombulgurri are not unreasonable. I think the desire for land rights came to the minds of Aboriginal people when they saw other sectors of the general community receive appropriate land tenure.

Aboriginal people merely want appropriate land tenure—reasonable protection. Naturally some people will depart from reality and say they want this, that, or something else. Those people could be Aborigines, farmers, pastoralists, or miners. Always we have an exception to the rule, but we as members of Parliament must be sensible and responsible in the legislative process of this State. Ultimately the Parliament will determine the destiny of the State and its people. All along I have said that personally I believe one of the most harmful things we can do as politicians is to allow or take part in a debate which creates fears in the minds of our people, particularly our European people whose interests are not under threat by the process of Aborigines obtaining, for the want of a better word, land rights.

Mr Shalders: Would you agree that the recently released policy in regard to reserves has alleviated many fears on the part of Aboriginal people?

Mr Wilson: Has it been released?

Mr BRIDGE: The Minister is referring to comments.

Mr Wilson: A report hasn't been released. What are you talking about? You have refused to release it. Get on top of things.

Mr Bryce: What a skunk; fancy asking a question like that.

Mr BRIDGE: The Department for Community Welfare in the course of its preparation of the report has given regard to the release of land to Aboriginal communities in order that those people might obtain a greater degree of land tenure. So long as that course is followed, I would say, "Good".

The main point I make is that the comments reported, correctly or incorrectly, in The West Australian were unwise; they did absolutely nothing to keep the whole situation in its proper perspective. So long as we, as members of Parliament, acknowledge the effect of such comments, the whole
situation will flow more easily. We must give a greater degree of land tenure to communities such as those to which I have referred. The community areas are defined clearly as reserves, and if the communities at those reserves are given a greater degree of control, I would not see anything terribly wrong in that being done. Such a course would be proper and consistent with the principles we in this House support, whether they relate to an amendment to the Mining Act, the Land Act, or any other Act. Such legislation relates to protection, and in regard to Aborigines that protection should be provided. The principle adopted in this House is to prop up the rights of people on the land. I for one always will abide by the principle of supporting the man on the land, whether he be a pastoralist or a farmer. He needs those safeguards because it works very hard on his land.

I can assure people who refer to the responsible attitude of others towards the use of land not their own that I have seen some terrible neglect occur on the part of those using land not their own. It is good that measures to protect the rights of landholders are supported with total consensus by this House.

Mr Herzfeld: Do you agree with the holding of land in perpetuity, the way it is being held, for Aboriginal people?

Mr BRIDGE: I am not saying that. We should give them a greater degree of control. Those who are seeking that greater degree of control by their calls for recognition of that need are demonstrating this. We should not be running away from that situation and should see that as a bogey, a problem, or a great fear to a sector of society.

Mr Herzfeld: To give them that greater control, you would give them a land title; is that the idea?

Mr BRIDGE: Greater than presently exists.

Mr Herzfeld: No, the land already is in perpetuity for their use at the present time, so the only other way you could give them any more is to give them the title to the land.

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, that would be correct. At the moment it is under the Minister’s discretion and he has the final say. This really is the key to the problem. A lot of land is set aside for the use and benefit of Aborigines at all times, and when it comes to a decision on or a determination of what can and cannot happen on that land, it is really not their decision, and that is the point; whereas the farmer in the south-west can say, “I have a say in a determination of whatever happens.” Whatever happens, at least he has a say in it, but the Aborigines do not.

Mr Herzfeld: The farmers do not have any say either in regard to mining.

Mr Cowan: Yes, they do.

Mr Wilson: Of course they do.

Mr Cowan: You should read the Act.

Mr BRIDGE: Let us maintain a balanced, sensible realisation of this matter and let us not go around accusing people of being reactionaries. I do not know whether that word is good or bad. I do not think there is anything wrong with such terminology. However, I do say it does no good whatsoever; in fact, it creates an unnecessary amount of concern and fear, particularly in the minds of the Europeans who perceive this as a threat to their existence, their livelihood, and indeed in some cases to their lifestyle. Members know that the Aboriginal people have a genuine interest in land rights and it has never been their intention to threaten the existence of people around them.

Mr Herzfeld: What about some of those imports like Steve Hawke? What is their objection?

Mr BRIDGE: If we look at and re-evaluate the work people like he does at times, we see it is very considerable. These fellows are tarred with a brush that tends to place them in the area of criticism. They have to work very hard with those communities assisting them to meet the westernised systems.

Mr Jamieson: There is very little financial return.

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, very little financial return is provided for that kind of person. I think the criticism is unwarranted. That concludes my remarks on the Budget.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [4.23 p.m.]: In general, I endorse the Budget that the Treasurer has brought down, but some matters relate purely to political expediency and they are the issues I want to take up with the Treasurer and other Government members.

The first matter is that of payroll tax. For approximately two years we have advocated that the State Government should do something about abolishing payroll tax. We in the National Party were very pleased to note that the Leader of the Opposition in his speech on the Budget commented that payroll tax should be abolished and that all State Governments should get together with the Commonwealth in discussions to try to achieve ways of abolishing that tax. When the Treasurer delivered the Budget speech to the House he made a great deal of play on the level of exemptions that were going to be made in relation
to payroll tax and the value that that was going to have on small businesses. I note that the level of exemptions provided for in the Budget and ultimately provided for in the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Bill amount to something like $3.3 million. It is very interesting to note that in the papers that the Treasurer tabled was a report on pay-roll tax revenue raised in this State. Despite the exemption that has been offered, it will increase by more than 10 per cent, or $31 million; that is, it will go from $230 million to $261 million.

From those rough figures, it is clear to anybody who wants to look at them that the report of exemptions to pay-roll tax that have been offered by the Government are rather token. I think it is about time that this Government became genuine in its attempt to do something to remove the burden of pay-roll tax, particularly to those small businesses which are forced to pay it.

I note that the Government also has included in its assistance to small businesses an increased amount of funding for Small Business Advisory Service Ltd. That is a very commendable additional increase in funds. That service can offer very good advice. In the past I have been quite critical of some of the activities of this service. I cited one instance where the service went to the town of Corrigin and addressed 71 small businessmen. That included farmers who were small businessmen. Two of the main speakers at that seminar were experts in receivership. Nobody at that seminar was particularly impressed to discover they were being informed about what would happen to them when and if they went broke. They were much more interested in finding out ways and means of preventing that from happening.

Nevertheless, with this increase in funds to Small Business Advisory Service, I am sure it will enable them to lift their game and will provide something a little more concrete to those small businesses which are crying out for some form of expertise and advice to help them in their endeavours to remain afloat in the business world. If we look at assistance to small businesses, we find there has been a $3.3 million pay-roll tax exemption and $320,000 was given to Small Business Advisory Service which amounts to something like $3.6 million.

In one fell swoop this Government offered a guarantee in excess of $4 million to one company, the proprietor of which was an overseas person. The company has now gone bust and the Government is quite likely to be required to meet its guarantee of $4 million. I am talking, of course, about Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. I use this example to point out the inconsistency of the Government in that it states it is prepared to do all it can to assist small business, but it is prepared to guarantee to one company more money than the total amount of money to be offered to the small business sector by way of pay-roll tax exemption or an advisory service; it will offer more money to one company which is at high risk and which has now gone into receivership, for which taxpayers will be expected to bear the burden of something like $4 million. These are the decisions of political expediency to which the Government must address itself if it is to have any credibility at all within the small business sector.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you aware of when the guarantee was extended to Bunbury Foods?

Mr COWAN: I am, but I could not give the Minister the exact date.

Mr MacKinnon: It was in late 1977 and an election was held earlier in that year. If it was expediency you would think we would have done it earlier.

Several members interjected.

Mr COWAN: An election was held in 1980. I would suggest to the Minister who has just interjected that some of the workers of Bunbury Foods certainly would live within the Bunbury electorate. Indeed, that particular processing firm was outside the Bunbury electorate. I think the Minister is drawing a nice point when he says that it is located outside the Bunbury electorate. In all the Government's statements related to that firm and its establishment in Bunbury kudos were given to the marginal seat of Bunbury. The Government can make decisions based on political expediency if it wants; that is its decision and prerogative. I am not really worried about the timing, but if the Government is prepared to offer a guarantee in excess of $4 million to one particular company, against good advice—I am not aware whether Mr MacKinnon was the Minister at that time.

Mr MacKinnon: Have you confirmation that it was against political advice?

Mr COWAN: Yes, I have.

Mr MacKinnon: I hope you can explain that to me.

Mr COWAN: The seed section of the PIA recommended that the edible oils factory should not be established in Bunbury because it was located too far away from areas where vegetable oil seeds are produced.

Mr MacKinnon: The treatment plant was the third stage.
Mr COWAN: It was stated by the seed section of the PIA that Bunbury was not the best location for an edible oils factory.

Mr MacKinnon: In its opinion!

Mr COWAN: Yes, in its opinion which was subsequently proved right.

Mr MacKinnon: It has not been proved right.

Mr COWAN: The company has gone into receivership. I would suggest that this had some relationship to one of the points made which was that there was not adequate production of oil seeds in Western Australia.

Mr MacKinnon: You are saying that because it was located in a decentralised area it went broke.

Mr COWAN: I am saying that the PIA made two statements. One was that Bunbury was too far away from the production of edible oil seeds and the other was that the demand for the factory's production perhaps was not great enough to warrant an extraction plant and I suggest they were proved to be correct.

Mr Blaikie: That has nothing to do with the financial ability or potential of the project.

Mr COWAN: I do not know.

Mr Blaikie: That is the relevance of the question, not where the oil seeds are grown or the factory is built.

Mr COWAN: I suggest it was a comment made by the president of that particular section and he has proved to be correct. Members of the Government can keep telling me that he is wrong, but the fact is the company has gone into receivership, and the Government issued a guarantee in excess of $4 million which it will have to meet. The Government has made great play of the fact that it has offered payroll tax exemptions to the business enterprises it could do better than for them to carry on their businesses.

Mr COWAN: If the Government wants to offer $4.4 million to business enterprises it could do better than choose a company which has a majority foreign ownership. It should look at some of the smaller businesses and offer them assistance. It would receive a far greater return and the amount of money which the Government would have to provide when honouring guarantees given to companies in receivership would be less. This particular company was established, it operated, and it failed. The Government made the decision to support it.

As I understand it, the Government made the decision against good advice from one Government department and the Primary Industry Association which would know about the quantity of oil seeds that are produced in Western Australia and whether a factory of this nature should be constructed. The Government made the decision against good advice and now it will have to pay the price. It should take note of that and do something about it on future occasions.
Statements have been made about what a wonderful thing the Government has done in terms of easing the burden on small businesses by way of exempting them from payroll tax. As the total amount involved is only $3.3 million, it is really quite insignificant, bearing in mind that with the total revenue, payroll tax will increase by more than 10 per cent despite the fact that those exemptions are being offered.

The Government needs to be a little more genuine when it says to small businesses, "We are interested in assisting you". It must be able to present facts and figures. Anyone who looks at the Government's figures in relation to payroll tax exemptions that have been made available, the guarantees offered to companies in receivership, and the direction in which Small Business Advisory Service is channelling itself in relation to small businesses, would say that he has some serious doubts about the general attitude of this Government. If he could not say that, he would certainly say that taxpayers' funds are being expended in an inefficient manner. That is something of which the Government must take note.

I am pleased the Deputy Premier is in the Chamber, although I have no doubt I will spend the next 15 minutes trying to make my speech over his interjections.

Mr Brian Burke: Do not provoke him, please.

Mr COWAN: The Leader of the Opposition knows the Deputy Premier does not need provocations to interject.

I wish to deal with the matter of transport, and again, it involves political expediency. On 1 July this year, people who lived outside the metropolitan area were required to suffer a company called Total West. The reason for Total West's birth was that the Government decided to transfer the transport of small goods traffic from one mode of transport to another—in other words, from rail to road.

Mr Rushton: It is strange that you did not accept my invitation to come along and get a little more knowledge on the subject. You were one of the absentees today. It would have done you good to know a little more about the system.

Mr COWAN: At the same time, the Government was going to divest itself of a cost of approximately $5 million which it believed had been expending on the transport of smalls.

Mr Rushton: Be accurate; the figure is $7 million.

Mr COWAN: The Government believed this to be a non-profit area. We have no argument with the transfer of smalls from one medium of transport to another. Indeed, we would have no argument with Total West, provided it worked.

Mr Rushton: It is up to the company, not the Government.

Mr COWAN: The regrettable fact is that it does not work. What is more important is that it is incorrect for the Deputy Premier to say that it is up to the company to make it work because Westrail has a 50 per cent equity in the company and Westrail is directly responsible to the Government. So, it is a Government responsibility.

Mr Rushton: At this stage, Westrail actually is in front of its estimate, for its part. It is only early days. Total West is a commercial operation which will succeed or otherwise, according to its ability.

Mr COWAN: I come now to the decision made on the basis of political expediency. Having established that Total West originated from the Government's desire to divest itself of $7 million in Budget deficits in the transport of smalls, about one month ago the grain growers in this State were required to pay an increase of 13.9 per cent in rail freight.

Mr Rushton: In terms of a negotiated agreement. You want it both ways. You want the Government to be involved, but when it is involved, you are critical.

Mr Davies: The member for Merredin was right. The Minister is about three minutes ahead of the member for Merredin, so far.

Mr COWAN: The point is that the decision was made to increase grain freight rates. Grain growers are the greatest contributors to the revenue of Westrail.

Mr Rushton: It depends on which year it is.

Mr COWAN: This year, grain growers certainly will be, although I concede that in past years they may not have.

Mr Rushton: In other years they have not been.

Mr COWAN: If the Minister can produce figures which state otherwise, I would be interested to see them. In fact, I would say that over the last 15 years, on only two or three occasions have the grain growers not been Westrail's greatest contributors. However, notwithstanding that fact, about one month ago, grain growers were asked to pay an extra 13.9 per cent in freight rates.

Yet only two weeks ago, this Government offered to the subsidiary company of the largest mining company in Australia—in fact, the largest company in Australia—a freight subsidy amounting to roughly $1 million.

Mr Rushton: You do not know what you are talking about. Would you prefer to see the people
at Kwinana and Koolyanobbing lose their jobs, and the people at Westrail lose their jobs? Would you prefer Westrail to be in an even worse position than it is in now?

Mr COWAN: I suggest that the time for the Government to take action was when Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. rationalised its total iron production, and decommissioned the blast furnace at Kwinana. At that time, the Government did nothing. How can Koolyanobbing operate without a blast furnace to feed?

Mr Rushton: Koolyanobbing is producing and the company is exporting.

Mr COWAN: It is producing, but it has no blast furnace to feed. The blast furnace used to take the major proportion of Koolyanobbing's ore, but it no longer operates.

However, because an election happens to be coming up, we see Dampier Mining Co. Ltd.—the operators at Koolyanobbing—offered a freight subsidy. Already, the cost of transporting ore from Koolyanobbing to Kwinana is only marginally more than half the cost of transporting grain from, say, Southern Cross to Kwinana. Yet, on the one hand, the Government is prepared to ask grain growers to pay an extra 13.9 per cent in freight rates while, on the other hand, and in the same breath, it offers the largest company in Australia a considerable freight subsidy. Where is the consistency in that situation?

Mr Rushton: Firstly, you have not acknowledged the fact that grain growers will receive a rebate under the agreement they made with Westrail; so, you are not being factual or truthful. Secondly, it appears you would prefer workers at Koolyanobbing and Kwinana and in the railways to lose their jobs by the closure of production at Koolyanobbing, with not much prospect of its recommencing production. This is still the best deal as far as Westrail is concerned, and that is why it was done.

Mr COWAN: I acknowledge grain growers are given discount, but the Minister must admit it does not amount to a great deal.

Mr Rushton: Only about four per cent this year.

Mr COWAN: Let us take that into consideration. This year, grain growers are being asked to pay a 10 per cent increase in freight rates; yet BHP has been offered a subsidy.

Mr Rushton: You are talking about two different situations. No wonder the public think the National Party is irresponsible.

Mr COWAN: They do not; the Deputy Premier should go up to Merredin and find out for himself.

Mr Rushton: At Merredin, they thought you had lost your electorate. That is what they are telling me.

Mr COWAN: We will wait until February or March next year and see what happens. Members made similar statements in 1980 that we would not exist after the election of that year, but we are still here.

Mr Rushton: Only just.

Mr Laurance: What was that again?

Mr COWAN: Quantity means nothing. Look at the number of "Yes-men" in this place. It is quality that counts.

The point is that one cannot make political decisions and not pay for them. Here we have the position where the greatest contributors to Westrail's revenue have been required to pay an increase of 13.9 per cent in their rates. Even if they attain the maximum discount, they will still pay 10 per cent. However, the largest mining company in Australia has been offered a freight subsidy by the Government in order to keep a mining operation open. The Government has known since the blast furnace at Kwinana was taken out of commission that, inevitably, Koolyanobbing would be phased down; but it is only at this juncture that the Government has made that decision.

The people in the wheatbelt area believe that decision was taken for political ends. They do not want Koolyanobbing to be closed; but they know that every year more farmers leave the Merredin electorate than would ever be stationed at Koolyanobbing. They know also that no assistance has been offered to grain growers in terms of freight rates in order to alleviate their costs. They see that as a decision of political expediency.

The farmers regard mining and agriculture as the two greatest contributors to decentralisation in Western Australia. They do not want mines to be closed, any more than they want farmers to leave their farms. However, they recognise that a decision has been taken for political ends. The decision taken by the Government will not wash. It might buy votes from the people of Koolyanobbing, but it will not buy votes from the people of Southern Cross, Moorine Rock, Carrabin, or Bodallin. They are the people who pay in excess of $20 a tonne for grain freight rates, when the miners are paying $11.50 or $11.80 for their freight rates. That just will not wash.
They were the two major points I wanted to make. I have other matters which are relevant, and because this is a Budget debate, I can raise them. The first relates to the drought in the Eastern States, and the consequences of that drought.

At the moment, a large number of livestock and a large number of secondhand machines are coming into Western Australia. I wear two hats in this place; and I am not ashamed to admit that I am a farmer. In fact, I am proud to be one. I come from an area in which the greatest expanse of skeleton weed ever found in this State was discovered in 1973. I know what effect that weed can have on the wheat-growing industry.

It is imperative that if we are to have livestock and secondhand machinery brought into the State from the Eastern States, our quarantine provisions should be more than adequate to ensure that the people in districts receiving these livestock and taking the machines onto their properties do not experience the same problems that we had. The Agriculture Protection Board receives funding from the skeleton weed levy to effect the eradication or control of skeleton weed; but that amount only touches the surface. Associated with the eradication or control of that noxious weed is an enormous contribution on a voluntary basis from grain growers.

No grain grower is likely to accept the challenge of maintaining control over noxious weeds if the Government of the day or the department, which is responsible for the quarantine provisions, demonstrates that it is inefficient or lax in the administration of its duties. It is imperative that all the livestock coming into this State from the Eastern States areas suffering from drought are submitted to the most rigorous quarantine provisions.

Similarly, it is important that all secondhand machines coming into the State are subject to the same quarantine provisions. I would go as far as to say that this matter is so important that the properties of the people who purchase livestock or agist them, or buy machines from the Eastern States, should be placed in quarantine for a period of two years and be liable for all the costs of controlling any noxious weed that may be introduced to the State or introduced to their properties by the action they have taken. That would be fair and reasonable; and it is something to which the Government must address itself.

I know that the Minister for Primary Industry answered a question recently about this subject, saying that quarantine provisions would be strengthened in future. I welcome that; it is important, otherwise the amount of voluntary effort contributed by farmers in ensuring that noxious weeds such as skeleton weed are controlled would be wasted. If there is no visible action by the APB ensuring that the most rigorous controls are imposed, the people will give up the fight, and I would hate that to happen.

The next matter relates to something which affects only the northern part of my area, and that is the Agaton water scheme. This issue was promoted by the former Premier of this State and various groups, particularly within the Dalwallinu, Dowerin, and Koorda Shires. A proposal has been put that a precedent be set inasmuch as the capital contribution for reticulation of the water be made not only by the State and Commonwealth Governments on a matching basis, but also by the primary producers of Western Australia who, it is said, should be asked to make a contribution. If that were to happen, I point out that I am opposed to the principle of farmers making capital contributions to the reticulation of water supplies.

This would create a very costly precedent; and if the precedent is to be established, it is incumbent upon the Government to ensure that the farmers who will be in the Agaton scheme are given the opportunity by referendum of indicating whether they are prepared to pay the price, which would be quite substantial. It would amount to something like $25 per hectare; and when one considers that the average farm size in the area concerned is just under 2,000 hectares, one would realise the farmers would be asked to contribute something like $50,000 cash per farm. That would make inroads into the cash reserves and operating accounts of farmers, particularly when one bears in mind that they would still have to pay the usual water rates and charges.

It is most important that if the Government moves away from the usual procedure of having water reticulated to rural properties on the basis of a 50:50 contribution by the State and Federal Governments, that matter be referred to the people involved by way of a referendum. I hope the Government takes upon itself the responsibility of making sure a referendum is conducted.

They are some of the points that should be raised in relation to this Budget. I am concerned that some of the “highlights” of the Budget are decisions that have been taken for political expediency, and I have indicated those decisions which it has been demonstrated have been made for that reason. The Government must be cognizant of the fact that people are intelligent enough to recognise why the decision was made and that it will not cut a great deal of ice with them.
I support the Budget.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

(Continued on page 4345.)

METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Water Resources) [5.01 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I say at the outset that I had hoped to present to the House an amending Bill which would bring completely up to date all the provisions for metropolitan water services. That has not been found to be possible because of the great complexity of legal problems of drafting on all aspects of water supplies, sewerage, and drainage, and the supply of these services to the community. What has been done therefore for this session of Parliament is the completion of those portions of legislation that, under completely different headings, cover several important issues, while at the same time allowing the Metropolitan Water Authority to continue to provide all the complex water services which the community requires under the old Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act as amended.

This Bill brings up to date in particular the two very important provisions of drainage and works. It consolidates these legislative matters, and provides also for more equitable arrangements with regard to land, entry onto land, the rights of the landowner or occupier, and several other issues to which I will refer.

Quite often in debate on legislation it is not necessary to spend much time on definitions, but this is not the case here. I wish to discuss the term “drain” as defined in this Bill. Mr Speaker, as I will state when explaining the companion legislation, you and I know what is meant by a “drain”. It is simply something that is used to carry away surplus water. That is the way we understand it and as it is defined in this Bill. But that is not the way it was defined in 1909 when the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Bill was passed. In those days, at a time when typhoid epidemics were so common, the word “drain” was defined as a way of carrying not just surplus water, but also sewage and urine. In short, sometimes, but not always, a drain was what we now call a sewer, and it has remained with that definition until this legislation before the House now.

At present many other major aspects of drainage are either not dealt with or else are dealt with inadequately in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act. Consequently, in the companion amending Bill, all the part which deals with drainage is to be repealed, and associated changes are proposed to other sections. This provides the opportunity which is taken in this present Bill for a completely new and comprehensive approach to drainage.

An arterial drainage scheme is to be prepared in consultation with local councils and appropriate authorities. As the name implies, this arterial drainage scheme or plan is intended to show, in time, the lines of arterial drains that thread through the metropolitan area. Therefore it will include drainage catchments, lakes, swamps, wetlands, rivers and streams, existing and proposed drains, as well as lands that will benefit from drainage and that contribute to the need for drainage, and the existing and the proposed drainage system.

The arterial drainage plan may be thought of as a set of maps which show for the metropolitan area the general way the drainage works naturally and with man-made drains. It is not in any way a statutory scheme in the sense that a town planning scheme is. In fact, a great deal of the success of the plan will come from the fact that the authority can work with local authorities, potential and actual developers, private land-owners, and town planning, environmental, and other bodies, in planning out what the drainage system is and should be.

The arterial drainage plan is intended ultimately to show all the matters contained in the legislation. At present, it already exists in part in the form of overlay maps, and in the vesting of metropolitan main drains in the authority and of other drains with local authorities. But for some years it is likely to remain a dynamically evolving plan being developed in a co-operative way by the authorities involved.

Attention has to be given realistically to the way that drains are built and managed as well as being designed merely as lines on maps, and the legislation deals with this also. In the first place, if practicable, drainage courses will be declared.

The idea of drainage courses and provision for their declaration is introduced for the first time so as to assist again in forward planning. A drainage course may be thought of as being like a road reserve, whereby notice is given in advance of the possible use of a swathe of land for drainage. Where practicable, existing topography and watercourses may be used as drainage courses.
The Bill provides that notice be given of a proposal to declare a drainage course, and for negotiations and objections. There may be problems in declarations of drainage courses, as there usually are in forward planning and in reserves of land. Provision is made for negotiations with owners and local authorities to overcome such problems as far as is practicable.

Procedures are provided where some arterial drains or portions of them are to be declared main drains, in which case it is the responsibility of the authority to maintain them. In order that the authority might be able to do so, certain powers are given to the authority to control blocking of a main drain, or pollution of it and connection to it, and other similar powers detailed in the Bill.

The scheme still will allow for some drainage control and rating by local authorities. The authority can rate for drainage only for drainage areas served by existing main drains or proposed ones.

In order to ensure that the rights of an individual or local authority are protected, the authority cannot declare a main drain unless it is in a drainage course, an easement, or reserve, or with the agreement of the owner or occupier. The proposal also must be advertised, and provision is made for objections.

The authority may recommend and the Minister may propose and, after having regard to objections, may declare a drainage area, which is one that benefits or will benefit from, or contributes or will contribute to, the need for drainage services. Therefore a drainage area is one for which drainage charges may be required.

The difficulty of framing legislation about drainage in a metropolitan area such as Perth is that it must provide for the present situation as well as plan for the future. It must take into account the responsibilities and the work done by local authorities as well as by the authority or its predecessor, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board. It has to take into account the topography and the natural watercourses, and the role these play and have played in drainage. It must take into account financial aspects such as headworks charges for major development proposals as well as the drainage charges and rates paid by owners of small blocks of land. It must take into account the possible community benefits of drainage, which may apply in these modern days even to people who do not own land in the area, but who may drive through the subway at Subiaco, for instance, on their way to or from work and expect the road not to be flooded.

These possible benefits, as well as possible recharge of aquifers by surplus water and the preservation and management of wetlands, are all factors that must be considered.

The present Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act does not take these factors into account in sections relating to drainage. Therefore the companion Bill makes provision to repeal the part about drainage so that these new provisions can come into effect. It is believed that this comprehensive new approach taken by the legislation before the House, particularly as regards the idea and approach to an arterial drainage scheme, will overcome the difficulties of what has often been a most contentious issue. Extensive discussions were held with local government officers about the intention of this approach and, with the correct and necessary co-operation, this approach will work effectively.

The Bill provides for the authority to carry out works in three categories. Firstly, major works include the construction of dams, waste-water treatment plants and other defined works. Secondly, general works include construction of mains for water supply, of mains for sewerage, pumping stations, and other specified works. Thirdly, exempt works are more in the nature of routine maintenance and repair work.

The three categories will ensure appropriate public notices, attention to the rights of local authorities and individual land owners and occupiers, as well as more efficient administration and operations in the field.

Major works require wide public advertisement and notice being served on affected local authorities and landowners. There is provision for comments and objections, and where practicable, alterations to meet those objections.

The approval of the Minister is necessary, and the authority must report to him on the objections and whether or not they have been met.

General works require more limited notification, in this case to the local authority and any landowner likely to be adversely affected. Again, objections and comments can be made. If they cannot be met, or if the authority desires to deviate from the publicised plans beyond specified limits, the approval of the Minister is required.

If the Minister considers that a proposed general works may be of sufficient general interest, he may direct the authority to advertise and otherwise treat it as a major work. For exempt works to be constructed on private land, the owner of the land must request the authority to do the work.
In matters of routine maintenance and repair, the Bill makes the entry provisions applicable, as they are for all entry onto private land.

A new part is given to the important matter of entry. The provisions are modelled along the lines of the existing provisions of the State Energy Commission Act. Except for emergencies and where it is suspected that the requirements of the Act are being violated, prior notice must be given to the owner and occupier.

The authority is empowered to gather information about engineering matters and carry out investigations of a general and a specific nature. It may investigate underground water resources.

In all works empowered by this legislation, the authority must ensure, so far as is reasonable and practicable, that as little inconvenience or detriment as possible results.

If there is some damage after entry or works, there is provision for the authority to make good the damage. If it cannot be made good, there are provisions for compensation.

The authority may now enter into agreements in its own right with owners of land, so as to obtain or use portions of land, it also may lease land if it has no immediate use for it.

This Bill therefore ensures that there are ways other than through the resumption powers under the Public Works Act for the authority to have land vested in it or acquired.

Concern has been expressed that there may not be available sufficient new general valuations for the entire area served by the authority in order that it might calculate equitable rates. It will be appreciated that the Valuation of Land Act provisions are directed towards valuations for different districts or shires or council areas. For each one of these, general valuations may be in different stages of completion at a time of the year when the authority must consider all 26 such areas or districts.

Provision is made for the circumstance where there are not enough complete general valuations for the overall purposes of the authority. The Minister may then empower the authority to use in the next rating year the valuations which are shown in the current rating year. Provisions made under that circumstance include one to ensure that there is continued limitation of annual increases of amounts charged and that there is continued provision for payment by instalments and other measures approved by Parliament in the last session.

Although this amendment does not cover all the matters which I had hoped that it would, it is still practicable to give to the authority some of the more general powers in the specification of its broad functions, in such a way as to ensure recognition of the broad responsibilities and duties of the authority.

Such broad duties as the conserving, managing, preserving, and distributing of water for domestic and other uses come into effect. It is necessary for the authority to take a broad approach because of the way in which water supplies must be managed carefully. A similar broad approach to drainage was explained earlier.

The authority is also empowered and in fact given the duty of carrying out or promoting relevant research. It is given the duty of ensuring the conjunctive use of water services, and of water both above and below the ground. In some past years, the authority has had to rely on underground water supplies to serve the community needs, even to the extent of providing about half the total water from underground. Obviously it is essential for it to consider conjunctive uses.

In conclusion, I make no secret of my disappointment that I am not in a position to present a complete consolidated new Act to replace the 1909 Act and the 30 or so amendment Acts which have been passed over the three quarters of a century since the original Act. But members who have studied the relevant Acts passed in the last session, and who study this Bill and the associated Bill, will realise just how complicated are the legal issues.

I am proud of what has been achieved already, and I am proud of what this Bill can achieve.

This Bill has given a bold new lead to the management of drainage in co-operation with local authorities. It has updated the approaches to works so that the interests of the community are protected fully. It gives broad and far-ranging responsibilities to the authority on all aspects of water services for the metropolitan area.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Parker.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

MR MENAROS (Floreat—Minister for Water Resources) [5.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to make further amendments to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act of 1909 and to repeal portions of that old Act so that further progress
can be made towards a complete and modern new Act.

These amendments and this Bill should be read in conjunction with the related Metropolitan Water Authority Act and amendment Bill.

One of the most important features of this Bill is that it makes provision for new methods of rating which will give additional flexibility in setting levels of rating and charging to take into account the requirements of the community. This is done by means of regulations made by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister after the Minister has had consultation with the authority.

Methods of making fair and reasonable charges for water services have been studied extensively and studies currently are being made here in Western Australia. The charges obviously have to be set at levels such that the authority has enough income to provide the water services that the community expects and for which it is willing to pay.

For the average domestic consumer, the way in which the amount of his water services bill is calculated is relatively simple. It appears that the Perth community now generally accepts the principle of paying for both services and use of its domestic water supply. It is a fair and equitable arrangement, and with the introduction in the last session of Parliament of the flexible methods of payment of bills and billing of the owner rather than the occupier, there are further advantages.

Methods of making fair and reasonable charges for water services have been studied extensively and studies currently are being made here in Western Australia. The charges obviously have to be set at levels such that the authority has enough income to provide the water services that the community expects and for which it is willing to pay.

For the average domestic consumer, the way in which the amount of his water services bill is calculated is relatively simple. It appears that the Perth community now generally accepts the principle of paying for both services and use of its domestic water supply. It is a fair and equitable arrangement, and with the introduction in the last session of Parliament of the flexible methods of payment of bills and billing of the owner rather than the occupier, there are further advantages.

It now generally may be appreciated that the supply of services of water sewerage, and drainage over the Perth metropolitan area must take into account very many factors in calculating equitable charges. There are dozens of possible combinations of service charges and allowance and usage charges which are applicable. The charges that were based on valuations and that were levied after the general valuation of 1980 highlighted several existing inequities, and I formed a working party to share the task of finding fair and reasonable ways of making charges. Studies by the working party and the authority are continuing. This Bill provides flexibility to implement acceptable findings.

The authority has a responsibility to advise the Minister as to the aggregate charges tailored to the revenue requirements that would be necessary to meet the needs of providing water services. The Minister and the Cabinet have in the past accepted the responsibility of setting the aggregate amounts of charges that are levied. This process will continue, but this Bill provides that this be flexible by the use of regulations that the Governor has to make and approve.

The remainder of this Bill makes necessary legislative provisions to take into account the improvements in legislation on water services provided under the cognate legislation of the amendment to the Metropolitan Water Authority Act.

Therefore the Bill repeals the drainage provisions of the Act. These are replaced with exciting yet realistic provisions which I have outlined for the accompanying Bill. It is sufficient to say here that the whole matter of drainage was one of the most inadequate features of the existing Act, unsatisfactory both to the Metropolitan Water Authority and to local authorities alike. Its replacement in the new version after repeal of part VIIA by this Bill has resulted from long discussions with local authorities as well as from analysis of the role of the authority itself.

In as complex a piece of legislation as the principal Act which this Bill is to amend, there are what might be called inherited problems of legislation which must be very carefully reviewed to make certain that a change in one portion does not make another portion inconsistent. That is the major reason that the draftsman has taken longer than I had hoped to modernise this legislation.

As an example of the problems that this old principal Act caused, I can refer members to the provisions made by this Bill for the word “drain” to be replaced with a new term “property sewer”.

Now members and I know what we mean by a “drain”. It is simply a way to carry off surplus water such as after heavy rains. But in the year 1909 when this principal Act was formulated, the word “drain” applied to the way sewage was carried, and “sewage”, by definition could include faecal matter, urine, and liquid wastes whether domestic or otherwise.

That definition of a “drain” continues in the present legislation. This Bill provides the opportunity to bring it up to date, by making the distinction between a property sewer as defined in this Bill and a drain as defined anew in the companion legislation. With this Bill, we can now talk of a “property sewer” and understand that it is a conduit that can carry wastewater or sewage, while a drain is something that carries surplus water.

I have spent some time in this speech on this matter not only because it is important by itself, but also because it is a good example of just how difficult it has been to bring this legislation up to date in all regards.

The words “drain”, “drains”, or “drainage” occur about 200 times in the principal Act. They occur in many different sections and also with the different meanings from our present modern
meaning. Therefore we cannot simply amend the term "drain" and hope that in all its 200 uses it fits in with the amendment. Instead, there must be a very careful analysis of the present laws and the desired laws; and this must take time to accomplish.

This amendment Bill takes the legislation forward quite a lot further. It builds on the related legislative achievements of the previous session of Parliament. It provides the necessary flexibility to enable the Governor to make regulations about rating and charging methods and matters of detail that will be able to take into account the findings of ongoing studies of such matters.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Parker.

**BILLS**

*Cognate Debate*

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Water Resources) [5.31 p.m.]: I seek leave for a cognate debate. It will be seen that if one Bill were not accepted and the other were passed we could be without provision for quite a lot of facets in this legislation, and alternatively, a number of provisions could be duplicated.

Leave granted.

**FIRE BRIGADES AMENDMENT BILL**

*(No. '2)*

*Second Reading*

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Minister for Police and Prisons) [5.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill sets out to amend the Fire Brigades Act to establish for the first time in the Act specific provisions for the discipline of officers, firemen, and other specified employees.

Members will recall my comments in connection with the Fire Brigades Amendment Bill passed in the earlier part of the session of Parliament this year. At that time I made mention of the fact that work had been undertaken over a period of time towards the development of new replacement legislation and I also commented that work was far from complete and that it was decided that the amendments then proposed should proceed as a first step. However, it has become clear that there is an urgent need for the discipline code to be spelt out in the Act if the overall control of discipline in the fire service is to be maintained.

The total review of the Act is still a priority matter which I will take up with the incoming executive chairman.

Discipline procedures in the fire brigade currently are provided by regulations 133 to 140 of the Fire Brigades Act regulations. These regulations on many occasions over recent years have proved to be inadequate, and inherent weaknesses have been demonstrated through legal challenge in the Supreme Court. The advice of Crown Counsel is that the regulations are defective and the Bill proposes that the discipline code should be in the Fire Brigades Act.

The code specifies what constitutes a disciplinary offence by an officer, fireman, or other employee and the procedures are designed so that disciplinary issues may be dealt with expeditiously and in the appropriate manner without resort to time-consuming formal legal proceedings. Discipline is seen as the responsibility of the chief officer and the uniformed officers under him, and the code responds to this principle.

A charge may be made by an assistant chief officer, superintendent, district officer, or officer in charge of a fire station who has authority or control over the person charged.

The code provides for a charge to be heard by an assistant chief officer except that the chief officer will hear all charges laid by or referred by an assistant chief officer.

An officer, member, or employee aggrieved by a decision of an assistant chief officer or the chief officer may appeal to an appeal tribunal consisting of a stipendiary magistrate as chairman, and employer and employee representatives. The appeal tribunal will determine any appeal by rehearing the matter appealed and the decision of the appeal tribunal will be final.

The discipline code accommodates the right of the employee to a fair hearing while at the same time providing a system which is consistent with the requirements of an essential service such as the fire brigade. There are other consequential amendments to the Act to accommodate the discipline code and to the powers given to the chief officer thereunder. There are powers to provide for regulations in connection with the more detailed working machinery of this code.

The Bill provides also for the chief officer, with the approval of the board, to make and issue standing orders for the management and good order of permanent fire brigades.

The discipline code as proposed will remove the previous uncertainties and reinforce the chief officer's authority as to his responsibilities in his overall command of the officers and men serving under him.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Parker.
BILLS (3): MESSAGES
Appropriations
Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—
1. Alumina Refinery (Worsley) Agreement Amendment Bill.
2. Metropolitan Water Authority Amendment Bill.
3. Fire Brigades Amendment Bill (No. 2).

BILLS (3): RETURNED
1. Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill.
2. Land Amendment Bill.
3. Land Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

QUESTIONS
Questions were taken at this stage.
Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.31 p.m.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL
Second Reading: Budget Debate
Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR CRANE (Moore) [7.31 p.m.]: I add my support to that of other members who have spoken from this side of the House on the Budget brought down by this Treasurer. I congratulate him on his first Budget, and especially for the manner in which he has kept up the tradition of good housekeeping to which we have become accustomed. It was not easy for the Treasurer to take over from someone who was so well versed in public affairs and had such great experience in the world of commerce as Sir Charles Court. It is fitting and proper to say that I for one believe that, as people in my electorate have expressed to me, this Treasurer has filled extremely well the shoes of Sir Charles Court, and in many instances has done much better than some people anticipated. I do not make that comment as a criticism of, but as a compliment to this Treasurer who has taken upon his shoulders the full responsibilities of his office. He has shown he can be humane, and understanding of the many problems which confront him.

I noticed that this year's Budget provides funds for several areas of my electorate. I thank the Government for the funding for which I have been asking over a number of years. As a patient man I appreciate the fact that we cannot get everything at once.

Within the province of the Minister for Works $149 000 has been granted for the establishment of a water supply at Bindoon. The Shire of Chittering is the only shire in Western Australia whose home town does not have a water supply. The people of Bindoon, and the people of Chittering Shire as a whole, have expressed their agreement with what the Government has at last decided to do.

I have requested that funds be provided for some important projects needed in my electorate. While I would not want it to be felt that I have a note of criticism in my voice, I am concerned that it has taken so long, and may take longer, for the Government to commence these projects. In particular, I refer to the establishment of a marina and fishing boat facility at Jurien. I noticed that many other places received similar facilities—good luck to the members who represent those areas. Similar facilities are to be provided right up north, and at Bunbury and Esperance, to name just a couple of places. However, I challenge the point that the fishing industry in those areas is as valuable to the State, and will continue to make as important a contribution as Jurien. Jurien is the centre of a valuable rock lobster industry. The harbour is exposed to rough seas; therefore it is important it has proper facilities for boats to be moored in safety, and it is recognised the fishermen do have problems and additional costs associated with moorings.

It appears that $49 000 has been spent to investigate the establishment of an inland marina or harbour for this area, and another $18 000 will be spent this year. However, I remind the Government that in all fairness it should recognise the importance of my request and should carry out the project I suggest immediately the investigations have been finalised. I expect that proper fishing boat facilities at Jurien will commence to be constructed within the next 12 months. I am not being unreasonable.

The fishermen at Lancelin have asked that I investigate the situation in regard to jetties in that area. Members may recall that recently I asked the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife a question on this matter. I asked for arrangements to be made for him to inspect the area and to consider whether another jetty should be provided. I said that if it were provided, it should be at the right place and be adequate for the requirements of the fishermen.
The letter I received from the people at Lancelin maintained that a marina was necessary, but we all must be fair. I am sure the people of Lancelin will be fair and will realise Lancelin is protected by an outer reef and Lancelin Island. For most of the year it enjoys a fairly sheltered anchorage, and is quite different from Jurien. The necessity for a marina at Lancelin does not exist at this time. We cannot afford such luxuries as an expensive marina; we cannot build marinas merely for the sake of building them. I am sure the people of Lancelin and Jurien accept this point, and I hope the people of Lancelin soon will have a jetty controlled not by the fishing companies, but by the Government. I hope also that when the jetty is constructed fishermen will be able to sell their catches wherever they want.

I was happy recently because the Minister for Education journeyed through parts of my electorate, and officially opened the new district high school at Gingin. The people of my electorate have been fortunate over recent years to have established not only that high school but also a district high school at Yanchep. The member for Vasse is correct; his confidence is well placed.

Mr Pearce: That makes you Robinson Crusoe, doesn’t it?

Mr Laurance: His confidence is well placed.

Mr CRANE: For many years I have indicated my concern at the daily problems arising in regard to the Agaton water project. I realise much work has been carried out by various Government departments and authorities such as the Country Water Supply and the Department of Agriculture. We have been very fortunate that Sir Charles Court, who is quite familiar with the scheme, has elected to help us with the proposal. Although the scheme is not out of trouble by any means, I hope it will go ahead so that our northern and eastern wheatbelt areas will have an adequate water supply.

Recently the Gingin Shire Council brought to my attention a problem that is created each year at the mouth of the Moore River. Guilderton and the mouth of the Moore River are attractive holiday areas. The boating population, however, has increased to such an extent that pollution is caused towards the end of each summer, and therefore a need exists for a boat launching facility at Guilderton for boats to be launched directly into the ocean.

The present situation creates difficulties. I accept that at the moment we have a shortage of funds, but the Government should be aware of the problem. I hope that in the near future the Premier will be able to visit the area to determine the situation for himself.

Some time ago a suggestion was made to me by the Gingin Shire Council; I believe it has a deal of merit. As members are aware, the proceeds from the sale of Crown land go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, from whence funds are spent wherever the Government finds it necessary to spend them. The suggestion is that some of the revenue from the sale of Crown land in a particular area be earmarked for use in that area.

The suggestion has great merit, and if necessary, legislation should be introduced to accommodate its implementation. For instance, proceeds from the sale of some of the building blocks at Guilderton should be earmarked for the local authority to spend on developing facilities such as the boat launching facility to which I have referred. The Gingin Shire Council and I will be pursuing this suggestion further, and I hope the Government will give the suggestion favour.

Mr Blaikie: That would have considerable merit for country areas because country people are disadvantaged generally in comparison with their metropolitan counterparts when it comes to expenditure in areas such as the one you have mentioned.

Mr CRANE: The member for Vasse is correct; country people are disadvantaged as a result of the economies of scale between country areas and the metropolitan area. Recently a boat launching facility was built at Ocean Reef, and I understand more money will be provided for other facilities in that area. I do not say the facility constructed is not good, or was not required, but expenditure for similar facilities at places such as Guilderton are not given as much support because the populations of those areas are so low. An important point to remember is that most of the people who use amenities and beaches such as those at Guilderton are from the metropolitan area. A great many people living in the metropolitan area want to get away from the city to areas such as Guilderton. Really, those city people cause the pollution which exists at Guilderton. That is not to say those people are not welcome. However,
more funds should be provided for proper facilities to be constructed.

As a result, unfortunately, of my reading The Western Mail of the weekend before last, a problem came to my attention. I do not know how it could have evaded me, but it has existed for approximately three years. The problem exists at Gingin. I have always claimed that I have known who sleeps with whom in my electorate, but I did not know this problem existed. I refer to the diversion of the Moore River. I asked the Minister for Works a question in this Parliament yesterday about this problem, and I was most concerned by his answer. Members may be aware from reading the article in The Western Mail that a certain gentleman has altered the course of the Moore River, where it runs through the Gingin Shire, from other people's properties.

As my question asked yesterday would indicate it was a Mr Maraldi. I was led to believe that in no way were we permitted to divert the course of a major river. Yet, from the Minister's answer to my question we find this has happened in Gingin.

In the last paragraph he said—

The Public Works Department unsuccessfully attempted to overcome what appeared at the time a small problem of flood plain management by relatively simple means, but the Government cannot now justify the expenditure of large amounts of taxpayers' funds to restore a comparatively small loss of real estate value to a private person.

While I accept this may be so I find it hard to accept that a responsible Government department such as the Public Works Department could possibly have underestimated the magnitude of something which occurred a few years ago. A serious blunder has been made by a person or persons who I am sure were responsible for this matter at that time. I have no fear of saying that the Public Works Department has a responsibility in this matter because the course of the Moore River has been diverted from the front of a person's property which has now been devaluated. In relation to the question I asked yesterday I find it hard to accept that the landowner should be expected to bear the expense of legal fees when the Government clearly was at fault through negligence.

As members know the electorates will change at the coming election and as a result of this I will lose approximately 6,000 electors from Wanneroo.

[Interruption from the gallery].

The SPEAKER: Order! I appeal to those people in the Public Gallery to remain silent while they are in the gallery. I ask also that the level of casual conversation on the floor of the House be reduced.

Mr CRANE: As a result of the redistribution of boundaries my electorate will take in the areas of the shires of Toodyay, Coorow and Carnamah and I will lose the townsite of Wanneroo which has approximately 6,000 electors. My electorate at the moment is considerably over-quotas as members would know.

It is always a disappointment to lose areas which one has become accustomed to represent and where one has made many friends. I have made many friends in the Wanneroo area and they have been kind to me in many ways and the fact I was elected at a time when all the political pundits considered it was against impossible odds may suggest that some people were happy with the manner in which I represent them.

I am happy to be going back to the Coorow and Carnamah areas. I mentioned to the members for Greenough and Mundaring who currently serve those areas, that I would go to those districts to make myself known. It seems the areas are in good heart and I noticed in the Budget that funds have been allocated to build a jetty at Leeman. This indicates that the member for Greenough is just as active as I am sure I was before he took that area from me. At that time I was responsible for the development of water and electricity supplies at Leeman and Greenhead and for the development of the school. Unfortunately, the change in boundaries took that area from me.

A similar situation applies in relation to Toodyay, although currently a problem exists in relation to the Goonaring and Beelaring Springs, in the Toodyay Shire, in an area which previously was owned by the Government when the Wundowie works were in operation, but which was sold to Agnew Clough Ltd., and has since been sold again.

Concern has been expressed in relation to the clearing of land that has taken place and to the serious salt problem the springs will have in the future if the catchment areas are not preserved. We are endeavouring to do something in this regard. Unfortunately, I believe the Government was lax and, as it happened, the land was sold and is being developed. I hope we may be able to rectify the situation by purchasing back some of the land and allowing it to rejuvenate itself and return to its natural state so it can be preserved for all time. It is important that we pay attention to such areas of land in Western Australia. Our land is our heritage and we have to remember that God will not make any more. All that we will ever have is what we have at the moment, so it is
necessary that it be preserved for future generations. The Treasurer is well aware of and understands the situation and thankfully he received a deputation from the people of Toodyay recently when they explained the situation to him.

Several Federal matters which concern me should be brought to the attention of the House. Many people do not differentiate between State and Federal Governments. When they see a member of Parliament in the field they immediately relate to the problem which is causing them concern even though it may not relate to that particular Government. The problem may be outside a member’s province yet most of us try to help in whatever way we can and we will make further strong representation on this matter.

I was concerned with the Federal Government’s removal of the exemption of excise on diesel fuel and with the effect it will have not only on the primary industries which include farmers and fishermen — and I have received many deputations from these people — but also on State charges as explained in the Budget by the Treasurer. The SEC, Westrail and other Government instrumentalities use diesel fuel and the exemption from the excise which had been granted on the use of fuel for off road purposes will cost this State a great deal. I believe the Federal members of Parliament have seriously let us down in this regard and it is our responsibility to advise them of this and not let them get away with it.

Mr Pearce: Why do you not vote against them? That would stop them getting away with it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pearce: The Parliament is full of Liberals who do not care a damn about the people.

Mr CRANE: The Government is to tax bank account debits which will affect the sphere of our stamp duty. No doubt it will cause the Treasurer some concern. This matter has been brought to my attention by my electors. It seems that State members of Parliament are more accessible to the public than Federal members. This is understandable because of the geography of our State and the difficulties that members experience coming from Canberra and travelling through their electorates. Therefore, we cop the brunt of what they should be getting.

The final matter I would like to mention concerns the discussions that have taken place recently about a new flag for Australia. I thought it would be most appropriate to raise this matter although I know it will not be well received in some circles. There are times when we should remind ourselves of the need for national pride and for our concern for patriotism in this country. I remind the House that the present flag — the Commonwealth blue ensign or as it is frequently called, the national flag — is not a flag which just happened to be designed by accident. At the moment competitions are being encouraged in the Press for people to design a flag which reminds them of Australia. The Commonwealth blue ensign was the result of a world-wide competition called at the time of federation in 1901 by the then Federal Government which felt Australia, as a new nation of federated States, needed an appropriate flag. Surprisingly over 32,000 people participated in that competition. Five identical entries which closely resemble the present Commonwealth blue ensign were received, three from Victoria, one from New Zealand and one from a Western Australian, Mrs Annie Dorrington.

The reason the Union Jack is in the corner of the flag is that it resembles our ties with Great Britain. When Captain Cook arrived in Australia in the Endeavour he was flying the Union Jack, as was Matthew Flinders, who arrived in the Investigator. If one looks carefully at the Union Jack one will find strong ties with our own Christian background because it is made up of three Christian crosses. The centre cross —

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

Mr CRANE: — is the Cross of St George, the patron saint of England. The white diagonal cross on the blue background is the Cross of St Andrew, the patron saint of Scotland.

[ Interruption from the gallery.]

The SPEAKER: Order! I again remind those in the gallery that they can stay there as long as silence is maintained. If it is not I will have no alternative but to ask for the gallery to be cleared. I do not want to do that but if the proceedings of this Chamber are interrupted I will have no alternative but to take that action. I ask for your co-operation.

Mr CRANE: The third cross, a red diagonal cross on a white background is the Cross of St Patrick.

Mr Pearce: You cannot blame the Irish either, this is a pathetic speech.

[Applause from the gallery.]

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not be able to tolerate that sort of intervention. I ask again for those in the gallery not to make any noise.

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Mr Speaker; if the gallery wants me to entertain them, I promise I could do that, too.
As I was saying, the third cross represents the patron saint of Ireland, which is an indication of the Christian background of our nation. The southern cross in the fly of the flag is well known to us all, if we care to look at the sky of the southern hemisphere on a clear night. The large six-pointed star represented each State of the federation. The only alteration to the flag came later when we added a point to the star to make it a seven-pointed star to represent also the Commonwealth Territories.

So, the flag has been designed for a reason. I believe our newspapers and other media would be better served were they to encourage the people of our nation to be more patriotic to their country and their flag, rather than be disruptive and ask for change merely for the sake of it.

I realise a great deal of business is to be conducted tonight. While I have a considerable amount of time remaining to me, I intend to conclude my remarks at this point so as to enable that debate to proceed. In this, I am affording members opposite a courtesy many have not afforded me. This will be the last time this year I will have the opportunity to speak in the Budget debate.

Mr Bryce: It might be the last time, forever.

Mr CRANE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that I will be back; there is no need for him to become overexcited on that point. I simply wished to add my few words in support of the Budget and of the Treasurer, for the work he has done in formulating this balanced Budget during extremely difficult times. I convey to him the gratitude of the people, the majority of whom are appreciative of what he has done and is trying to do in the formulation of this Budget and of what he intends to do for the continuing prosperity of Western Australia.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [8.03 p.m.]: Does the Treasurer want me to adjourn the debate?

Mr O'Connor: Not at this stage.

Mr DAVIES: Would that not be in accordance with the undertaking the Treasurer gave the member for Fremantle this afternoon; namely, that we would continue with the Budget debate until about tea time, and then get on with the Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill (No. 2)?

Mr O'Connor: No, it is not.

Mr DAVIES: That is what I have been told, and if I am to believe anyone, I believe the member for Fremantle. This afternoon, he went into the Treasurer's office and the Treasurer said we would go on with the Budget until about tea time. The Treasurer then conferred with his deputy—withe whom we rarely want to deal these days—and the final decision was that that would be the course to be followed.

Mr Rushton: That is totally untrue.

Mr Nanovich: You are simply grandstanding for the gallery.

Mr DAVIES: If I have a choice of believing either the Treasurer and his deputy or the member for Fremantle, I know which member I would believe; the member for Fremantle told me not two minutes ago that the Budget debate was to be adjourned. This is indicative of the complete shemozzle the Government has made of the handling of the business of this House.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr DAVIES: Day after day, we do not know where we are going. We receive instructions which are countermanded almost as soon as they are given. Indeed, the member for Morley, who looks after the business of the House from the Opposition's side, had to tell the Deputy Premier, who is supposed to look after the business of the House on behalf of the Government, that he no longer wanted to deal with him; that the Deputy Premier was an embarrassment; that he could not give clear instructions. The member for Morley told the Deputy Premier the only way he could find out what was going on to any reasonable degree was to talk directly to the Treasurer.

The member for Morley reported to the party room that the Deputy Premier was completely impossible to deal with and that he could not get any sense or direction out of the Deputy Premier or the Treasurer. Once again, if it comes down to an argument between the member for Morley and the Deputy Premier, I know whom I would believe.

In some ways, I am glad the Treasurer has refused to honour his undertaking of this afternoon.

Mr O'Connor: I did not give such an undertaking.

Mr DAVIES: The Treasurer on two occasions this afternoon gave such an undertaking to the member for Fremantle.

Mr Bryce: The Treasurer would not remember.

Mr DAVIES: If the Treasurer believes in the advertisements he has been placing in the newspaper, at terrific cost to this State, one would have thought he would welcome the opportunity afforded by the large audience in the gallery tonight to explain the purpose of his industrial legislation, and to talk about all the things on which he will only go into print. One would think the Treasurer would want to face the people. One would think every member opposite who has been
telling us about what a wonderful Bill it is, would be pleasing with his leader to adjourn the Budget debate and get on with the Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill (No. 2) in order that Government members might tell the gallery exactly how good this Bill is.

However, members opposite know what the Bill contains; they are shamefaced about the whole business. They do not want to defend their actions in front of a gallery such as we have here tonight. So, the Treasurer intends to drag on the Budget debate as long as he possibly can in the hope that perhaps some people in the gallery will tire and go home and so that the Government will not have to defend that most abominable piece of legislation.

We know what is going to happen when members opposite try to defend that Bill. Last night, in a speech lasting 2½ hours, the member for Fremantle showed us at every turn just where the Government was wrong. Every time some of the smart alecks opposite interjected and tried to put the member down, he would give them an answer and show where they were wrong and how very little they knew about the arbitration system.

The Minister in charge of the portfolio of Labour and Industry (the Hon. G. E. Masters) has been in the country for only five minutes, and would not know of the proud history of the labour movement in Western Australia, or of the history of industrial arbitration as we have known it and come to appreciate it. We do not want that system to be decimated.

I am pleased to have the opportunity for a few minutes to speak to the Budget. Last night, I was surprised the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development entered the debate to support the Budget. In 21 years in this House, I have never known a Minister to find it necessary to support his Treasurer in such a manner. If Ministers want to speak to the Budget, they do not enter the debate until their section comes up for discussion during the Estimates debate. However, because the Budget is such a poor effort and will do very little for the community—in fact, it will do a lot against the community—the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development felt constrained to tell us what a good Budget it was.

I thought the Minister may have tried to defend the “Go for it” campaign, because if ever money was wasted, it has been on the television advertisement which tries to implore us to buy Western Australian-made goods. Such a campaign is nothing new; Bert Hawke started it back in the 1950s, and it has continued since then. If the Government is to spend money promoting WA-made goods, it should do so in a way which might attract people to buy those goods instead of driving them away. I have never seen anything as stupid as the Arabs, the nuns, the London “bover” boys, and half a dozen other nationalities joining together to pretend there is nothing in this world as good as Western Australian-made goods.

I have been fortunate on two occasions to attend the awards presentation held by TVW Channel 7 to honour the best commercials made in Western Australia. I have been proud of some of the fine commercials produced in this State. The best thing the Government can do is to find out who won the competition last year and employ them as its agents. I have done a very wide survey and asked people what they thought about the television advertisements and, unanimously, they have said the advertisements were terrible. They are terrible. We want Western Australian-made goods to be sold, but the Minister is doing nothing by using those kinds of advertisements.

However, the Minister would not tell us that last night; in fact, he told us very little. He said the campaign was taking a new turn.

Mr MacKinnon: I did not say that last night.

Mr Davies: That is correct; last Thursday, in answer to a question without notice, the Minister said that the campaign was to take a new turn; that is the best thing which could happen to it.

I have seen 21 Budgets introduced into this House and, increasingly, I find they are becoming quite dull. At one time, we knew what increased charges were to be imposed and what benefits were likely to be granted, because they were all announced at the time of the Budget. However, these days the Treasurer—adopting the course followed over the past several years—comes to the House and says, “The Budget imposes no increases in taxes or charges.” We know that, because all such increases have been imposed long before the Budget gets to the House.

I just happen to have a list of increased taxes and charges, which I should like to read to the House. Stamp duty on mortgages has been increased by 14.7 per cent; stamp duty on credit facilities by 20.2 per cent; payroll tax by 13.8 per cent; tobacco licences by 30 per cent; revenue from Crown grants by 128.5 per cent; royalties in total by 30 per cent; iron ore royalties by 26.5 per cent; and petroleum royalties by 28.6 per cent. They are only some of the increases.

Mr Coyne: Tell us about the situation in New South Wales.

Mr P. V. Jones: I thought you advocated increased royalties.
Mr DAVIES: People know they are paying increased licence fees; they know of the increased impost on petrol; that public hospital charges and outpatient fees have increased; that bus and rail fares have increased; people know some freight charges have risen and that electricity and gas charges have gone up by 13 per cent; they know their domestic water and sewerage rates have increased by 11 per cent and their drainage rates by 9 per cent; people realise their household water charges have gone from $68.50 to $76 and that the charge per kilolitre of excess water has gone from 28c to 31c; and in addition, country water charges and port charges have increased. I do not need to list them all because the public know those charges have been increased, and are feeling the result of those imposts. Yet the Treasurer has the gall to come in here and say, "The Budget imposes no increases in taxes and charges."

Mr O'Connor: That was true.

Mr DAVIES: It is perfectly true that the Budget does not provide for increased charges. However, the figures speak for themselves. Those increases were imposed last April, May, and June and we have been paying them since that date. We all know about them, because the people who trek into my office tell me how increasingly difficult it is for them to live.

We have to look only at the Treasurer's own economic statement to find out exactly how we are being hit. I do not need to give members the figures relating to this area, because everyone knows them. Nevertheless, this might be the time to mention to the House some of the increases which have been imposed. Each year, the per capita cost of taxes and charges has increased, roughly in accordance with the increase in the Consumer Price Index. I suppose that is fairly reasonable; if the Government is to impose any increases, we would expect them to be in line with the CPI increases. The Government does not like the unions going to the courts and asking for a flow-on of CPI increases. However, the Government feels quite entitled to increase its own charges to that degree.

In 1977-78, the cost of taxes per head of population was roughly $271; in 1978-79 it had risen to $292, an increase of the order of the Consumer Price Index. In the next year, 1979-80, it had gone to $320 per head of population; that is, the average being paid by each Western Australian. That amount again was in accordance with the CPI. In 1980-81, it had gone up to $360 a head, at which time it was $12 per head in front of the inflation rate for that year. In the following year, 1981-82—the year just completed—it rose to $405 a head, or $18 in excess of the inflation rate for that year. Over the last two years, the figure has increased until now we are now paying, on average, $30 per head of population over and above what we should be paying in accordance with the charges established in previous years. This results directly from the Government's workings with the Federal Government, and the new federalism.

I have not heard anyone this year complaining about the new federalism. I have heard plenty of complaints about Malcolm Fraser and what the Liberals in Canberra were doing. What the Government here did helped in no way to reduce the CPI; neither did it help the average worker to meet the ever increasing demands that he had to face.

As I said, in the past two years, we have been paying in excess of $30 per head because the imposts being put on by the Government by way of taxes and so forth are so much ahead of the inflation rate.

It is interesting to note that of the $405, $175 per head is made up of payroll tax. The least amount consists of probate and succession duties, and, or course, that is a result of the action taken by this Government several years ago to abolish probate. We would have thought that that would have met with general approval. At the time, I was not very happy about the move, and I thought we could have raised quite considerably the minimum charge before probate applied. We still would have received some probate from the people who have made a killing from bottom-of-the-harbour schemes.

Mr O'Connor: I am sorry, I did not quite hear. Are you saying we ought to bring back probate?

Mr DAVIES: I am saying there is scope for probate; I will quote a letter from C. B. Hugall in The West Australian of 2 November last. Mr Hugall is an accountant in St George's Terrace; and certainly is not a follower of the Australian Labor Party. I met him on several occasions and found him an absolute gentleman, but I doubt that he has ever embraced the philosophies of the ALP.

Mr O'Connor: Is that Charlie Hugall?

Mr DAVIES: It is C. B. Hugall. I imagine it would be. His letter is as follows—

Nearly two years since the decision to phase out probate and estate duty the ultimate effect is beginning to be realised. It must now be obvious that the effect will be that the rich get richer and the poor maintain their position, with an ever-increasing gap between the two.
Over the next generation we will see 5 per cent of the population owning 95 per cent of the wealth of the country. This, in turn, will create an aristocracy based on wealth.

History has demonstrated that the disadvantaged majority will not tolerate such a situation indefinitely.

There seem to be only two answers. They are:

1. Introduction of a capital gains tax.
2. Reintroduction of Federal estate and State probate duties, with a more generous exemption base than previously, and with total exemption from spouse to spouse. Gift duty would need to be re-introduced simultaneously.

Option 2 is favoured since it ensures an examination of one's affairs by the taxing authorities at least once during a lifetime.

It would also reap a desirable harvest from the huge superannuation payouts our Federal parliamentarians voted themselves in April this year, and the public service superannuation scheme approved by the Whitlam government in 1975.

I can see a lot of good sense in that because we were netting from probate duty something like $16 million a year, at its height. We are now receiving less than $1 million from probate duties, because now they are applicable only to estates that are being cleared up.

When one realises that five per cent of the population owns 95 per cent of the wealth, one knows there is something in what Charlie Hugall said in his letter to the paper in November 1981.

Mr MacKinnon: In other words, you agree with it?

Mr DAVIES: I certainly do. As he says, I agree that there should be no duty spouse-to-spouse; but in huge estates, some money should be paid to the State in probate duties.

Mr MacKinnon: And capital gains taxes?

Mr DAVIES: No, I did not say "capital gains taxes". I agree with the statement made by Mr Hugall, because I do not believe that people should amass fortunes of the type being amassed at present. That is a matter which will have to receive consideration.

When I challenged him on various taxes, the Treasurer always said, "What are you going to do? If you take off one tax, you have got to put another tax on." When I asked him what tax would replace probate duty, he did not reply, and he has not replied since. I asked him that question on a number of occasions.

Mr O'Connor: You were referring to the previous Treasurer, I take it?

Mr DAVIES: Yes.

As I said, last year we had a Consumer Price Index below the national average. I thought we could be reasonably proud of that. In the June quarter of 1981, the change for Perth was 8.2 per cent, and the national average was 8.8 per cent. In 1982, the Perth change was 11.2 per cent, and the national average was 10.4 per cent! As we pointed out yesterday evening, Western Australia has the third lowest CPI for the September quarter, and it is likely that it will become worse.

The Treasurer did not appear to know about this. Indeed, he thought we had the best CPI in the nation. The following appeared in the newspaper this morning—

Mr Burke interjected, saying that WA had the third best. Mr O'Connor said he had read in the paper where WA's rate was the best.

I do not know whether the Treasurer is given to reading the newspaper, but that is what appeared in it.

I read the editions of State Report that the Premier puts out from time to time. Originally they were issued weekly; but lately we have found that they have been coming out intermittently. Sometimes they are three weeks apart, and sometimes a fortnight apart; but certainly they are not weekly. As I have said in the House before, they always provide a little bit of humour. I am sorry that they do not appear more often, although their infrequency means quite a saving to the State.

I look at the State Report to see whether there is any indication of an economic recovery, any hope for the future, or any new jobs to be created. What did I find recently? "Look for the silver lining"! Good God! Next the Premier will say, "Chin up; cherrio; carry on." That is the kind of situation we are getting into. "Starve to death while you are doing it, but look for the silver lining. Things will be better!"

During the last election, we were told that the Government would get the money flowing into Western Australia at the rate of $5 million a day. We would see 180,000 jobs in a couple of years. Certainly the jobs have not materialised, and the investment is not here. What does the Treasurer say about that now? He says, "Well, it is a good thing that things have slowed down and we can take stock of ourselves." He is the man for the moment. Whereas before it was all go, go, go,
riding on the crest of the great wave of prosperity—we were going to be there before every other State, and we were going to be better off in every other way—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the level of background conversation and noise be reduced. It must be very disconcerting for a member attempting to make a speech to have so much noise in the Chamber.

Mr DAVIES: As I said, recently the Treasurer has said that we should be thankful that the pace has slowed down, because it is giving us time to get our thoughts together. I have to admire him. He is the man for the moment! He certainly adjusts his comments according to the circumstances of the day.

The Treasurer's attitude has not stopped the endless trail of people to my office looking for jobs, looking for mortgage relief, looking for help with their problems. Time and time again I have had to tell them that there is very little I can do for them.

I want to speak briefly about another matter, and that is the gall of this Government which tries to enforce its will upon everybody and everything. We have spoken on other occasions about what happened with the previous leader, when he had a mock-up made of a Time magazine with his photograph on the cover, to give the impression, when it was distributed abroad, that he had actually been honoured by having his face put on Time magazine. That was paid for by the public of Western Australia. Indeed, a whole string of such things have been happening; and they will happen as long as the Government can do what it wants to do to make certain that its people are put in the proper place.

I want to criticise once again the money spent on advertisements by the Government to defend its industrial legislation which it is so coy about standing up and defending in the House tonight. The Government spent money on State Report, from which I have just quoted. We have seen endless advertisements from the Minister for Recreation (the Hon. R. G. (Bob) Pike), whose photograph appears anywhere and everywhere. His advertising budget was overspent. Of course, we have the propaganda supremo, Mr Leggoe, who was appointed to the Premier's office to oversee the public relations section. We have recently seen the new spectacle of Ministers holding gatherings in their offices in the hope that they would be able to curry favour with a few electors and a few people who might have some influence in the community. I can understand their doing this, but I cannot understand their doing so at the expense of the taxpayers. However, as I say, they always want to have their way.

The latest thing that came to my notice was the absolute gall of the Minister for Recreation who tried to have cancelled the appointment of Mr Ian Templeman to the Australia Council. Like the British Council, the Australia Council is a prestigious organisation which is not loaded down with supporters of the Labor Party. Indeed, I do not know of one Labor supporter who is on the Australia Council, although it was set up initially by the Whitlam Government.

Mr Pearce: They are not appointed for political reasons, anyway.

Mr DAVIES: No. They are appointed for their expertise in particular fields. I was delighted that Mr Ian Templeman, the Director of the Fremantle Arts Centre, was appointed as a representative from Western Australia—

Mr Pearce: An excellent choice.

Mr DAVIES: —when Mr Nicholas Hasluck retired from the position. I thought it was an excellent choice indeed.

I will quote from The Canberra Times of 11 September as follows—

A row between a Western Australian Liberal minister and a Federal National Country Party minister over Australia Council appointments surfaced at Parliament House this week.

The Western Australian Minister for Cultural Affairs, Mr Pike, sent telegrams marked "confidential"—

No doubt, that was done at Government expense. The report continues—

— to several of his party colleagues on the Federal backbench complaining about an action by the Minister for Home Affairs and the Environment, Mr McVeigh.

He accused Mr McVeigh of ignoring the advice of Western Australian Liberals.

"After a phone call from my office to the Australia Council, I have learnt that the Minister for Home Affairs has made appointments to fill the five vacancies on the Australia Council," the telegram said.

"Despite the views expressed by me, and supported by you, I now learn that Mr Ian Templeton—

He did not have the name correct, incidentally. The article in The Canberra Times continued—

— of the Fremantle Arts Centre, has been appointed as the sole Western Australian rep-

"This act by the Minister has ignored the wishes and advice of all of us who represent Western Australia and has caused me great concern as to what the future will hold for Western Australia from this Commonwealth organisation."

My knowledge of Mr Templeman is such that I believe he will be a far better person than any we have had before. He is a man of great distinction and has been the Director of the Fremantle Arts Centre for 10 years. He trained as a specialist art teacher and has been associated with the Fremantle Arts Centre, the Fremantle Art Gallery, and the Fremantle Arts Centre Press. He is on the advisory panel of the ABC and on the committee of the Festival of Perth. He was a Churchill fellow in 1976 associated with arts. In 1978 he was Citizen of the Year in this State in the field of arts. He previously worked with Liberal Party Ministers, Mr Tony Staley being one. He had never met Mr Pike and yet that Minister complained to Canberra about a man he had never met and complained that his—the Minister's—views had been ignored.

Dr Tim Pascoe is the new Director of the Australia Council and he worked for the present Prime Minister for a couple of years. That is how political it is getting over there. Yet here we have a man in Mr Ian Templeman—I do not know what are his politics—who has a distinguished record in the arts in Western Australia and is still a young man, yet he has been criticised in this way by a Minister who does not even know him. He replaced Nicholas Hasluck who was Deputy Chairman of the Australia Council at the time.

Last Thursday week the Treasurer was at a function with me at the Fremantle Arts Centre and he commented on what a great place he thought it was. The Treasurer was the guest of honour and he made a speech in which he said how great the centre was and what great work it was doing. Yet a Minister in his Government had been criticising its director. The Chief Secretary's action was shameful to say the least.

All I can believe is that the Chief Secretary wanted a political appointment himself; perhaps that is why he was upset. The advice he would have given to Canberra would have included two names. One would have been Hal Colebach, a former Liberal Party candidate and a man whose record in the arts field would certainly not match the record of Ian Templeman. The other name would have been John Harper-Nelson, who is a good fellow and, again, I do not know this man's politics, but I do not believe he has the qualifications of Mr Ian Templeman.

Bruce Lawson had only just arrived in this State to head the Arts Council when things started to emanate from a Minister's office querying the sort of qualifications he had because he had worked for a socialist Premier in Canada. That is the sort of thing this Government's Minister did, and Mr Lawson no longer is with the Arts Council. I am waiting to see who is to be appointed as the new director. It was said at the time that Bruce Lawson would not last because the council had another person it wanted as director. If good money is to be spent in these areas we need to have the best possible people in charge; but the Government is not prepared to see that this happens. It is politically biased, constantly and continuously.

I have never heard as shameful a direction as that given by this Government that if a person is an endorsed Labor candidate he cannot work in the office of a member of Parliament. Although the Government can give that sort of direction, it is yet a Government that still has W. W. Mitchell on its payroll for about $20,000 a year; it is still a Government which allowed Phillip Pendale to continue working as a Minister's secretary when he was an endorsed Liberal candidate.

The Government is running scared; it is frightened and has the staggers. This Budget will do nothing to help it electorally because it is a Budget already forgotten.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [8.34 p.m.]: I join with the member for Victoria Park in criticising this Government for the advertising in which it is indulging; it is nothing more than a political campaign in another form. We have heard very clearly from members opposite on numerous occasions that they do not believe in the public funding of election campaigns, yet they are prepared to do the very thing which they claim should not be done. The Government should come clean on this sort of practice and introduce legislation enabling all parties to be funded during election campaigns as they are in New South Wales and elsewhere in the world. We are one of the last areas in the democratic world not to adopt this system and it is high time we got around to doing something about it.

Liberal Governments believe they have more access to funds at election times—which they have—and they are able to take advantage of opportunities in advertising on those occasions. The Labor Party has to scrimp and scrape to get enough funds together to mount a meaningful campaign in the various branches of the media.
To make matters worse we now find this sort of advertising campaign being conducted by the Government. If it were a Labor Government in office doing this sort of thing, members opposite would be screaming to high heaven. No doubt rather than refuse advertisements from some sections of the Labor movement, the Press would run editorials criticising the Labor Party for its advertising campaigns and for using public funds for this purpose. That will not happen with this Government because it has good supporters in the various branches of the media. The Government will continue to receive that support while the people presently in charge of the various media remain.

I want briefly to deal with several matters of the parish pump sort although they are important to many people in Western Australia to some degree. The first matter is the determination made last week that the Commonwealth would proceed with option four of the development of Perth Airport. This option entails one serious problem. Members will recall that earlier in the year this matter was the subject of a speech by me during a grievance debate. I indicated then that if option four were not adopted, we would finish up with the worst system that we could possibly have been stuck with in the metropolitan area because the noise ratio would increase as the aircraft using the airport became bigger.

To give credit to the Government, it did go along with option four although it was not over enthused with the idea of having the second runway built too soon. With the support of the various groups and the local authorities, a number of meetings were held which in the end carried a fair amount of weight with the Commonwealth, particularly with its Public Works Committee, in making the recommendation it did in favour of option four. It went right away from option one for which it had opted six months earlier. It is remarkable to think that the Commonwealth had made its decision, but was influenced to alter it.

Having looked at the development plan, the only problem I see is that it still envisages an extension of the east-west runway. Should this happen, it will be the worst possible action environmentally that could occur.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: At present the bigger aircraft do not put down on that strip. I refer to the jumbos, the DC10s, and the other heavier aircraft. It is true that sometimes when an east wind is blowing, the 727s use the strip, but it is not suitable for the larger aircraft. If the runway is extended as proposed, these larger aircraft will use it on occasions in the future. This will create a worse noise problem over the South Perth, Rivervale, and Victoria Park areas than ever before. It is undesirable that this should occur.

It is true that the environmental committee of the House of Representatives still has not submitted its report on what it believes should be done. The Public Works Committee left things a bit in the air by indicating that the time of development of the runway could be influenced by the decision of the environmental committee. That committee is to hold several hearings in Western Australia and I hope the Minister for Transport follows up what is being done and, on behalf of the Government, points out that we do not want this environmentally bad situation to occur by the extension of this runway. If we do not lodge an objection to that work now, there is no saying that it will not be the first work done. A further delay on the parallel strip will be in accord with that because the Commonwealth will say the east-west strip can be used as well as the present north-south strip.

If we can arrange to have the same co-ordination with the action groups and the local authorities, backed by the Government, in presenting a submission to the environmental committee when it holds its meetings here later in the year, we could influence the early development of the other strip in the Newburn territory, which is really no-man’s land. If members do not believe me they should drive through the area and see just how desolate it is, even though it is just a few kilometres from the centre of the city of Perth.

Mr Rushton: Would you send me a copy of your corrected speech later?

Mr JAMIESON: I will do that.

It is undesirable that such valuable land so close to the city should be left in its present condition and not used after it has been secured by the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of extending the airport.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: I have spoken before of the Beechboro-Gosnells Highway and the desirability to have work on it concluded as soon as possible. At the unveiling ceremony of the proposed international airport terminal, the Minister for Transport indicated that the Government and the Main Roads Department would co-ordinate the completion of that highway. I put the suggestion to the Government that this could be a project considered in the bicentennial road programme. Perhaps it would need to be considered ahead of that programme; some sort of priority should be accorded it because it will be a bit expensive to construct the last link. Only about three kilo-
metres are left before it is completely joined. Knowing the area as I do, I believe it will be the most expensive three kilometres of the highway. It will need an interchange on Great Eastern Highway and a bridge over the river between Redcliffe and Bayswater before it goes on its way to Beechboro on the other side of the river.

Mr Rushton: I am giving it consideration.

Mr JAMIESON: Something must be wrong; I had better think about this again! It seems some consideration is being given to this work.

Let me now mention briefly Bentley Hospital. The other day I asked some questions about the hospital because I could not find any reference to it in the loan funds or the estimates which would indicate it would receive extensions this year.

The proposal alarms me because while I want what is proposed, I do not feel that the Minister has given the matter enough consideration. He has pointed out that Mental Health Services propose to commence a psychogeriatric treatment care and assessment facility on the site this financial year. I asked about the physiotherapy section which is now housed in temporary buildings and he said an alternative plan is being developed for the replacement of the facility which needs to be relocated to allow for the construction of the facility I have mentioned.

I am concerned because under the proposal, the psychogeriatric section would be on the other side of Hamilton Street where the physiotherapy section is at present. I do not see the need to break up a hospital system in this way. It may be because one section comes under the mental health system and the other under the Public Health Department.

It seems to be quite ridiculous because of the backup services which must be provided, such as X-rays for geriatric patients. They would need to be taken to the X-ray section of the hospital which means they would have to go by ambulance or be taken across the street in a wheelchair. During inclement weather that would become a greater problem still and all these factors have been overlooked in the planning.

In the Minister’s reply to my question, he did not make it clear what was proposed. For instance, the X-ray and lab sections work as a separate entity at Bentley Hospital and are connected by a covered walkway to the main hospital. As there is an abundance of land on site, it would be a sensible proposition to combine the services.

Last week the Government decided not to proceed with the police traffic section at the corner of Hamilton Street and Albany Highway because of opposition by the local authority and residents. That land abuts onto the hospital site, so it is available now if none is required. Why cannot this land be used? I make my complaint now because it is no use my complaining once a building appears on the other side of Hamilton Street.

There is an urgent need for new physiotherapy facilities to be provided because the staff have suffered temporary conditions for many years now. It is high time a proper building was provided.

I hope the Government will give consideration to the protection of the coastline of Western Australia. One has to be glad of one aspect which was brought to light as a result of the Falklands war. We lost the aircraft carrier that looked like being an encumbrance rather than an advantage to Western Australia. It may have left us in a position where we can expect more patrol boats of a faster calibre for the Kimberley and Pilbara regions, where they are needed.

I have mentioned this matter before, but wish to point it out again because many platforms are being constructed for offshore projects and the people working there should be protected from any marauders. We already have noted the incidents where a ship was attacked by pirate groups not far off the Western Australian coast. Something must be done now so that, if there is any sign of danger, those people will be protected. The people working on these projects are Australian nationals and ought to be protected.

Mr Blaikie: What about the Premier’s proposal for P150s?

Mr JAMIESON: I think that is a sound proposal. I am not a shipping architect, but I am sure they would be ideal. We need something to warn off any undesirable people. We could come to the situation otherwise where as the member for Vasse might say, it would be better to be red than dead.

Mr Blaikie: No, I am afraid that is your saying. I could not go as far as that.

Mr JAMIESON: We need a mobile force to keep out undesirables, but we will not keep out a mighty power if it wished to attack us. However, if we start talking about aircraft carriers, etc., and go overboard, we will not get very far at all.

Mr Parker: The Premier’s proposal is by no means new. A proposal was put to the Federal Government by various people, including me, as long as 12 to 15 months ago.

Mr JAMIESON: This idea has been floated for some time and it needs to be taken up. We need four to six ships to operate between Darwin and Geraldton. We do not have any worry from New
Guinea, so we do not need a naval strength there and, of course, we have no threat from the penguins in the south. On the other side, the New Zealanders are placid people, except perhaps their Prime Minister. We may need to keep one boat just in case he wants to burst in and we need to keep him out. We should be looking to military protection for the State.

I will not give a travel talk, because that has occurred here often when a member has returned from overseas, but I wish to say that, in association with five other members of Parliament, I spent the month of June in China.

They have a saying there that a man is not a man until he has been to the wall. Of course that might be a little different here with some of our financial people, but members will get the general drift of what they mean in China. One has to experience the system to have an appreciation of it. The country has a population of 1 000 million who are clothed, fed, and housed. When we consider China by comparison, we realise that we, as a country, have no administrative problems.

To coin a similar expression, I could say that a representative is not a representative until he has looked at the system in China and considered its problems. Our problems pale into insignificance when we consider China's. Whether or not it has a socialist system, we must admit that China has achieved something great, without force. China is a socialist system, we must admit that China has achieved something great, without force. China is a largest nation in the world population-wise and has made a great achievement in anyone's language.

I am sure I am echoing the opinion of those who travelled with me when I say that it would be a worthwhile experience for any representative in Parliament to see the most populous nation in the world which is able to administer in the way that it does. It clothes, feeds, and houses all its people and they still come up smiling.

The Premier of this State has trouble with his 1.4 million people and they are nothing like fully employed. I will leave those comments for members to consider because we do not have any problems in comparison with the conditions that exist in other parts of the world.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Treasurer).

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 October.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [8.59 p.m.]: I appreciate the length to which Opposition members have gone tonight to have me initiate debate. When supporting the legislation, I ask why it has become necessary for amendments to be introduced to the Industrial Arbitration Act—

Mr Brian Burke: Because you cannot win an election without them.

Mr MacKinnon: You are assuming we will win. Thank you.

Mr COURT: Our arbitration system has evolved over the years and continually has been tuned to the pressures of the time. The past two decades have been of tremendous economic progress for Western Australia, and our economy, as we are all aware, has become very much a part of the international trade circuit. Until this year, we were fortunate to have a healthy rate of growth, and business generally has been quite profitable.

Unfortunately, a mentality has built up among many of us that the prosperity we have experienced is a right, and the normal way of things. We have started living on expectations and not on performance. As the member for Kalgoorlie said today, a cargo cult has developed.

The industrial relations scene in recent times has been dominated by the growing strength of some powerful unions, with their officials negotiating every possible dollar and improved conditions out of an employer who generally has been profitable. For some years the iron ore industries in the north have been quite profitable and have found it easier continually to give in to some of the demands for increased wages and improved conditions. Some of the unions involved have seen certain weaknesses in the companies' bargaining position and have grabbed the opportunity to enforce closed shop control on many of the operations of these large companies.

Mr Parker: Are you aware the so-called closed shop operation in the iron ore industry is partly at the behest of the employers?

Mr Sodeman: That does not make it right.

Mr COURT: Elsewhere, large unions such as Mr Halfpenny's metal trades union, the TWU, and the BLF have been negotiating for increased dollars, shorter hours, and wages and conditions which finally have become unrealistic even in buoyant times. Now that the economy is suffering a downturn, these policies are seriously affecting employment. It is a matter of history now that the inflexibility of some sections of the union movement and our present arbitration system has resulted in an unacceptably high level of unemployment.

Mr Parker: Are you seriously suggesting that?
Mr COURT: That is particularly so with the reversal in the economy.

Mr Tonkin: Take the blame yourself! It is the system, is it?

Mr COURT: One does not mind enthusiastic negotiations, providing—

Mr Brian Burke: The employers win.

The Speaker: Order! Last evening this House was treated to one of the best speeches I have heard delivered by a member of the Opposition in support of the Opposition's point of view. The speech was heard almost in silence and it is a pity the people in the gallery who are interested in this subject were not here to hear the member for Fremantle make his speech. I thought it was a very well-researched, well-presented speech, and it was well received. The member for Nedlands has indicated by his demeanour that he intends to make his remarks to the Chair without fielding the interjections. I ask members of the Opposition to give him the same courtesies which were extended last night to the member for Fremantle when he presented his case.

Clearly, with members of the gallery as intensely interested in the subject before us as they obviously are, interruption will be incited by interjections from the Opposition benches. The members of the gallery have been exemplary in their attitude until now, and they have had to sit through some speeches which clearly were of no interest to them. I do not want to be placed in a position where I have to clear the gallery after the public have listened for so long and waited for the debate. That will happen if we have a situation where interjections fly thick and fast and the gallery reacts. I do not want to do that; I ask for the co-operation of the House.

Mr COURT: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

One does not mind enthusiastic negotiations, providing the agreements reached are realistic and related to performance. An unfortunate side aspect of union strength has emerged which some of the amendments in this Bill address. That is the stringent enforcement by some unions of closed shops, which even though they are illegal under existing legislation, are enforced and often accompanied by intimidation and standover tactics. Large employers have considerable resources at their disposal when they are negotiating, and unions have similar tools available to them. Further down the scale, small businesses, subcontractors, and the like, have little with which to fight against unreasonable demands.

The 1979 Industrial Arbitration Bill which was passed by this House, initiated provisions to protect the individual against excessive use of union power. That legislation and the amendments before us tonight support article 20 (2) of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states that no-one may be compelled to belong to an association. Convention 87 of the International Labour Organisation also upholds this principle of freedom of association as part of the protection of the right to organise. Article 2 of Convention 87 states—

Workers and employers without distinction whatsoever shall have the right to establish and subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned to join organisations of their own choosing without previous authorisation.

This Government, in line with the stated policy with which it went to the polls at the last election, has found it necessary to reaffirm the principles of protecting the individual's rights, along with other initiatives which have been written into these amendments to attune the arbitration system to the needs of our time—to the changing environment in which we find ourselves operating. These principles are that the individual has a choice of whether or not to join a union; that an employer has the right to exert lawful management authority; unions have the right, if consent is given by the employees, to lawfully negotiate and uphold industrial rights; and that the public have the right to expect that arbitration decisions will not seriously be to the detriment of the economy. All this is clearly stated in the Liberal policy, and I quote from our policy document which says under the heading of "Freedom"—

We are proclamation legislation providing unqualified freedom for union members:

* By ending compulsory unionism.
* By introducing voluntary unionism—with a free choice either way.
* By ensuring a free and private vote through secret ballots on proposals to strike.
* By recognising the right to strike only when a genuine secret ballot majority is obtained.

It should be clearly understood that we will firmly uphold these freedoms:

* We will act without hesitation against employers or unions who breach the freedom laws we have introduced.
* We will maintain a close watch to ensure fair play for workers who demand the right of freedom of choice—whether it be to join a union, or stay out of a union.
The Labor Party, which is supposed to be pushing a new, refreshing, modern image in its policy, wants to retain the existing Industrial Arbitration Act. It is saying, "Do not touch it; it works. Perhaps it is not perfect, but leave it as it is". It cannot hide from the fact that, currently, the arbitration system is contributing to unemployment and to some unsavoury practices which have taken place in the work place. Last night the member for Fremantle said—

The Bill is designed to dismantle the basis of our industrial arbitration system in Western Australia, to dismantle the foundations of that system, and to move towards a system in which the rights of workers to organise are substantially undermined and, any following collective bargaining which takes place as a result takes place with much strengthened employer organisations and much weakened unions.

I say that is incorrect, and that the member for Fremantle has brought in a red herring. This legislation is designed to strengthen the arbitration process.

Several members interjected.

Mr Tonkin: It is not.

Mr COURT: We are not debating tonight whether we are scrapping an arbitration system and introducing a collective bargaining system. As has been done over the past 78 years, we are introducing amendments to enable the Act better to handle conciliation and arbitration within our existing industrial environment. How do these amendments strengthen employer organisations and weaken unions?

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: A strong employer is a profitable employer, and that is the type of employer we want. A strong union is a responsible union—a union which is capable of representing the rights of its members.

Mr I. F. Taylor: One that does what you tell it.

Mr COURT: That is the type of strong union which will thrive in Australia. Talk of collective bargaining confuses the subject we are debating tonight. The member for Fremantle and Labor speakers in another place point out there are many forms of collective bargaining. This word—

Mr Brian Burke: It is two words.

Mr COURT: All right, it is two words. Most of the collective bargaining systems would not work in Australia. We have built up a tradition of arbitration, and we accept the benefits of that form of comparative wage justice.

Mr Parker: I wish you would tell the Minister.

Mr Brian Burke: The Premier is on record as favouring collective bargaining.

Mr COURT: I have been involved in contract bargaining in the auto industry in the United States on two separate occasions.

Mr Parker: On whose side?

Mr COURT: I will give the House two guesses.

Mr Brian Burke: We need only one.

Mr COURT: This experience, as humorous as it may sound to the Opposition, gave me an insight into the way their system operates. An arbitration system has evolved in Australia, and the amendments before us tonight are a part of this evolutionary process. We want a fair system, one which protects all parties including the community as a whole.

When talking about the arbitration system the member for Fremantle said that when it was first worked out, it was designed around the principle that might is not right. He said, on the other hand, that the basis of collective bargaining is that might is right. He said it created a situation where anybody who had the power to obtain something would use that power.

Is that not what has happened in the 1980s with our existing arbitration system? Have not some people used their excessive powers to obtain things?

Mr Parker: What powers would you describe as excessive? At what point do they change from being acceptable to being excessive?

Mr COURT: I am talking about a situation when muscle is used and small employers and subcontractors are faced with intimidation.

What the community wants is amendments to the arbitration system which will control this situation. We are all well aware of some of the incidents which have been taking place, and whether the unions are Federal or State, the practices are still the same, and they are occurring in our State.

Let us look at the activities of the Builders' Labourers Federation, and I will list some of them. There are threats of strike action affecting building sites, normally when non-membership of one or a few of the employees is involved.

Mr Parker: Are you saying that the threat of strike action is excessive use of muscle?

Mr COURT: These threats include the threat of further strikes made by the employees for employers to pay wages for the time they spend on strike; the threat of subcontractors for non-union membership, both on construction sites and in other places; the threat of black bans on constructions sites by the Transport Workers'
Union; and the coercing of companies to pay union dues for individuals. The one which has drawn particular attention lately is the stopping of concrete pours on construction sites to soften up employers for union demands.

I could go on with the record of the TWU. Cases have occurred throughout the State where non-union members have been forced off sites, and employers have been forced, through threats of strike action, to reinstate shop stewards.

Under the heading, "Violence to person and property and intimidatory conduct", the Winneke report has this to say—

There have been many instances put before this enquiry of threatening and violent conduct engaged in by officials and members of the Builders Labourers Federation in pursuit of demands made upon employers. These instances appear to demonstrate the existence of a philosophy in the federation that resort to mob violence as a justifiable weapon in the process of softening up an employer.

It is those sorts of tactics which none of us want. We do not want to see them becoming widespread in this State.

The ALP has demonstrated the hypocrisy of its policies. In recent times in this House, its members have said, on the one hand, that they want to support small business and they would go out of their way to assist them to grow and to remain profitable, but, on the other hand, that they support unions which have heavy industrial muscles, and which often enforce unrealistic conditions upon these very same small businesses.

The Leader of the Opposition, at one of his recent luncheons—luncheons which he seems to enjoy lately—had this to say, and I quote from The West Australian—

"One of the areas from which Labor Parties have traditionally retreated has been industrial relations because if you think about it, it is not an area that we can easily win in. Regardless of what union is involved, whether it is a temperance union or the Baptist union or some other union that is involved in some sort of disruption, inevitably the Labor Party wears the political blame because of the historical nexus between the party and the trade union movement", he anecdotally disclaims. "Now, there's a very tenuous nexus. It's not one that I can deny but it is certainly more tenuous than most people seem to think. Many of the unions that traditionally reflect disadvantage on the Labor Party are not and never have been affiliated with the Labor Party", he specifically denies.

The leader of the ALP is saying that. He is saying that his party is not under the influence of the union movement. At business meetings, he is trying to stand his distance from his traditional support group. I will be interested, when the Leader of the Opposition gets to speak, to hear his views on the amendments before us. I would like to know whether he supports the individual's right to go about his work.

Does the Leader of the Opposition support the right of small businesses to be profitable producers without being threatened with standover tactics? Does he support the audit conditions in the Bill which are still far short of those under which any company, small or large, has to operate? Does he support stronger protection for employers and employees against secondary boycotts that deny their freedom of movement and the right of essential supply? Does he support the retention of prerogatives of management, and does he support the provision for the consideration of the community's capacity to withstand the economic effects in bringing down those awards?

The Leader of the House may not be able to say what he wants to in this House, but I would like to quote the remarks of Mr Clyde Cameron in a book he has published recently. He said—

"Our creed amounted to this. We mustn't oppose anything, no matter how extreme, that is put to us by a union official or we will be branded as anti-union and then our preselctors will know we are also anti-Labor.

We all know what happens when a Labor Government comes to power. Labor members promise that, under a Labor Government, conciliation will be much more effective than under a conservative Government. This is the most hollow promise of all times.

Mr Herzfeld: Look at what is happening in NSW.

Mr Pearce: There are about half the strikes under Labor Governments than occur under Liberal Governments.

Mr COURT: What is happening in Mr Wran's State is a classical example of the situation to which I am referring. Of course, Mr Wran is the man who would fix everything. He has given his employees and Government instrumentalities virtually what they asked for—higher wages, shorter working hours. It was great until the Government started to run out of funds.

What has happened when the employees have been granted these things? Private employers have not been able to match the conditions, and Government employees have come back and asked for even more.
Can anyone imagine the Labor Party in this State standing up to the heavies in the TLC? No way—Labor Party members will do what they are instructed to do.

Mr Bryce: We have heard all this before, you know.

Mr COURT: To come back to the individual’s rights—

Mr Pearce: Mr Wran can win an election on fair boundaries.

Mr Bateman: How would you know what a Labor Government would do? Are you a member of the Labor Party?

Mr Davies: Cut it out! Draw the line somewhere!

The SPEAKER: Order! I would just draw members’ attention to the statement I made earlier. I asked that interjections be kept to the absolute minimum. If interjections do occur, they will just invite people in the gallery to respond, and that can mean only that I would have to clear the gallery—something I do not want to do. The member for Nedlands.

Mr COURT: To come back to the rights of the individual, and the member for Gosnells is very vocal on this matter in this House—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Canning appears to want to take issue with the statement I made. That is his right, but I would say that the debate has gone along particularly well. I do not think the member for Canning was in the Chamber when I drew attention to the fact that the member for Fremantle, in a very long and a very good speech last night, was heard in almost total silence. The only interjections, I think the member would probably admit, were interjections which enabled him to make points he wanted to make.

Mr Brian Burke: Except for the ones from the member for Bunbury!

The SPEAKER: By and large, the debate went very well. I would suggest that the same opportunity be afforded to the member for Nedlands to make his remarks to the Chamber.

Mr COURT: I come back to the subject of the rights of the individual, a subject about which the member for Gosnells has so much to say in debate. As I mentioned before, in a previous speech we heard that the member for Gosnells is appalled that the little people and minority groups are pushed around. Why does he not speak out for those people being intimidated by unreasonable and militant unions?

Mr Pearce: Tell us about them.

Mr COURT: Why does not the member for Gosnells speak out in support of subcontractors and small businesses which must face up to this treatment? He can ignore the BLF exercise which we read about in the Press. That sort of thing just does not exist as far as he is concerned. The protection rackets, where people are forced to join one or more unions just to get on a site, does not exist.

Mr Hodge: The Liberal Party ought to moralise!

Mr COURT: We continually must seek ways to improve our arbitration system.

Mr Bryce: A bunch of crooks!

Mr COURT: We must keep in mind basic principles when we are examining our arbitration system. These principles are the right of people to go freely about their lawful business;—

Mr Bryce: To the bottom of the harbour! All the way. Do you want some goggles?

Mr COURT: —the right of people to work; the freedom of political thought; and the right of companies, contractors, and subcontractors to operate without coercion.

Mr Parker: Do you take the same view of freedom of rights with respect to section 54B and the emergency foodstuffs legislation?

Mr COURT: The ALP must think it is a beaut system under which we are operating judging by its opposition to the amendments and its desire not to go ahead with changes to the existing Act, but the community as a whole is having second thoughts.

Mr Bryce: About the Liberal Party.

Mr COURT: Some sections of employers and employees are cosy, but what about the interests of the community as a whole? Some of the smaller people are struggling to operate in our existing economic climate.

Mr Bryce: If they paid their taxes —!

Mr COURT: Governments, whether Liberal, Labor, or whatever, have a responsibility to protect the community as a whole. The Government must consider the flow-on consequences, particularly at times like the present when we are operating in a tough economy. The Government must consider employment consequences; for example, the effects that flowed through the economy after the last metal trades award resulted in thousands of breadwinners no longer having jobs.

Mr Parker: There is no substantiation for that whatsoever. I challenge you to prove one iota of that.
Mr COURT: While the negative flow-on effects are still going through the economy, we see that particular union negotiating heavily for further increases in real wages, saying that those who still have jobs should be paid more. This is a great attitude, and it will make the industry even less competitive; it will put more people out of work, and it will widen the gap between the employed and the unemployed in our society.

As I have said previously, the State ALP in conjunction with the TLC, and the Federal ALP in conjunction with the ACTU, seem to blunder along a downhill path when it comes to industrial relations.

In this House, we hear very little about industrial relations from the Opposition. I believe Opposition members are showing a complete lack of understanding of the plight of employers and employees and of the community as a whole, particularly in our current times. I suggest that members opposite may have become too comfortable—they may have become too fat on their salaries.

Mr Wilson: Listen to it!

Mr COURT: They may not know what it is like—

Several members interjected.

Mr Bateman: Have a gander at your mob!

Mr Bryce: Silk sheets and silver spoons!

Mr Bateman: What a hypocritical thing to say.

Mr COURT: I think members opposite have lost contact with the community. Perhaps the carpets in this building, the silver tea services, and the Government pay cheques every week have put them too far removed from what is happening in the real world.

Mr Bateman: You are a funny man! You are a goose, to be quite honest!

Mr Bryce: Is it Peppermint Grove, Dalkeith, or Nedlands you hail from?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! The member for Nedlands.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: The Opposition has forgotten that the union movement commenced with people—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that interjections cease.

Mr COURT: —organising themselves voluntarily to win better wages and conditions.

Mr Tonkin: Against the opposition of your predecessor. Your predecessor used tricks against them.

Mr COURT: That is a right with which we all agree. However, the spirit of the original union movement is being lost. We can see what happens in the Teachers’ Union when membership is voluntary. A true spirit comes back into the union which cannot be achieved through compulsory membership.

The legislation before the House will reinforce the powers of the Industrial Commission and make it more effective. Responsible unions have nothing to fear. If they offer good services to their members, just like any business, they will attract a strong and enthusiastic following. This is the sort of union movement we must encourage, not one of compulsion which inevitably ends up in dissatisfaction.

As the Minister in another place stated, “We are aiming to be a catalyst for a healthy trend of long-term benefit to the atmosphere of industrial relations in the work place. Co-operation is much healthier than coercion.”

This is the message union officials rightly preach to management in their arguments for appropriate worker participation.

I support the legislation.

Mr Bryce: You are a silver-tailed delinquent.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [9.32 p.m.]: I suppose it is appropriate that the Minister handling the legislation should be attired in a dinner suit—

Mr Young: I thought you would like it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —and the only member so far to have defended the Government’s legislation is the newest member and the only one to have inherited his seat.

I intend to address myself shortly to some of the matters raised by the member for Nedlands and to attempt to cover them in the order in which he presented them to the Chamber. Firstly, however, let me make one or two points about the legislation which support our opposition to its passage.

There is absolutely no doubt that this legislation is not much about industrial relations, but a lot about the Government’s ideas of how it might win the next election.

Mr Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It reflects entirely and precisely the Government’s notion that confrontation puts votes in the ballot box for the Liberal Party. I warn this Government—a Government
that has the staggers—that the experience of the Heath Government in the United Kingdom was that, in the final analysis, confrontation led the voting population to decide that, regardless of to whom the blame might properly be assigned, the incumbent Government was the one to suffer the consequences.

After a long period during which the miners in the coal industry were on strike, the Heath Government was evicted from office, not according to the polls because the population believed that the Government was responsible for the strike, but simply because that Government was incapable of dealing with the problems that gave rise to the dispute and to the problems and inconvenience suffered by the population.

Five months from an election, this Government does not have a feather with which to fly. After nine years in office, unemployment is skyrocketing, inflation is out of control, and the economy is sicker than it has ever been. Interest rates are crippling small business which the member for Nedlands pretends so piously to support, and in every area of Government activity this Government has been found sadly lacking.

It is a tribute to the insensitivity of the present Government that, in that situation, rather than address the problems that impinge so heavily upon people, it instead chooses to promote to the front rank of its policies legislation of this sort.

It is appropriate to recall the complete lack of consultation in relation to this legislation. It was introduced in another place without any consultation whatsoever with the parties it will affect. The Minister is on public record as having said that the introduction of legislation without consultation is the normal way in which legislative change is enacted.

Mr O'Connor: Did the TLC refuse to go to those conferences?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Trades and Labor Council at some stage refused to attend the tame cat advisory committee that was used by this Government to dishonestly justify changes with which the TLC did not agree; but the Premier cannot deny the fact that whether or not that advisory committee had a representative of the TLC on it, this legislation was introduced without consultation, leaving the unions aside, and with no discussions with employers, who did not refuse to attend any meetings. The employers simply were not informed and that is a splinter off the mirror that reflects this Government's attitude towards industrial relations. Not only that, but also in his public defence of failing to consult, the Minister said that it was the normal procedure—the normal way of doing things—and that was a dishonest representation of the procedures of this Parliament, because it is simply untrue.

Legislation is invariably framed to reflect the needs and the considerations of parties who will be affected by the change in law. If we were to introduce legislation in this place without any consultation, we would spend hour after hour amending legislation as deficiencies became obvious.

Firstly, let me say this legislation will cause massive unemployment. At a time when this State is the third worst of all mainland States in terms of unemployment, this Bill will add at least three per cent to the ranks of unemployed in Western Australia.

Mr O'Connor: This State is also the best in terms of employment, is it not?
Mr I. F. Taylor: Definitely not!
Mr O'Connor: I just asked a question.
Several members interjected.
Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition steadfastly has tried to demonstrate to this Premier that his consistent claim about the creation of employment without taking into account the loss of jobs is an inaccurate and dishonest method of representing the situation.

Mr O'Connor: You are saying what I said is correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In any case, if the Premier is proud of the fact that 7.4 per cent of the work force is unemployed, let him say so.

Mr O'Connor: I am not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Premier is proud of the fact that one in every five young people aged between 15 and 19 years cannot find work, let him boast about it.

Mr Hassell: Your policies would produce plenty more.

Several members interjected.
[Interruption from the gallery.]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order and I repeat the comments which have been made earlier by the Speaker; that is, we welcome the people who are in the gallery this evening to the Parliament to take part—not to take part—

[Applause from the gallery.]

Mr Parker: They would be a damn sight better than 29 of the people who are here.

Mr Harman: Do you want another encore?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Under normal circumstances, of course, the gallery would
have been cleared, but might I suggest to the people in the gallery that this presents a great opportunity for them to hear the debate which is taking place. I ask members of the House to exercise due restraint in order that the debate may proceed, otherwise I shall be obliged to ask that the gallery be cleared.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I was saying that this legislation will cause massive unemployment.

Mr Hassell: It will not cause one person to be unemployed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will keep order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Minister is known far and wide for his sympathy with the unemployed and I have no doubt that he is privy to special knowledge not shared with employers or union people who maintain—I believe it is true—that this legislation will cause massive unemployment.

Little doubt exists that this legislation will be the vehicle by which the Government will provoke industrial disruption on a scale not previously seen in this State. If that is not going to cause financial embarrassment to employers in this State, I do not know what, in the mind of the Minister for Police and Prisons, it will cause. By its penalties, the legislation will impose burdens on business in this State. Indeed, it will cause many businesses to go bankrupt and I refer particularly to the small businesses about which the member for Nedlands spoke so often.

Mr Hassell: Don't you believe in penalties in industrial law?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I shall deal with penalties in industrial law and I shall explain to the Minister why I do not believe in them.

Mr Hassell: You believe in them when they are applied to employers who break awards, don't you?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is not my view that penalties have any possible place in industrial legislation and I shall explain to the Minister a little later. However, he should understand clearly that this legislation will provoke a rapid increase in unemployment both through the disruption that it will inevitably bring and the magnitude of the penalties it will impose on the actors in the industrial relationships.

Members should consider also in respect of those penalties that we are seeing inserted into industrial law minimum penalties of $400 in one case applying to one category and $1,000 in another. Members should understand too that it is clearly the case that penalties of this sort never have worked previously and that, on this occasion, the Government has not advanced any reason to suggest they will work now.

As far as the Opposition is concerned, in respect of the unemployment that will be provoked by this legislation, the Bill marks a new low in the bitterness with which the Government attacks this particular area of its responsibilities.

The member for Nedlands had much to say about how this Bill strengthened the arbitration system. I do not know which Bill the member for Nedlands has been studying, if indeed he has been studying a Bill, but I shall indicate what this Bill does in respect of the arbitration system.

Firstly, in a specific clause, it exempts from the industrial arbitration system's consideration potential areas of dispute that include housing rentals and matters, payroll deductions by unions, and what is called "management prerogative". If that is not taking away some of the powers of the Industrial Commission, I do not know what it is doing.

If that is not lessening the ambit of the arbitration system, what is it doing? If that is not sufficient, the member for Nedlands, the Minister introducing the Bill, and the Minister in another place—in fact all the proponents of the Bill—consistently have failed to explain what they mean by "management prerogative". Presumably the term "management prerogative" means something. If that will exempt from the arbitration system further consideration of potential causes of disputes, how will that course strengthen the arbitration system? It will not.

If the Government was dinkum about strengthening the arbitration system, it would consider allowing that system to address itself to every potential cause of disputes. But of course it will not.

Mr Hassell: Are you saying that includes all management issues?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt that the proper role of the arbitration system is to deal with any issues that give rise to a dispute.

Mr Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is what the arbitration system is about. That system cannot be strengthened by exempting from consideration items that have led and will lead to disputes. The member for Nedlands is living in a fantasy world if he thinks that that exemption will strengthen the system.

In addition we see in this legislation a provision to permit stand-downs without reference to the commission. Is that strengthening the arbitration
system or the Industrial Commission? That provision will take from the commission any reference with respect to stand-downs. Of course it will not strengthen the system. Once again the member for Nedlands and the Minister who introduced this Bill failed to address—at least, honestly—the truth of this Bill.

In addition we have the situation of the Attorney General having an unfettered right to intervene to correct decisions of the commission. Is that unfettered right likely to strengthen the arbitration system or the Industrial Commission? Of course it will not. In fact, it is the clear view of the Opposition that politics should play no role in the arbitration system or the Industrial Commission of this State.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The sooner politics is removed from industrial relations, the sooner we will get down to a sane and rational system that prevents the exacerbation of disputes by Governments chasing votes.

[Interruption from the gallery.]

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is clear that the central challenge to the strength of the system lies in the way this Bill creates in the minds of participants in industrial relationships a disregard for the Industrial Commission and the arbitration system. The Government cannot attack the system thoroughly and comprehensively, as it does with this Bill, and expect people to respect the operations, procedures, and decisions of that system. The distractions embodied in this legislation will diminish overall respect for the Industrial Commission and the arbitration system.

It is interesting to note that this legislation presents to illegality. It was interesting to hear the Minister for Health trading words with the member for Fremantle. I realise this matter is not within his responsibility, but if ever I saw a Minister out of his depth, it was the Minister for Health—the member for Fremantle ran rings around him. The Minister tried to explain his view that Federal laws are subordinate to State Laws. I cannot say that I have heard even third-year high school students pretend to that illogical concept. I heard this Minister say patronisingly to the member for Fremantle that Federal laws are subordinate to State laws.

Mr Young: I didn't say that at all.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: All of what I say when I repeat the Minister for Health is quite true. The question of consistency was explained concisely by the member for Fremantle. What the Minister fails to understand, as does his ministerial colleague in another place, is that once a Federal law enters a field, regardless of its addressing itself to specifics within that field, State laws in that field are subordinate to the Federal law. That applies to preference to unionists.

Mr Young: We know that.

[Interruption from the gallery.]

Mr Parker: You know that now because I explained it to you last night.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Once the Federal law enters a field, regardless of whether it addresses specific occurrences within that field, consistency demands that the Federal law takes precedence over the State law. What this Government is doing is propelling this State into a position from which it portends to illegality. All the ranting and raving that we hear about the Builders' Labourers Federation and the Transport Workers' Union are so much hot air because this legislation will not do anything at all about those unions. If this Government thinks that armed with this piece of legislation it will bring to heel the Builders' Labourers Federation, it has another think coming.

[Applause from the gallery.]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The gallery already has been advised by the Speaker on a number of occasions this evening that conditions apply to entry to the gallery while the Parliament is debating. That has been explained clearly, and has been understood; certainly the public already have been advised. It is my intention not to keep reminding the gallery because there are other actions the Chair can and will take. It is not my purpose to take that sort of action, so I appeal to members of the gallery to acknowledge the requirements they are obliged to meet. I call on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As I was saying, this legislation will not permit this Government to do anything about unions such as the Builders' Labourers Federation and the Transport Workers' Union, about which it complains so often, because those unions have Federal awards.

The next point I want to make is that the legislation will do one thing. It is centralised legislation that will force into the Federal jurisdiction all those unions which want to evade the effective provisions of this legislation. While the Premier parades his position to Canberra, and as Malcolm Fraser assumes the status of an untouchable—
Mr BRIAN BURKE:—the truth is that this Premier and this Government are forcing into the arms of the Federal Government and its Federal arbitration system all the unions that will seek Federal coverage to avoid the provisions of this legislation. I do not expect the Premier to understand that nuance, and I do not think he really knows what is in the Bill. What has happened to the Liberal Party in this State is this: The ugly side of the Liberal Party has taken control. The venerated member of another place, the Hon. Graham MacKinnon, was heard to say that the other side of the Liberal Party has taken control. The stand that nuance, and arbitration system all the unions that will seek arms of the Federal Government and its Federal

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is a typical comment of the Premier. He has a Gallup poll which talks about compulsory unionism. The poll was taken in June, but is not reflected in any way in this legislation. He consistently sits there muttering, “What about the 75 per cent of the public?” The next point the member for Nedlands raised related to prosperity and living on expectations of performance.

Mr Parker: Who better?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As the member for Fremantle asks, “Who better?”. The truth is that, as explained by the member for Kalgoorlie, the cargo cult mentality was installed in the minds of the Australian public—if that is where it is—by the Fraser Government, which promised so much, delivered so little, and taught people to be selfish, and to have no regard for anyone else. It is true that the nation of which we are so proud is living on expectations of the cargo cult mentality was installed in the minds of the Australian public—if that is where it is—by the Fraser Government, which promised so much, delivered so little, and taught people to be selfish, and to have no regard for anyone else. It is true that the nation of which we are so proud is living on expectations of.

Mr Bryce: You won’t be able to jump over the shadow of Mr Bartholomaeus, let alone get into Government.

Mr Pearce: You are one of the plastic uglies.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will touch briefly on the alternative to the management of industrial relations that this Government trots in. Firstly, it is the replacement of confrontation with harmony; and, secondly, it is genuine concessions to that change by way of tripartite consultation between employer, union, and Government representatives in preliminary discussions. Those discussions will relate to changes in the law prior to changes being introduced. The alternative is to retrain in order to adjust the stock of skills within the community, and to adopt the judicious use of education to make sure that readjustment is facilitated. But this State Government and its Federal counterpart continue to lead the economy through crises.

I refer also to this Government’s attention to occupational health and safety. If the public consider any one aspect, they will understand where the priorities of this Government lie. The fine for a first offence under the Shops and Factories Act is $100, but the fine for an inspector under that Act who divulges information is $200. That really encapsulates the sorts of attitudes this Government displays.

In the time left to me, I will address one or two of the points raised by the member for Nedlands. They are not in a sensible order, but I took them down as they were delivered. I hope the House will bear with me.

Firstly, the member for Nedlands said that we are in the process of fine tuning our industrial legislation so that it fits in with the times. Look, not even the employers’ federation supports the Bill, so apparently employers are not aware of the times in which the member for Nedlands appears to loll.

Mr O’Connor: What about the view of 75 per cent of the public?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is a typical comment of the Premier. He has a Gallup poll which talks about compulsory unionism. The poll was taken in June, but is not reflected in any way in this legislation. He consistently sits there muttering, “What about the 75 per cent of the public?”

The next point the member for Nedlands raised related to prosperity and living on expectations of performance.

Mr Parker: Who better?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As the member for Fremantle asks, “Who better?”. The truth is that, as explained by the member for Kalgoorlie, the cargo cult mentality was installed in the minds of the Australian public—if that is where it is—by the Fraser Government, which promised so much, delivered so little, and taught people to be selfish, and to have no regard for anyone else. If it is true that the nation of which we are so proud is living on expectations, the blame for that selfishness rests in the central thread of the philosophy to which this Government adheres. We heard the member for Nedlands say that industrial relations were dominated by powerful unions which force extra dollars out of employers. He said also that the iron ore industry found it easier to give in, but that now we are in difficult times.
Look, I know the iron ore industry is in difficult times because this Government has let the Japanese assume a stranglehold around the throat of that industry. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas very definitely has explained to this Government of that industry. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas tonight for a drink, I would not get past the first doorman to whom I addressed myself because I am not a member.

Mr Rushton: You are not forced to join either.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We have plumbed the depths of the Deputy Premier and he will now start.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: One of the quaintest things said by the member for Nedlands was when he equated strength with profitability—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We all heard him, even the sour-faced Minister for Police and Prisons must have heard the member for Nedlands say that strong business is profitable business. The great train robbers were profitable, but there is not much morality to their strength; and the statement simply is not true.

Mr Hassell: Like the ship painters and dockers' union—there is not much morality there, either.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The House should reflect on the need for Malcolm Fraser to establish the Costigan report to catch ship painters and dockers' union members who were affiliated with the Labor Party and all he turned up with were members of the finance committee of the Liberal Party.

[Applause from the gallery.]

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask those in the gallery to restrain themselves from acting in that way. If it occurs again I will have no alternative but to ask you to vacate the gallery.

Mr Hassell: It sounds as though members of the ship painters and dockers' union are in the gallery.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Throughout his speech, the member for Nedlands kept going back to the BLF and TWU and I have already said it is true those unions will not be touched by this legislation. An interesting point is that the member for Nedlands accused me of attempting to distance myself from the union movement and he asked a number of questions. Before I answer those questions, let me tell the member for Nedlands and everyone else what my position is.

Mr Laurance: We know your position. Neil Bartholomaeus pulls the strings and you jump.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The first point is that I do not agree with every action taken by every...
union in this State or nationally. I have said that previously.

Mr Hassell: It is just that you never tell the public when you disagree.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am telling the House what my position is and if the Minister for Police and Prisons cannot cope with it—I see the Premier has returned—he could replace the Premier outside. It is true I do not agree with every action taken by every union in this State or country. That is the first point.

The second point is that at times when strikes are called I think that particular weapon is inappropriate and at times when unions fail to strike, if I were in charge of those unions, I would think a strike was appropriate.

Mr Hassell: You never tell the public when you disagree with the unions.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The next point I want to make is this: The Opposition in the past year has not attempted to run away or retreat from industrial relations. It has been a policy of Labor political parties in the past to believe industrial relations is one area in which they cannot win and for that reason the tendency is for them not to venture into that field. The performance of the Opposition in this place has been the opposite to that trend and we have put it to the public that we are better at industrial relations than is the present Government.

Do members know what galls the Government? It is that business in this State is starting to believe us and say the big dangers to this community are not posed by ideological people who want to turn the world upside down. The dangers are posed by incompetent dullards who do not know the facts of the policies and do not think through the way policies will operate. That is why business is starting to look seriously at the Labor Party and is starting to compare a young and well qualified front bench with an aged and dull lot of Ministers who really are not doing much of a job.

Whether or not the Government likes it—and the Minister for Lands in his Rotary-type fashion can snigger—it is true. I do not care what the Government says, the longer it persists in its ignorance, the less time it will have to adjust when it finally wakes up.

Let me answer specifically the questions posed by the member for Nedlands. Firstly, he asked whether I supported individual rights. Of course I do.

Mr Hassell: Except the right of membership of unions.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In the seven minutes left to me, let me try to get through to this Minister that the logical extreme of nonsense is that I can walk into any club for which there is membership, and demand entry if it provides facilities. The logical extreme of the Minister's argument is that employers should have the right to choose to employ unionists if that is what they want, but they are denied that choice under this legislation.

Mr Hassell: What if they want non-unionists? Why do you not answer that?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Why do I not answer the Minister's nonsense? Why does not the Minister for Police and Prisons make a speech from his feet and not from his seat?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that interjections cease.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The next question was—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are confronted by these indentikit Liberals like the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development.

The next question the member for Nedlands asked was whether I thought small business has the right to be profitable. That is a little curious. Of course, I support the right of small business to be profitable. That is why we want to reform Government taxes and charges which are driving them into liquidation. Very briefly, we would restructure the whole charging system to stop the massive subsidies being paid by small business to big business.

The member for Nedlands asked whether I supported the audit provisions of this Bill. Of course the Opposition supports audit provisions. Most of the unions certainly do because many of them already apply them. He also asked about the capacity to pay. In a general sense that has been taken into consideration.

Mr Rushton: Why do you have to make the same speech as the member for Nedlands?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is beyond the comprehension of the Minister for Transport. This is a debating forum and that usually means that we have the opportunity to answer arguments and in that way not go off on a tangent as the Minister is so fond of doing.

Let me answer the following points raised by the member for Nedlands. He said in conclusion that we had a situation where the unions are still trying to achieve better employment conditions and wages for their members. It was their irresponsibility, he implied. But consider the position of workforce organisations in this country in the face of the duplicity of conservative Govern-
ments. This is demonstrated easily by reference to wage indexation. Who can forget the Fraser Government’s saying, “We will support wage indexation if the unions will agree to wage indexation. We will be half way towards a solution to our problems.” The unions, despite objection from many sections, did support the proposition and look at what happened.

The Fraser Government said, “We agree with indexation, but it must be partial indexation.” Partial indexation became the order of the day, and how did the Fraser Government respond? It said, “We support partial indexation, but it must be plateau indexation.” Plateau indexation was introduced and then what happened? The Fraser and Court Governments—now the Fraser and O’Connor Governments—came back with, “We support indexation, but there should not be any raise today.” That is true; that is the Government’s sterling performance in honesty and straightforwardness. Whether this Government realises it or not, it is assuming the stance of the walking dead, and I will tell members why: We have a Premier whose idea of leadership is political triteness. He cannot display the sort of direction and instruction which is so necessary.

Mr Hassell: Can’t you do any better than this? That is pathetic.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Is it not funny that we have a Minister for Police and Prisons—

Mr Mensaros: All you can do is smear people. That is all you are capable of doing in this place.

Mr Hassell: That is absolutely pathetic.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—who in this Parliament piously comes to the defence of the Premier—

Mr Hassell: You are only grandstanding for the gallery.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is entirely inappropriate to have a member trying to address the House being shouted down by other members. I ask for that sort of interjection to cease.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I repeat: Inside the House, the Minister for Police and Prisons piously defends the Premier when everybody knows that outside the House, that same Minister bags the Premier wherever he goes.

Mr Bryce: Stabs him in the back.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is known throughout the community.

Mr Young: You have sunk pretty low, but this is about as far as you can go.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Do not members opposite squirm when we serve it back to them? They are very good at dishing it out, but when it is thrown back at them, they go to water.

Mr Young: You are only a bag of wind.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition opposes this legislation and gives notice that the day after it wins Government, whether it is in March next year or in March, three years hence, this law will cease to operate.

MR TRETOWHAN (East Melville) [10.18 p.m.]: I have listened with great interest to the two speeches from the Opposition. I agree with the description the Speaker gave of the speech of the member for Fremantle; I believe it was obviously thoroughly researched, if somewhat partisan. Essentially, it covered the development of the arbitration system in this country. The interesting thing I found was that the member for Fremantle rarely touched on the detail of aspects of the legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much background noise. I can barely hear the member, and I am sure the Hansard reporter, whose obligation it is to report the speech, also is experiencing difficulty. So, if not in the interest of the dignity of the House, at least in the interest of the Hansard reporter, I ask members to reduce the level of noise.

Mr TRETOWHAN: I believe it was understandable the member for Fremantle did not touch on the detail of aspects of the Bill; obviously, as the lead speaker for the Opposition—and, as he indicated in his speech—he will be speaking on the detail of many of the clauses of the Bill.

However, I found it passing strange the Leader of the Opposition had so little to say about the substance of the Bill.

Mr Pearce: Why do you have speakers of so little substance?

Mr Young interjected.

Mr Pearce: Why don’t you have a go?

Mr Young: Because I am closing the debate, you idiot. That shows how much you know about the procedures in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gosnells will cease interjecting. Cross-Chamber conversations are totally out of order.

Mr TRETOWHAN: The speech of the Leader of the Opposition was very short on the facts relating to the Bill, but long on abuse and verbosity. However, I can understand that; I can understand why members of the Opposition are refusing to come to grips with the real substance of this piece of legislation. They know that any opposition to the provisions of this legislation would be
thoroughly out of step with the attitudes of the community at large. Members opposite know that the attitudes of the Opposition and, particularly, of the trade union movement to the Bill are out of step with the attitude of the community.

This Bill is about the rights of the individual and the rights of the community.

Mr Bryce: It is about trying to get even the member for East Melville re-elected.

Mr TRETHOWAN: The fact is that if the Opposition is so strong in its political argument about this Bill and in its belief that the Government is using the Bill as a means to gain popularity, it simply reinforces my argument that members opposite know that opposition to the Bill would be out of step with community beliefs.

Mr Bryce: It used to be; that is the difference.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I will demonstrate objectively that this is a fact. It is interesting to see the dilemma which confronts the Opposition in that if its members support this legislation they will receive the approbation of people in business, of individuals in the work force, and of the community at large. However, they will incur the wrath of their political masters, the trade union movement.

I do not believe the kind of description offered by the Leader of the Opposition of his relationship with the trade union movement is correct. Rather, I believe the substance of his statement is in relation to his attitude towards industrial relations; namely, that he would replace confrontation with harmony. “Harmony” means that he would give in to every demand placed on his Government and on the community by the trade union movement. He would not have the substance to stand and argue the economic effects such decisions would have on the whole community. That is precisely what we see happening with States under Labor Governments, particularly in New South Wales.

Mr T. H. Jones: Have you ever been a union member?

Mr TRETHOWAN: I have not been a member of a union.

Mr T. H. Jones: You are not very competent to talk on this subject, in that case.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I am glad I have not been a member of a union, and I am grateful to the member for Collie for highlighting that point because I intend to indicate statistically how union leaders are completely out of step with the attitudes of the work force and the rest of the community.

As I said, this Bill is a law designed to safeguard the rights of the individual in the work place, be he a unionist or a non-unionist. The Bill will safeguard the individual subcontractor, the small man, and the person in business who do not have the resources of a large company behind them. It will ensure the community is treated fairly in any decision of the State Industrial Commission relating to awards, and the like.

I do not believe it is inappropriate for the Minister to refer in his speech to article No. 22 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights guaranteeing the freedoms we seek to protect.

Mr Bryce: Do you believe in the principle of one-vote-one-value?

Mr TRETHOWAN: I intend to go on to prove that the community does not believe it to be inappropriate, either.

It is interesting that the historical development of the union movement was on the basis of safeguarding the small individual in the work place. As the Minister indicated, at that time an imbalance of power existed in that the employers held most of the cards and the employees, very few. The formation of unions produced a countervailing set of powers which created more equity in the wage determination system.

Mr Bryce: Is that right?

Mr TRETHOWAN: That is right. However, it is quite clear that over the last 50 or 60 years, the pendulum has swung too far; that is clear not only to people like me, but also to the rest of the community.

Mr Jamieson: You are talking like a bourgeois nut.

Mr TRETHOWAN: As soon as a person runs out of facts in a debate, generally he starts to abuse people, because that is the only way he can appear to be fighting for his argument, without having any basis for his argument.

There is a strong and pervading feeling in the community that in general, some unions—I do not categorise the whole union movement as irresponsible—still operate on behalf of their members on the same basis as they did when the union movement first began 50 or 60 years ago.

Mr Bryce: Which ones?

Mr Trethowan: I am not prepared to name names.

Mr Bryce: You do not know; do you?

Mr TRETHOWAN: It is quite clear this view is accepted by the rest of the community.

Mr Jamieson: Now you are using innuendo. You are a fine one to talk about people running
out of arguments; you have never had an argument.

Mr TRETHOWAN: One of the ways this abuse of power is most clearly seen is through the exercise of the closed shop arrangement. I would like members of the Opposition to indicate whether they favour that principle. I believe it would typify very accurately their true feelings on the matter and would indicate what actions they would take if in Government.

The fact is that responsible unions have nothing to fear from this legislation. Only those which seek to use their power in an excessive manner, contrary to the interests of the community, will find themselves affected.

Mr Bryce: That is exactly what Jaruzelski said in Poland.

Mr TRETHOWAN: It is very interesting that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentions the situation in Poland. This Bill seeks to guarantee the rights and freedoms of individual workers of this State; it does not seek to implement the intimidation of a closed shop system similar to the Government-oriented trade union in Poland, which now is the official trade union movement of that country. That obviously is the kind of union movement the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would seek to introduce in this State, through a closed shop arrangement, were we ever to have the misfortune in this State to have him as of the Government.

Mr Bryce: You are trying to achieve exactly what they have just achieved in Poland; namely, the destruction of the trade union movement.

Mr TRETHOWAN: The interesting thing is that the Labor Party does not want the facts. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fremantle were scathing about public opinion polls; but I would like to quote the passage that the member for Fremantle referred to from a speech by the Minister for Labour and Industry from another place when he was at the industrial relations conference held recently in Mandurah. In relation to the question of public acceptability, the Minister said——

But in the privacy of interviews for public opinion polls, they say what they mean.

And on June 30, this year, 73 per cent said "No" to being compelled to join a union.

This was a 7 per cent increase on a similar poll four years earlier.

The feeling is 7 per cent stronger among women than among men and strongest of all reaching 80 per cent among the younger age groups.

This is decisive evidence that the principle of individual rights matters a great deal to individuals.

Mr T. H. Jones: What would happen if you did not pay your Liberal Party fees? Would you be allowed to stay in the party? Would they support that?

Mr TRETHOWAN: I can understand that the Opposition would not be prepared to accept the statistical evidence of the rightness of the Government's position.

Mr T. H. Jones interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order! The member for Collie! I have been very tolerant, particularly with the member for Collie. I have accepted an occasional interjection; but continual interjections will cease or I will take the appropriate action.

Mr TRETHOWAN: As I stated earlier, the fact is that union executives are totally out of step with the attitudes of the rest of the community related to the work force. I can indicate that clearly by quoting from one of the bench marks of statistical study into the whole range of industrial relations and employment factors in this country. This is a survey which is accepted widely as the most complete survey of its kind conducted in this country. The survey was commissioned by Sentry Holdings Limited and it was carried out by McNair Anderson Associates Pty. Ltd., in association with Professor Roger Layton, the Professor of Marketing at the University of New South Wales. The title of the survey is "Managers and Workers at the Crossroads". In the section dealing with the role of unions, questions were asked of groups representing the total work force, union leaders, public administrators, personnel managers, and general managers.

To the question, "All employees should be made to join a union—agree or disagree?", the total work force agreed with the proposition on the basis of 25 per cent.

Mr Jamieson: What was the poll number?

Mr TRETHOWAN: Only 20 per cent of the public administrators agreed that all employees should be made to join a union; 15 per cent of personnel managers agreed; and no general managers agreed; but 80 per cent of union leaders agreed that all employees should be made to join a union.

Mr Davies: What an amazing figure!

Mr TRETHOWAN: Of the groups surveyed, including the total work force of which 25 per cent agreed, 80 per cent of union leaders agreed——
Mr Bryce: Do you realise you have been speaking for 15 minutes and, in accordance with the way you started, you have not touched on the Bill.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I am touching very closely on the Bill. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not want to listen to the facts I am presenting. They bear a direct relationship to the substance and basis of the Bill.

Mr Jamieson: How big was that poll? Can you tell us that?

Mr TRETHOWAN: Yes, I can.

Mr Jamieson: And where was it taken?

Mr TRETHOWAN: It was taken throughout the whole of Australia. A total of 801 full-time members of the Australian work force were involved, and representatives totalling 204 members of the following leadership groups were included: managers, personnel managers, union leaders, and Government officials. Statistically, the survey is extremely sound. It was handled by probably the top statistical research organisation in Australia and one of the most senior academics in the field in Australia. I do not believe anyone could imply the survey was irrelevant.

To highlight how out of step union officials are in relation to the work force and the rest of the community, I indicate that on the statement that "union leaders often seem to be looking for something to justify their existence", the work force agreed 78 per cent with the proposition; public administrators, 62 per cent; personnel managers, 81 per cent; and general managers agreed 80 per cent with the proposition. Not surprisingly, the union leaders themselves agreed only 12 per cent with the proposition—again, totally out of step with the rest of the community.

On the further statement that "the pressure for wage increases by unions is now not really supported by the rank and file", of the total work force 63 per cent agreed; 57 per cent of personnel managers agreed; and 72 per cent of general managers; but of the union leaders who had answered to the extent of 12 per cent on the previous question, when it came to the question as to whether they had to justify their existence, only 20 per cent agreed with the second proposition.

Mr Bryce: What percentage of them knocked back the rise?

Mr TRETHOWAN: Again, they are totally out of step with the rest of the work force and the rest of the community.

Their being out of step and out of touch with their own members and with the needs of the community has resulted, as the previous questions would have indicated, in wage rises continuing to flow, even when members of the unions do not agree that they are appropriate. This has had devastating consequences on the economy of this country. It has had a serious effect on our ability to export competitively.

The only way in which excessive wage demands, without accompanying productivity increases, can be overcome in order to maintain the competitiveness of our manufacturing industries is to devalue the Australian dollar. The devaluation of the Australian dollar prevents what we need to increase our community wealth—an inflow of capital in order to finance the development of this country; and that, the Leader of the Opposition has so trenchantly agreed, is the basic needs of our community.

Apart from reducing our competitiveness on international markets, these wage demands have resulted in many people in Australia losing their jobs. In fact, it was a former Labor Minister who quoted publicly the saying that one man's wage rise is another man's job. In no way has that changed, as has been agreed by the work force at large. They can see the folly of their pursuing excessive wage demands.

Mr Davies: The parliamentarians' wage rises mean extra members, as far as this State goes.

Mr TRETHOWAN: The only way we will achieve a higher standard of living in this country, is through increases in productivity. Productivity is the basic key to wage determinations. If the interests of the community were taken into account—the effects of wage decisions on the national and State economies—not only would we have a rise in the standard of living within the community, but also we would see that this continued to be shared equitably between the interested parties.

Mr Bryce: Productivity is primarily a function of management.

Mr TRETHOWAN: The fact is that it takes two to tango in order to create productivity. It takes a greater effort on the part of management to ensure that there is greater co-operation in the work place leading to higher productivity; but at the same time the other side must be prepared to come to the party. The union movement, and particularly the union executives, must be prepared to go along.

On that question, I would like to quote from a slightly later survey for Sentry Holdings Limited, again conducted by McNair Anderson Associates Pty. Ltd., this time in conjunction with Louis Harris Associates Inc. The survey is titled "Perspectives on Productivity: Australia".
Mr Bryce: I am still waiting for you to come back to the Bill. Where does the Bill deal with productivity?

Mr TRETHOWAN: The Bill refers to productivity in relation to clause 26. What I am talking about now is covered in the effect of 26.

The survey covered basically the same groups as before. To the question, "Do you think that trade unions today are more helpful or less helpful than they were 10 years ago in helping businesses to grow and become more efficient?", those who answered "more helpful" were only 16 per cent of the work force. Those who answered "less helpful" were 62 per cent of the work force. I note that 57 per cent of public administrators said that trade unions were less helpful than they were 10 years ago in helping businesses to grow and become efficient; 61 per cent of service sector company executives said the same; and 60 per cent of industrial company executives said that they were less helpful; but 62 per cent of union leaders said they were more helpful. How out of step can they be with the rest of the community?

To the question, "What groups within the economy were mainly responsible for the fact that this country's productivity is not better than it is?", in relation to trade unions 73 per cent of the work force indicated that they were one of the groups responsible for this country's productivity not being better than it is; 82 per cent of public administrators agreed with that; 94 per cent of service sector company executives agreed with it; and 94 per cent of industrial company executives agreed with it; but only 22 per cent of union leaders agreed—again, dramatically out of step. When dealing with the same question relating to the private sector, only 36 per cent of the work force said that they thought that was the case; only 38 per cent of public administrators thought that that was the case; only 41 per cent of service sector company executives said that that was the case; and only 34 per cent of industrial company executives thought that was the case; but 88 per cent of union leaders thought it was the case—dramatically out of step with the work force and with the community.

That is the nature of the opposition to this Bill. I do not wonder that members of the Labor Party are chary about the way they oppose the Bill, because they know that, fundamentally, the legislation is supported by the community, by the people in the work place, and by the individuals who have been subjected the threat of oppressive action.

It is supported by members of the community who feel they are disadvantaged by extortionate wage claims and strikes used to back them up.

Mr Jamieson: Supported by stupid questions by McNair and Anderson.

Mr TRETHOWAN: Anyone who knows anything about industrial relations would know that these two surveys are considered to be the benchmarks covering the whole community attitude in this area.

The basis upon which the Government has introduced this legislation is that it is needed and wanted by the community. The Government is not here to represent sectional interests; it is not here to represent political opportunists who are out of step with the community and the work force. The Bill is here to represent the rights of individuals, the rights of small businessmen, the rights of subcontractors, and the rights of the community in the industrial area. I have very great pleasure in supporting this legislation.

MR McIVER (Avon) [10.46 p.m.]: As a life member of a union it would be very remiss of me if I did not comment on this Bill. I am saddened by the ignorance of Government members in both Houses, who have illustrated their lack of knowledge of industrial relations and the trade union movement.

The introduction of this Bill parallels the action taken in 1963 by the Liberal Government under Sir David Brand when it amended the arbitration system to remove the Commissioner of Industrial Relations, Mr Justice Neville, and replace him with industrial commissioners. What we have heard in the other place and in this place this evening is more or less a repetition of that action. At that time the Liberal Government strongly attacked the trade union movement in the same way as members of the present Government are attacking the trade union movement. This is all done purely and simply for political purposes. We all know of the great respect unionists had for the judicious decisions and judicious balance of Justice Neville.

I am also saddened by the implications made against the Industrial Commission by Liberal members. What they do not seem to realise—particularly the younger members—is that when a union submits a wage claim, it has not been handed to it on a plate. Wage claims are drawn up only after months of preparation. Unions have first to prepare a case and substantiate it. Employers, with their far greater resources and help within the legal profession, challenge those submissions in the Industrial Court. Should the industrial commissioner hearing the
case decide in favour of the unions, in the Government's eyes he is always wrong. The Government believes unionists should not receive increases in their pay. The Government does not realise the weakness of an employer's case and his inability to justify a refusal of the union's case. The younger members opposite do not understand this.

It is unfortunate that in our society today the younger members of Parliament have never been in a position where they have had to call on the assistance of respected unions, because their parents have seen to it they were educated at schools such as those attended by the member for East Melville. It seems to be the "in" thing these days to be a union hater and to hound the unions.

However, this action has backfired on the Government. In sheer ignorance, the Government has introduced this legislation despite the fact that, for the first time in the history of this State, employers and unions have come together and asked that a Bill be withdrawn. The Confederation of WA Industry represents employers; employers in this State pay into the confederation so that it can handle their cases, just as unionists pay their dues to their unions to have them look after their interests.

Mr Sibson: The confederation is running scared; it is objecting for different reasons.

Mr McIVER: Irrespective of whether this legislation is passed—naturally it will be passed, even if we speak on it for three months, because the Government has the numbers—the Government has failed to realise as it always does that it will not be able to implement its policies. The introduction of this Bill will strengthen the trade union movement rather than weaken it.

Do members opposite honestly believe that men working underground in the coalmining industry, men who have to work as a team, will allow a young novice to join them if he is not a member of a union? Do members opposite really think these men would go underground with a non-unionist? Do members opposite think a train driver would run his train when his fireman was not a member of the union? Do members opposite think unionists should not receive increases in their pay. The Government does not realise the weakness of an employer's case and his inability to justify a refusal of the union's case. The younger members opposite do not understand this.

Here we come to the crux of the legislation; here we come to what the Government wants to achieve. It wants to provoke the unions; it wants to create industrial unrest. It wants to go to the people of Western Australia and tell them it will resolve the industrial unrest by controlling the unions. It wants to do this because it has no other issue on which to go to the people. This is certainly true after the last two months with the debacle of the Costigan report and the actions by the Federal Government which have continually embarrassed Liberal Party supporters. This is a wasted exercise; it is a waste of the Parliament's time.

The Transport Workers' Union came under attack by the member for Nedlands when he criticised the union for its past action. However, I notice recognition never is given to the TWU for the industrial stoppages it prevents; no mention is made of that. As for subcontractors, those people who do not join the TWU and would cart anything anywhere at any rate—

Mr Herzfeld: As they are entitled to.

Mr McIVER: These people have no regard for the transport industry. The industry would not be in the state it is at present but for the subcontractors the member for Mundaring thinks are so marvellous.

Mr Herzfeld: Rubbish!

Mr McIVER: Do not rubbish me. The member is just a little boy when it comes to industrial relations.

Mr Sibson: Subcontractors are the backbone of this country.

Mr McIVER: The rates set by the TWU and enjoyed by hundreds of its members have been gained only through arbitration and, as I said, after months of preparation have gone into drawing up wage claims in an effort to obtain rewards for union members. It is because of people like the member for Mundaring, who supports the subcontractors who are ratting on the industry, that the transport industry is in its present dire straits.

I have people coming to my office who have taken a load to Melbourne and back and found they were hardly paid enough for the petrol they used.

Mr Bateman: If they blow a tyre they have lost the lot.

Mr McIVER: They are used by the trucking companies who give them scraps off the plate to cart north of the 26th parallel. Yet the member for Mundaring has the temerity to say that this is great and is what we should have. He has a lot to learn.

It is a pity that the Minister who introduced the Bill is not in this Chamber. Unfortunately he has lived in this country for only a short time, but his hatred of the union movement and its supporters is well known.

Mr Bryce: He is unbalanced.

Mr McIVER: How he ever got to be a Minister I do not know. The Liberal Party is surrounded
by incompetent Ministers, particularly in the field of industrial relations. He certainly won no friends by introducing this Bill, irrespective of what the polls might say. Although the Premier said 75 per cent of the people are in favour of the legislation, I could conduct a poll tomorrow and find just as many people who oppose the legislation.

Unions must have finance and must employ staff. They are a big industry and they obtain their funds through membership. If I could find some loophole to enable me to get out of paying my house rates and my water rates I would use it. Many unionists like to get out of paying their union fees.

Mr Parker: A very good point.

Mr McIver: But how many of these people who do not want to pay their union fees refuse any rise obtained for them by the union submission to the Industrial Commission?

Mr Bateman: Not one.

Mr McIver: Even though they have said they do not believe in the principle of compulsory unionism, they are the first in the queue.

If we consider the history of the State over the last few years we know we have heard the term “militant unions”.

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr McIver: It is just a general term.

Mr Sibson: It is not unions it is the individuals.

Mr McIver: Not so long ago, the Police Force in Western Australia, for the first time in its history, threatened to go on strike. The fire brigades threatened to strike because of the intimidation and action taken by this Government, and the Civil Service Association for the first time in 60 years went on strike to try to obtain some redress. This Government insists on hounding the trade union movement and on bringing legislation before this House to inflame the situation.

The unions will not fall for that. They are not fools. Do Government members think they will go on strike when this Bill is passed—if and when it is passed? Of course they will not. The Government must consider these aspects if it wishes to retain the Treasury benches. It is very debatable that it will.

Shop assistants, as well as those in the trade union movement will be greatly affected by this legislation. If we consider the firms of Coles and Woolworths, we note that their employees are federally directed to join a union. If any member were to enter the firm of Coles or Woolworths tomorrow, the first thing he would have to do is sign an application for union membership.

How will the Government's Bill cover that? How will it alter that fact? That is compulsory unionism—federally directed.

When we read the speech of the Minister for Labour and Industry in the other place, we note his ignorance on this matter.

Mr Herzfeld: There will be complementary Federal legislation shortly.

Mr McIver: I do not think there will be. The Federal Government is just hanging on at the edge of the cliff. It does not want to fall off the edge.

Mr I. F. Taylor: They are on the run like you.

Mr McIver: The larger unions, the TWU and the AWU were mentioned. Does the Government think this legislation will have any effect on them? Does not the Government think in all sincerity that it is far better to have a closed shop situation where negotiation can be handled by the management and union? The management, the union and the employees should get together and negotiate rather than reach the stage of confrontation and weeks of strike.

Let us consider what has happened in the north of this State with the consortiums such as Cliffs Robe River Iron Associates, Mt. Newman Mining Co. Pty. Ltd., Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd., and Goldsworthy Mining Ltd. A proposition on super-annuation was put to Cliffs Robe River Iron Associates, by the union members. It was agreed upon because the company could see there was merit in the proposal. That proposition was followed by Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd., but Goldsworthy Mining Ltd., said it would like some time to examine it. Unfortunately it did not reach the area of top management. A couple of little upstarts at a lower level decided they would make it their decision and we had one of the longest strikes in the history of the iron ore industry.

Mr O'Connor: It lost us years and jobs.

Mr McIver: It did not lose people their jobs.

Mr O'Connor: Yes it did.

Mr McIver: Does not the Premier agree that if discussion had been at company level the dispute could have been resolved in a couple of days?

What will happen to the young people who will be lured into a false sense of security? I wish to give the example of a motor firm in my electorate which has gone into receivership. The spare parts manager is due for long service leave and his officer is due for holiday pay and wages totalling in the vicinity of $100. These men are not in the union. Where can they go? Will someone please interject and say, “The Department of Labour and Industry”??
Mr Sibson: Where would they go if they were in a union?

Mr McIVER: The member for Bunbury would know that it is a statutory duty that wages are the first thing that must be paid. The point I am making is: Where do these young people go to obtain redress?

The licensee of a hotel in my electorate owes his staff of 14 wages and holiday pay. What redress do these people have? Where will all these people go? I am sure they would not go to the member for Bunbury. Where will these people go when this legislation becomes law and is on the Statute books? This legislation will affect not only unions, but also many people who believe in the Government's philosophy and who have supported it up to now. They most certainly will not support this Government once the Bill becomes law.

We hear often from Government members about these "terrible strikes and terrible unions".

Do you know, Mr Speaker, that when airline pilots, bank officers, teachers, and air traffic controllers go on strike, not a word is said. Evidently it must be okay because the unions which represent those people are not affiliated with the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Sibson: The Teachers' Union is.

Mr Jamieson: Like hell it is. It is not affiliated with the Australian Labor Party, you galah.

Mr McIVER: Why does not the member for Welshpool get the member for Bunbury a sleeping pill? It is terrible when one hears such interjections from a legislator who has been in this House for a number of years. It is sickening to hear the ignorance that comes from the other side and members' lack of knowledge not only of the trade union movement but also of those people they supposedly represent.

When those people I have mentioned go on strike it is all right because many of them support the Liberal Party. It is all right for air controllers to go on strike and hold up the movement of interstate, intrastate, and overseas traffic. It does not worry the Government because they are Liberal supporters. However, if one were to mention the TWU or the AWU which are affiliated with the Labor Party it is a different question.

When I was an engine driver with the railways I became involved with the trade union movement. Some very fine men belonged to that movement and some of them have had their services recognised with various awards. These men are well respected in the community. They certainly did not come from Russia or Peking and they certainly were not communists.

Mr Sibson: The good old days.

Mr McIVER: I will not go into the technical detail because I do not want to confuse members but when one worked on a train in the country areas and it arrived at a cattle pit the fire had to be cleaned. In those days someone got underneath the engine and tried to clean the fire with hot ashes falling onto him and I can assure members that was no joke. The department did not want to change that situation, but it was only through the continual representations by the union to the department that ash slides were installed on the engines so that a lever could be moved to make the ashes fall from the fire bars. This was a much quicker process. My colleague, the member for Collie, would know what occurred.

Another matter was that the employees had to contend with very old barracks for accommodation. Many other issues could be highlighted but I do not intend to do that.

Money is not the only consideration. Working conditions is another and a further one is work safety, which this Government seems to disregard.

Mr Sibson: That is not right.

Mr McIVER: I read in the Press that a strike took place recently in the member for Collie's area because a man was killed in a drain due to poor working conditions. The coroner apparently took the company to task. We seem to be getting away from safe working conditions and this has nothing to do with monetary returns. Had it not been for the work of the unions over the years we would have no safety precautions at all. Young people like the members for Nedlands and East Melville make the sorts of speeches they make without any knowledge of the background or history of the trade union movement and what it has done in regard to the progress and advancement of this State. I suggest they look at the history of the movement, particularly the coal-mining industry in the member for Collie's electorate. We heard the member for Collie speak of the horse in the coal mines. "Red" cost the State millions of dollars through the company's stupidity. Similar situations have occurred elsewhere and in particular I mention the iron ore industry in the north.

The trade union movement has a permanent role in our State and the legislation that members on the other side of the House bring forward in relation to compulsory unionism—they even got away with dismissing Justice Neville—will make no difference whatsoever because it will serve only to unify the workers and we will see a situation occur similar to that which occurred in Canberra last night. Those men came from ordinary homes,
just as we do, and when men are hungry and their working security is taken from them—

Several members interjected.

Mr McIVER: Surely members must have a picture of what will happen if unemployment in this country is allowed to continue at its current rate.

The points I have made tonight have been made sincerely and I trust the Government will take some notice of them. I trust also that the young members of the Government will take notice, and will try to brush up on their history in case this State is unfortunate enough to have this Government back after the next election and it brings in further legislation to impede the trade union movement as it has always tried to do in the past.

I have made it quite clear in my few remarks that I most certainly oppose the legislation before the House.

Mr PEARCE (Gosnells) [11.19 p.m.]: I am not—

Mr Sibson: An old union man.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: —the most senior member on this side of the House to speak tonight. The Premier has been notable not only for his silence tonight, but also for his absence.

Mr Young: He walked out a second ago.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: Let us have him back in his seat again.

Mr Young: So he has to listen to you; he would have to be a masochist.

Several members interjected.

Mr Blaikie: The Premier is not at the Table of the House and you try to make something of it.

Mr Young: Telling lies to Mansard does not work.

Mr Clarko: Get a couple of bottoms from champagne bottles and use them for glasses.

Mr PEARCE: In fact, the point is that as I rose to speak the Premier disappeared behind the Speaker's Chair; and as I began to speak, he suddenly reappeared on this side of the Chamber. This may betoken some shift of allegiance on the part of the Premier—

Government members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: I particularly wish to address myself to the fact that here we have a piece of legislation which the Government claims is one of the most significant pieces of legislation that it has introduced during the course of this year. It is no secret that it is one piece of legislation upon which the Government is happy to hang its hat with regard to the election next March; yet the Premier has not spoken on this important piece of legislation. I wonder why that is? Why is the Premier being kept in cotton wool on this particular matter?

Mr Blaikie: Just on that particular point, you were bitterly complaining because the Minister in charge of the Bill had not spoken, until the Minister advised you why he was not going to speak.

Mr PEARCE: I was addressing my remarks at that stage to the Premier.

Mr Young: You were talking to me. Come on! It is bad enough for you blokes to tell complete untruths—

Mr Brian Burke: Come on! Give him a go. What are you so touchy about?

Mr PEARCE: When the second of the Government's spokesmen on this matter rose to his feet, I said to the Premier, "Why aren't you speaking on this matter? Why aren't you getting to your feet to defend this piece of legislation?"

Mr O'Connor: There is plenty of time for me to speak.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Health called out across the Chamber, having held up a piece of paper on which there was an illegible scrawl—I suppose that befits the Minister for Health—to say "I wrote down what the Leader of the Opposition said; and he said hardly anything", which could hardly be called a truthful statement.

Mr Young: About the Bill, I said.

Mr PEARCE: I said to him, "Then you had better get up and take the Premier's place", or words to that effect.

Mr Young: You said, "Why don't you stand up and speak?" That is what you said. If you do not believe me, check Hansard.

Mr PEARCE: And take the Premier's place.

Mr Young: Check Hansard—and don't alter it.

Mr PEARCE: That goes to show the extent to which the Minister for Health knows what goes on in this place; because members do not receive Hansards of their interjections, for heaven's sake!

Mr Young: Don't you?

Mr PEARCE: All I receive—

Mr Young: I get quite a few with your long-winded interjections.

Mr PEARCE: If I receive a Hansard with these interjections, I guarantee to take it to the Minister for Health so we can correct it together.

Mr Young: As long as it takes in what was said.
Mr PEARCE: Just in passing, with regard to the doctoring of Hansards, I take the credit for being the member in this place who drew to the attention of the House the fact that a Hansard had been changed. I notice in the printed version of Hansard that the words which had been removed by the member for Mt. Marshall were somehow reinstated.

I resent the proposition by the Minister that I would seek to doctor a Hansard record. I never have, and I never would. However, that is beside the point; and I wonder why members of the Government are so keen to drag me away from this point.

Mr Young: You are walking across the paint. You have got yourself in the corner.

Mr PEARCE: Why has not the Premier spoken on this matter and taken a key role?

Mr Young: Would you like me to answer that? Let me tell you that we discussed this situation. Your leader has said that this is one of the most horrendous pieces—this is almost parrot fashion, because he says this all the time—of legislation, that he has seen. Horrendous pieces this is almost parrot fashion, of legislation, that he has seen.

Apart from the member for Fremantle, who made a 2½-hour very scholarly speech, no-one has mentioned this Bill yet. The Leader of the Opposition hit two points only of this Bill; and there are at least 20 important points. Up to date, no-one has hit the importance of this Bill. It is up to you, if your record is so bad, to put up speakers to tell us where—

Mr Parker: I spoke on it, and so will the member for Gosnells, if you would stop interjecting on him.

Mr Young: I bet he will!

Mr PEARCE: We have taken the view that this is a very significant piece of legislation; but that is not our view alone. That is the view announced by the Government as well. It has characterised this Bill as one of the most important pieces of legislation that it has introduced. Look at what we have done. We have put up our spokesmen—our lead speaker spoke for 2½ hours—and he was followed immediately by the Leader of the Opposition. Now we have had two of our Shadow Ministers to follow them.

Mr Young: Tell us what points in the Bill you are going to speak about.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister will get to hear all of them.

Mr Young: Will you tell us what points you have got written down that you will speak about?

Mr PEARCE: Members will know that I very rarely speak from notes, and I have no intention of changing the habit of a lifetime.

Why is it that the Government has put up its two most junior back-benchers—

Mr Laurance: What are you talking about? You put up a member as junior as them.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Fremantle is a shadow Minister—and a very competent one at that. We are putting up the best we can. If the people on the Government side believe that they can catch us with two of their junior backbenchers, I hope that the public perception and the Press perception prove that that is an inaccurate idea of what is going on. I suggest, in fact, that quite the reverse is true. Despite the fact that the Government has great hopes for this legislation in terms of its electoral appeal and the electoral advantage it hopes to gain from it, the public's opinion hangs on the Premier's interjection—one of the few times he has been—

Mr O'Connor: I have been here nearly all night.

Mr PEARCE: —involved in the debate. I was not suggesting he was not sitting there.

Mr O'Connor: I was more orderly than you. That is what it proves.

Mr PEARCE: "Less participatory" is the way in which I would explain it. I would have thought some participation by the Premier would have been expected. I am not asking him to interject from his seat; I am asking him to stand and give us a speech.

Mr O'Connor: There is ample time yet. There is another week or two to go.

Mr PEARCE: Is the Premier intending to speak in this debate at some later stage?

Mr O'Connor: That depends on whether it is necessary.

Mr Shalders: Do you realise that your shadow spokesman has been in this House no longer than the junior Government members?

Mr PEARCE: I said that the member for East Melville was a junior Government back-bencher, as is the member for Nedlands. Simply, the point is that their merits are unrecognised by the leadership of the party. The Premier has the ability to appoint his own Cabinet, and if he believed that the member for East Melville and the member for Nedlands were worthy of being in the Cabinet, he would put them there. He has not done so; so if I refer to those gentlemen as junior back-benchers, the "Back-bencher" half of their label is not an appellation I gave to them, but is a status which has been accorded them by the Liberal Party's
own leader. The fact that they are junior merely reflects the fact that they are only recently in the House.

Mr Blaikie: You have not spoken on the Bill yet.

Mr PEARCE: Because I have been answering interjections.

Mr Sibson: As one of the top debaters in this country—

Mr PEARCE: I am flattered, at last.

Mr Hodge: He says something sensible only once in a while.

Mr PEARCE: With regard to the member for Fremantle, who has been in this House for less than three years, it is fair to say that in terms of our party he is one of the senior members.

It is no accident that the member for Fremantle occupies significant and substantial shadow Ministries on our side, because he is a person of very great ability. He will be a Minister in this State soon and he will go on to very great things in Western Australia. That is why he is our shadow Minister in this very important area. The speech of the member for Fremantle last night was one of the finest I have heard in the 5½ years I have been in the House. It was thorough, well researched, germane to the point, dealt with the Bill in great detail, and showed a grasp of the situation which has been totally lacking so far on the Government side. By that I do not refer only to members of this House, but also to members in another place.

Last night I made a comment to some of my colleagues that the reason the member for Fremantle got by with so few interjections last night, in relation to a Bill which caused so many problems in the other place, was that Ministers and Liberal back-benchers had to know something about it before they could interject. I sat back and watched three or four of the parrots try to be disruptive and they were put down so effectively and with such rational argument that it indicated they did not know anything about the Bill. After two or three members opposite were made to look stupid and retired hurt, nobody interjected for approximately an hour and a half until the member for Bunbury came into the Chamber and behaved in his normal manner.

Mr Young: You have made it through to 12 minutes and you have not mentioned the Bill. See if you can try for 20 minutes.

Mr PEARCE: Why has not the Premier spoken on the Bill? It may be the Premier intends to speak at some later stage of the debate and that would point to something which is becoming embarrassingly obvious to members opposite; that is, the tactic tonight has been to protect the Premier in cotton wool, to throw up a couple of kids to keep the debate going, and then leave it to the Opposition so that the Premier can go away tonight, obtain the Hansard transcript of what the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Fremantle, and other speakers on this side have said, get the departmental briefing, and return with a speech he can read some time next week. That speech would not be prepared by himself, but by somebody else. I issue a challenge directly to the Government that, if it wishes to say what I am suggesting is not true—that is, that the Premier does not require very extensive help and assistance before he can even take part in this debate—

Mr O'Connor: I do not require it.

Mr PEARCE: —let us proceed with the debate to the end of the second reading stage tonight or tomorrow morning.

Mr O'Connor: I will run this House, not you.

Mr Young: You have been going for 14 minutes and if you would like to make one comment about the Bill, we would be very interested.

Mr PEARCE: I have 31 minutes to go and I am quite capable of dealing with the Bill in the way I see fit; but the Minister is making the error, which his parliamentary and Cabinet colleagues have made, of thinking that the reason for the introduction of the Bill is to put into effect its provisions. This is the point I was making five minutes ago before the interjections carried me off onto some little sidetracks.

The point is the only bit of participation by the Premier during the whole debate on this legislation so far, occurred when the Leader of the Opposition asked, "Why is the Bill being introduced at this time?" The Premier then said, "We have a poll which shows 75 per cent of the people in this State may be inclined to support it." The Government does not have 75 per cent support in the community on this issue, nor does it have 75 per cent support on any other issue. It is simply hoping to get an issue on which it seems there is a good deal of consensus in the community and on which the Government can aim for popularity.

Therefore, it does not matter that Government members have not read the legislation, because they will be able to go out into the community and say, "Look what we are doing to the dreadful, nasty unionists. Re-elect us!" They will totally disregard all the problems of unemployment, inflation, and rising interest rates and say to people, "An enemy is within our midst. There is a hidden Fifth Column. There are Reds under the bed. Look at the fellows down at the TLC and the
Teachers' Union. Only we can save the State from this insidious horde."

Mr Parker: Do you think just because the Minister for Health is dressed like a croupier he should be making an illegal wager in this House?

Mr PEARCE: I would have thought gambling would be a sore point with members opposite.

Mr Young: He thanks you for that interjection, because now he has something else to talk about. Why are they doing this to you? Why haven't you got anyone to talk about the Bill?

Mr PEARCE: The Minister can hardly say we have not had speakers on the Bill. The member for Fremantle dealt with the Bill in intimate detail. The Minister asked why we did not have somebody on this side who can deal with the Bill. The member for Fremantle has dealt with the Bill in detail.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: When it comes to many of the philosophical principles that are involved in this legislation, the Leader of the Opposition dealt with them very competently. When it comes to dealing with a personal viewpoint from past experience as a union member, the member for Avon—our shadow Minister for Transport—has dealt with that. Because we are operating as a team tonight, my role in the debate is to deal with the political reasons that the Government is seeking to introduce this legislation at this time.

Mr Young: What is the name of the Bill?

Mr PEARCE: That is precisely what I am doing. I am getting sick of the inane interjections of the Minister for Health. They are becoming very foolish. Let me stop and give him one last chance. Why has not the Premier spoken?

Mr O'Connor: I told you I will speak in due course if I feel you have put up something worth replying to. I will speak when I want to, not when you want me to.

Mr Young: Give him a go! He has made 18 minutes.

Mr Herzfeld: Is this what you call a "night watchman"?

Mr PEARCE: I have hardly ever played cricket in my life.

Mr Hassell: By his own standards, he is a bit of a contrast to the member for Fremantle.

Mr PEARCE: I am quite happy to stay here all night.

Mr Young: But you will have to think of something to say eventually.

Mr Clarke: Are you certain he is not working from notes?
back to his department and received his briefing notes—

**Point of Order**

Mr O'CONNOR: Could I bring up the point of tedious repetition by this member? He has gone over the same points right through, and it is difficult to know what Bill he is talking to.

The SPEAKER: The member for Gosnells ought to make progress with his speech.

**Debate Resumed**

Mr PEARCE: I am prepared to do that, but I point out that as I started to make my point about the Premier's non-participation I was subjected to a cacophony of interjections. As is my wont, I answered each one of them, but this took time. Then, to remind members of the point I had begun to make, it was necessary to repeat the point. If we can have a cessation of the interjections I will progress far more rapidly.

As the Premier obviously must take himself back to the department for briefing notes before he can take on the excellent speech this evening by the Leader of the Opposition, that should strike home to the back-benchers on the Government side, because the Premier will not have that opportunity if he appears on television shows such as "Nationwide" in debate with the Leader of the Opposition. He will not be able to ask for the cameras to be stopped for 24 hours so that he can ring up the member for Nedlands or the member for East Melville to get a response to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Sibson: Who wants to appear on "Nationwide"?

Mr PEARCE: The Premier will not be able to avoid this issue when the polls show the Government is languishing with 46 per cent. He will not have the capacity to ring up the member for East Melville to get him to do his job for him. He will not be able to hide because the people will be looking for him and there will be six weeks or less to voting time.

One of the reasons members opposite reacted so badly when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking this evening was the uneasiness they have about the desperate gamble riding on this legislation, legislation which has been shown clearly not to be the plus they thought it would be. Members opposite lack the people to bring to successful fruition the desperate chance they are taking with this legislation. We have on this side in our Legislative Assembly spokesman for industrial relations matters and in the Leader of the Opposition, the people who can deal most effectively with this issue. So the embarrassed laughter, the idiotic and inane comments made during the Leader of the Opposition's speech in an attempt to drown out and shout down, were signs of despair when thinking about the performance of their own members in this area. It was a clear demonstration to them of how the whole business has come unstuck.

This Bill represents a desperate political ploy to assist a Government which has the staggers, a Government on the skids, a Government on the way out, a Government in desperate electoral trouble.

But who will pay the price for this desperate throw of the dice? This comes right back to the reason that employer groups are opposed to this Bill. Obviously the employers will foot the bill for what occurs as a result of the passing of this legislation. If the Government is pinning its hopes for its re-election on causing industrial disruption in factories and on building sites before the election is held in order to gain some cheap political advantage, the employer groups know they are the ones who will pay the price for the industrial disruption that will occur.

The irony of this whole matter is that the Government has aimed this Bill at the unions, but the people who will pay the price will be the employers. They realise this only too well. They realise they will sign the cheques for the industrial disruption that will occur, caused by this Government in its hopes of being re-elected. Many employer groups in the community do not want the disruption; they do not want it; they do not want the disruption; they do not want to pay the price to get this Government off the hook. It is not a secret that in the past employer organisations have been prepared to sign quite substantial cheques one way or another to save a Liberal Government.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, what is happening now is that business is beginning to listen to what members of the Australian Labor Party are saying. They are starting to do their calculations and coming to realise that a Labor Government in this State may not be so bad even in their own terms, which are not particularly community oriented in many ways. They are not prepared to pay the price to get this Government off the hook. That is why the employer groups are so concerned about this legislation. They do not want it; they do not want the disruption; they do not want to pay the price. The price they will pay will be spread through the community. This was one of the points made so ably by the Leader of the Opposition. Employers will be paying the price, but they will not be able to pay the workers. This Bill clearly will result in unemployment to an
even greater degree in this State, so to that extent the community will pay the price.

What we have on the Government side is a little under 30 people who are prepared to sell the employer groups and the community down the drain. They are prepared to cop 10 per cent unemployment in this State merely to hang on to their big white cars, their ministerial salaries, and their hopes of promotion which always rest in the saddle bags of Government back-benchers. But it is the people in the community who will have to pay the price.

I do not believe this Government is worth it to the community; I do not believe the community believes the Government is worth it. The employer groups do not believe the Government is worth it. The tragic irony of this will be that the Government's move will come unstuck. Not only will the community pay the price and the employers pay the price, but also they will not be getting the goods because in the end they will finish up with a Labor Government anyway.

Mr Coyne: God help them!

Mr PEARCE: I think they will be remarkably well off compared with what they have now. Look around—where is the substance on the Government front benches; where is the substance on the Government back benches? During one of the keynote debates in this session all we have had from the other side are two junior Government members presenting the Government's case after the Minister for Health had read word for word the speech given to him by the Minister in another place when introducing the Bill. That is the substance we have had from the Government. It is not good enough; it is not a good enough presentation to this House; it is not a good enough presentation to the people of this State.

Unfortunately, the Bill will be a disaster for industrial relations. It will not lead to greater harmony in the work place; it will not lead to greater harmony in the community. If one thing is required in industrial relations, it is harmony. One only has to look at the Government's pathetic and jack-booted efforts to deal with the Teachers' Union to realise how little respect it has for the principles which underlie industrial relations and how ineffective its efforts have been in trying to introduce jack-boots into the industrial process.

Mr Coyne: What about the Teachers' Union?

Mr PEARCE: It is more anti-Government now than it ever was.

Mr Coyne: How many members does it have now?

Mr PEARCE: I do not deny there are unfortunate splits amongst the membership of the Teachers' Union.

Mr Coyne: Who brought it about?

Mr PEARCE: Members opposite did, and that is exactly the point I am making. In order to deal with the Teachers' Union because it was mildly critical of the Government, the Government has taken a union which must have been one of the most conservative and moderate in this State and turned it into one of the most radical unions. It still speaks for teachers.

Mr Sibson: It does not; it speaks for about a quarter of them. It took the best school in Western Australia out on strike.

Mr PEARCE: It was all because of the Government's effort to involve itself in industrial relations for political purposes, and this made for all those unfortunate things that occurred. And who paid the price? It was the kids in our schools. It is exactly the same principle that underlies this whole business.

The community will be made to pay for the Government's latest attempt to intervene in industrial relations for political purposes. We need only look back at what the Government has done in industrial relations in our education system to realise how unfortunate this is. Everyone pays the price because the Government believes it can gain points from industrial disharmony. What sort of a cynical attitude is that, when a Government is prepared to hold the community to ransom in order to lift its own rating in the polls? The lower the Government sinks in the polls the lower it sinks in every other way in terms of things it is prepared to do in its feeble attempts to hang on to office.

This Bill is a disaster in two ways: It is a disaster for the community and it is a disaster for industrial relations. Unemployment will be higher and the economic downturn spiral will go even lower. The savage irony from which I will gain some personal satisfaction is that the legislation will be a disaster for the Government. Not only are unions—the workers of our community—speaking out against this legislation but also employer groups are speaking out against it despite the efforts of the Government's big money men to lean on those employer groups; but they have not been successful.

How can the Government go to the public and say, "We are treading on unions", when employers are being disruptive and saying that the Government should stay out of the industrial arena? Consideration must be given to not only the fact that employers are strongly against the
Government's introduction of this legislation, but also the fact that this legislation was politically designed. The Government will not obtain community support because every group involved with this legislation is opposed to the Government's actions.

In the end the public will accept the argument put to it by the Leader of the Opposition. He put that argument superbly well tonight. Nobody in this House believes that the Premier will be able to speak in the same forum as the Leader of the Opposition. If he is to take on the Leader of the Opposition at all he will have to scurry off to his office to prepare notes. The media will not give him that opportunity at election time.

We have the strong arguments, and we have the people to put our arguments well and strongly, and we have on our side the groups involved. We are not fearful of this legislation, or of opposing it wholeheartedly, especially with the knowledge that we have the strength and force in our hands to adopt that course.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr I. F. Taylor.

JUSTICES AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Rushton (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.53 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Membership

1708. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary, Minister for Cultural Affairs, and Recreation:

In respect of the following bodies—

(a) Youth, Sport and Recreation Advisory Committee; Sub-committees for:

Youth
Recreation
Sport (WA Institute of Sport Advisory Board);

(b) Vacation Care Advisory Committee;

(c) Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities Fund Committee;

(d) Betting Control Board;

(e) Racecourse Development Trust;

(f) WA Greyhound Racing Association;

(g) Perth Observatory Scientific Advisory Committee;

(h) Charitable Collections Advisory Committee;

(i) State Advisory Committee on Publications;

(j) Finance Brokers Supervisory Board;

(k) Insurance Brokers Supervisory Board;

(l) Land Valuers Licensing Board;

(m) Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board;

(n) Settlement Agents Supervisory Board;

(o) Western Australian Art Gallery;

(p) Western Australian Arts Council;

(q) Western Australian Heritage Committee;

(r) Perth Theatre Trust;

(s) Perth Cultural Centre Planning Committee;

(t) Regional Cultural Facilities Fund Committee;

(u) National Trust—

(i) who are the people who comprise the membership of such bodies;

(ii) what is the occupational background of each member;

(iii) what is the term of appointment to each body and when was each member appointed;

(iv) on how many occasions did the bodies meet during the last financial year; and

(v) what is the amount and basis of payment of financial allowances to members of each body?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(a) to (u) The answer is hereby tabled.

The reply was tabled (see paper No. 526).

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Emergency Relief

1795. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Can he confirm that the Commonwealth Government has allocated $40,000 to Western Australia for emergency relief?
(2) Can he confirm also that he will be making recommendations to the Minister for Social Security regarding the allocation of these funds to distributing agencies?

(3) (a) Will applications for grants from this allocation to agencies involved in administering emergency relief be advertised; and
(b) if not, why not?

(4) If not, what opportunity will be given to interested agencies to apply for grants from this allocation?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

(1) The Commonwealth Government has allocated $43,000 to Western Australia for agencies active in the provision of emergency financial assistance.

(2) and (3) Yes.

(4) Answered by (3) above.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Como

1813. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Education:

(1) In respect of the Budget allowance of $90,000 for the provision of a library resource centre at Como primary school, was the consultation evening held at the school on Tuesday, 19 October, satisfactory to the Education Department?

(2) Is it still intended to provide a 160 square metres library building and also carry out some minor changes to the administrative area of the school?

(3) When will the project proceed to tender?

(4) When is it anticipated the work will be commenced?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) A consultation was held at the school on the morning of Tuesday, 19 October. The result of the consultation was satisfactory to the Education Department.

(2) Yes.

(3) and (4) The work should be ready for tender early in the new year; and construction should commence shortly afterwards.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Como

1814. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Apropos of his answer to question 1714 on Tuesday, 19 October 1982, has he yet received a report on how the bicycle congestion at the Como Senior High School can be resolved; and if so, what is the substance of that report?

(2) If no report has yet been received, when is one expected?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) and (2) The proposed solution, determined by Education Department officers in consultation with the principal, is for the provision of a new cycle access pathway from the existing cycle enclosure to an alternative exit away from the point of congestion. Supervision and use of the proposed alternative cycle access will be monitored by the principal and staff.

An additional cause of congestion relates to the buses. The possibility of additional bus bays in Henley Street is being investigated also by the Public Works Department.

CHIROPODISTS ACT

Amendment

1815. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

Further to question 1754 of 1982, if agreement was reached between the Public Health Department and the Australian Podiatry Association in August 1981 on amendments to the Chiropodists Act, can he explain why, during the 14 months that have elapsed, the Bill could not have been drafted and presented to Parliament?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The ordering of priorities within the Government's legislative programme is not determined by the Public Health Department or the Australian Podiatry Association.

HOSPITALS

Free Service

1816. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) What percentage of Government hospital bed days, in the period 1 September 1981 to 30 June 1982, were accounted for by Commonwealth eligible beneficiaries such as age pensioners, health card holders, etc.?
(2) How much was the Commonwealth health grant to Western Australia for the 1981-82 year; and what percentage of the hospital gross and net operating payments did it represent?

(3) Can he provide details of the total cost or an estimation of the cost of providing a free hospital service during the period 1 September 1981 to 30 June 1982 for eligible pensioners and health care card holders?

(4) (a) Has there been a decline in the use of casualty and outpatient services in Western Australian Government hospitals since the introduction of the new health arrangements in September 1981; (b) if "Yes" to (a), would he please provide details?

(5) Has the overall bed occupancy rate in Government hospitals declined since 1 September 1981, and if so, please provide details?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) 46.3 per cent.

(2) (a) The identified health grant paid to Western Australia for the 1981-82 year was $155 million; (b) represents 45 per cent of gross payments of hospitals; (c) represents 55.8 per cent of net operating payments of hospitals.

(3) An estimate using average daily bed costs is $127 million.

(4) (a) Yes; (b) September 1980—June 1981—2 074 957 occasions of service September 1981—June 1982—1 805 514 occasions of service.


TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Overlength

1817. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Why does an overlength vehicle licensed in South Australia and permitted to travel in all other States face prosecution in Western Australia for being overlength?

(2) What rights has an owner driver in such circumstances, or is he not permitted to travel in Western Australia at all?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) An overlength vehicle licensed in South Australia is allowed to operate in Western Australia for the cartage of an indivisible load provided that an overlength permit has been applied for and obtained. This concession does not apply to the transport of divisible loads which can be transported on regulation length vehicles. This policy applies in all other States and is not confined to Western Australia.

Existing South Australian regulations provide for the licensing of longer vehicles than all other States. This situation is currently under review by the South Australian authorities with the aim of changing their regulation length limits for vehicles to conform with those applying in all other States.

(2) Owner drivers are permitted to travel in Western Australia subject to obtaining relevant permits for overlength vehicle, load, or vehicle combination. These permits are issued in accordance with longstanding procedures and policies.

HEALTH

Pyrton Training Centre

1818. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) As there appear to be rumours being spread as to what is going to happen to the inmates at Pyrton Training Centre, will he put the parents' minds at ease by stating what exactly is planned or proposed to happen to the inmates?

(2) What is planned or proposed to happen to the training centre?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Pyrton Training Centre is a residential facility designed to accommodate 160 persons, and provides for residents' appropriate training in a wide range of skills. There has been no change in this facility's purpose or function; nor are any changes planned.
It has always been the case that residents are appropriately transferred when, as a result of training, they reach a level of competency which permits their transfer to other training facilities of the Division for the Intellectually Handicapped.

In recent years, as a result of transfers from Swanbourne Hospital, there has been an increase in transfers from Pyrton to other Division for the Intellectually Handicapped facilities. Devonleigh Hostel accommodates 32 children who were former residents at Pyrton. In the current financial year, 16 children—residents of Blackwood dormitory, Pyrton—will transfer to appropriate facilities, suitable for their age and training needs.

(2) There are no plans for proposed changes to the purpose and function of Pyrton Training Centre, nor the services it provides.

APPRENTICES
Suspensions

1819. Mr Brian Burke, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) How many applications have been made to cancel or suspend the indentures of apprentices in each of the last 12 months?
(2) How many applications were granted?
(3) In how many cases was the applicant a Government employer, including statutory authorities?

Mr Young replied:

(1) to (3) As the answer requires detailed statistical information, the member will be advised by letter.

1820. This question was postponed.

STOCK: SHEEP
Shearing

1821. Mr Brian Burke, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

(1) Is he aware that there was a shearing class held at the Mt. Barker High School last month which involved an Aboriginal instructor, six young Aborigines, and a similar number of unemployed white people?
(2) Is he aware that at the end of the two week class the youths became efficient shearsers?
(3) Will he consider the shearing and crutching of sheep on the Pardalup prison farm for the training of young Aborigines with an Aboriginal instructor?

Mr Hassell replied:

(1) A shearing class held at Mt. Barker High School during the August school holidays was arranged by the Commonwealth Employment Service, Albany. Approximately 600 sheep were shorn or crutched by 12 participants.
(2) No.
(3) Prisoners at Pardalup Prison Farm receive instruction regularly in shearing and crutching from a qualified staff member. In addition, an annual shearing school is held for prisoners in co-operation with the Department of Agriculture. Although no distinction is made between white and Aboriginal prisoners, at the last school, six out of eight prisoner learners were of Aboriginal descent.

ARGENTINE ANTS
Herdsman Lake

1822. Dr Dadour, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) In treating Herdsman Lake for Argentine ants, will he please state—
   (a) the precise areas being treated;
   (b) the chemicals being used;
   (c) the strength of the chemicals;
   (d) the dates during 1981-82 on which treatments have been carried out for each precise area?
(2) Who is responsible for assessing the level of infestation of Argentine ants?
(3) Who compiles the treatment programme?
(4) Who is responsible for monitoring the treatment programme?
(5) Will he table the treatment programme?

Mr Old replied:

(1) (a) Herdsman Lake is a containment area of 350 hectares treated annually by a narrow perimeter spray;
   (b) heptachlor with backup of diazinon, optunal, and chlorpyrifos in selected situations;
   (c) 0.5 per cent dry ground application;
ARGENTINE ANTS

Herdsmen Lake

1823. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware of statements contained in his letter to residents in the vicinity of Herdsmen Lake which indicate that sprays being used to treat Argentine ants leave toxic residues?
(2) Why did his letter not include a list of chemicals used?
(3) Is heptachlor being used at Herdsmen Lake?
(4) If “Yes” to (3), is he aware that heptachlor is reported to be highly toxic to aquatic life, to persist for prolonged periods in the environment, to bio-concentrate in organisms at various trophic levels, and to exhibit carcinogenic activity in mice?
(5) Will he investigate other toxic options for controlling Argentine ants?
(6) Is research being undertaken in Western Australia on biological control of Argentine ants?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Yes.
(2) There are a number of options available depending on the situation.
(3) Yes. Along with other registered insecticides.
(4) Yes. Every attempt is made to avoid chemical contamination of water. Local evidence shows that a chemical is broken down within three months.
(5) Yes. The USA Academy of Science has reported that the cancer could not be cross-linked to humans.
(6) No. Research is being undertaken by the USDA. My department is in contact with workers in this field who visited Western Australia in 1979 to inspect local conditions.

1824. This question was postponed.

TOURISM

Wittenoom

1825. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is the department satisfied that the area 7 kilometres east of Wittenoom proposed for tourist development, is free of asbestos fibre?
(2) Has any monitoring for airborne asbestos fibre been conducted in that area?
(3) If “Yes” to (2), what are the results?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Yes, to the extent that any area in the Pilbara is free of non-introduced asbestos fibre.
(2) No.
(3) Not applicable.

TOURISM

Wittenoom

1826. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Tourism:

(1) With reference to the area 7 kilometres east of Wittenoom proposed for tourist development, is the State Government going to provide any of the basic infrastructure, i.e., roads, power and water service?
(2) If the Government does not intend providing any of those services, who is going to provide them?
(3) What involvement does the State Government intend to have in the new area?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

(1) to (3) Proposals for detailed study of a new centre are being examined by the Government at this time. It is proposed to commence this detailed study shortly. The study will provide advice on all matters including infrastructure, i.e. roads, power, and water services.
WITTENOOK
Public Buildings
1827. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Works:

(1) How much maintenance has been carried out on—
   (a) State Housing Commission;
   (b) Government Employees' Housing Authority;
   (c) Public Works Department; and
   (d) Police Department
buildings in Wittenoom since November 1979?

(2) Are the buildings being maintained to a standard acceptable elsewhere in Western Australia?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) (a) to (d) As the State Housing Commission and Government Employees' Housing Authority are not part of my portfolio, I am not in a position to provide any information concerning these two organisations.

The Public Works Department engineering division has a small depot in Wittenoom. Because of its function, minimal maintenance is required. Maintenance on the police station has been confined to matters of an essential nature. The building is due for major repairs and renovations this financial year, but work has been held over pending clarification of the future of the town.

(2) This question does not apply to the Public Works Department. As stated, the police station is receiving essential maintenance and, bearing in mind that major repairs and renovations are due this year, the standard of maintenance is considered acceptable.

WITTENOOK
Asbestos Tailings: Removal
1828. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Works:

How much money has been expended by the following departments in removing and covering asbestos tailings in Wittenoom to a standard similar to that carried out by the Shire of West Pilbara and local residents:

(a) State Housing Commission;
(b) Government Employees' Housing Authority;
(c) Education Department; and
(d) Police Department?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) to (d) As the State Housing Commission and Government Employees' Housing Authority are not part of my portfolio, I am not in a position to provide any information regarding these two organisations.

With regard to the Education Department and Police Department buildings, departmental records are not maintained in a manner which would enable expenditure on removal and covering of asbestos tailings to be separately identified.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT
Woodman Point
1829. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) What instrumentality compiled the Woodman Point concept plan?
(2) On what date was the plan completed?
(3) Has the plan been publicly released?
(4) If "No" to (4), why not?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) The Jervoise Bay/Woodman Point coordinating steering committee.
(2) The report of the committee was submitted to me on 26 June 1981.
(3) Basic details of the plan were announced in May 1982, and I table a copy of the plan.
(4) Not applicable.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 524).

EDUCATION
Language Development Centre
1830. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Does the Government intend to establish a language development centre north of the river?
(2) If so, when and where?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) Yes.
(2) (a) Beginning of first term, 1983;
(b) negotiations have not yet been finalised regarding the location as such, as appropriate accommodation and transport and the geographic location of the possible students have to be considered.

RAILWAYS
“Prospector” Service

1831. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) In the estimate given by Westrail to allow the Prospector to stop at Midland terminal, what is the break-up of labour and material?

(2) Is this costing based on the work being carried out by Westrail or by private contractors?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Track work</th>
<th>Signalling alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>105 000</td>
<td>16 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>219 000</td>
<td>157 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324 000</td>
<td>173 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) By Westrail.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES: GOVERNMENT STORES

Motor Vehicle Deliveries

1832. Mr GRILL, to the Treasurer:

(1) Is it a fact that the Government Stores department is taking weeks and sometimes months to effect settlement on new cars taken delivery of by various other Government departments?

(2) If “Yes”, is he aware of the financial strain this is placing on certain car dealers, some of whom have had to borrow money to finance these sales?

(3) What are the usual terms given to the Government on the purchase of motor vehicles?

(4) Will he look into the matter with a view to directing the department to effect settlement on the vehicles on delivery?

Mr O’CONNOR replied:

(1) There have been some problems with the payment of accounts by the Government Stores department due to a change in the method of processing the accounts. The terms of payment under the motor vehicle contract is 30 days from the date of acknowledgement of the receipt of the vehicle. In the majority of cases this condition has been met by the department.

The Government has a policy of purchasing vehicles required in country areas through local dealers and, in some instances, departments in remote locations have been slow to acknowledge receipt of vehicles.

(2) I am aware that delays in the payment of accounts can cause financial problems for suppliers; and we are constantly seeking to ensure prompt payment of accounts.

(3) Answered by (1) above.

(4) The Controller of Stores is aware of the need to expedite the settlement of these accounts and is taking steps to ensure that the terms of the motor vehicle contracts are met.

POULTRY: CHICKENS

Licensing System

1833. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has he received representations from chicken meat growers in Western Australia seeking to have the industry restructured to introduce a system of licensing or a system of seven-year contracts with transfer rights between growers?

(2) If “Yes”, what attitude did he express to these growers?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) I received a delegation of chicken meat growers in June 1982 to discuss industry problems. At that meeting—

a system of licensing was not sought by growers;

a four-year contract system was supported.

(2) The discussion was for information purposes only.

POULTRY: CHICKENS

Shedding

1834. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Does his department make regulations under the Chicken Meat Industry Act
with regard to shedding used in the chicken raising industry?

(2) If "Yes", do these regulations embrace the construction of additional shedding in the industry?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) The regulations which exist regarding shedding were made following recommendations by the chicken meat industry committee.

(2) Yes.

POULTRY: BROILER CHICKENS

Price

1835. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What is the price which broiler growers currently receive for raising each bird under contract to processors?

(2) (a) What price per bird was set in the most recent survey conducted by the Department of Agriculture; and
(2) when was this survey carried out?

(3) (a) Has there been a price per bird to growers indicated by an arbitrator this year; and
(3) if so—
(3) (i) who was the arbitrator;
(3) (ii) what price did he indicate;
(3) (iii) on what date did he bring down his findings?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) The standard price is currently 32.4c per bird.

(2) (a) Based on the most recent survey the calculated standard price was 29.55c per bird; this price was not accepted by the chicken meat industry committee;

(b) May and June 1981; report dated June 1981.

(3) (a) Yes;
(3) (b) (i) W. H. Crawford;
(3) (ii) 28.87c per bird for pools completed after 30 June 1981;
29.13c per bird for pools commenced after 30 June 1981;
29.57c per bird for pools commenced after 30 Sept 1981;
30.31c per bird for pools commenced after 31 Dec 1981;
(3) (iii) 28 April 1982.

POULTRY: CHICKENS

Contracts

1836. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Have any chicken meat growers been given notice of intention that their growing contracts with a processor will be terminated?

(2) If "Yes"—

(a) how many growers have received such notice;
(b) what is the reason for their being given such notice;
(c) under what conditions and terms is it expected such notice will be withdrawn;
(d) if this notice is not withdrawn, does the Government propose to take any action; and
(e) if so, what action?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Five;
(2) (b) surplus shedding capacity in the industry;
(2) (c) notice has been withdrawn already following discussion between growers and processors;
(2) (d) and (e) do not apply.

POULTRY: CHICKENS

Consumption

1837. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What number of chickens were consumed in Western Australia in each of the past three years?

(2) What number of chickens were imported into Western Australia for table purposes in each of the past three years?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) The number of chickens slaughtered for consumption in Western Australia was—

1979-80 18 982 000
1980-81 19 562 000
1981-82 18 561 000

(2) This data is not recorded.
LOCUSTS
Spraying

1838. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In cases where the spraying of locusts under the Agriculture Protection Board has been unsuccessful, will the property owners be required to meet all or any of the costs; and if so, what costs?

Mr OLD replied:

Unsuccessful spraying in the Jerramungup area was caused by a range of different factors. Liability for payment will depend on the reasons for poor results. Each case is being considered by the farmer and the operator concerned, with technical advice from the Agriculture Protection Board.

EDUCATION: DEPARTMENT
Building: Land

1839. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Who owns the land on which the Education Department building is located?
(2) What was the cost of the building?
(3) Who owns the building?
(4) Does the Education Department occupy the building on a lease or mortgage repayment arrangement?
(5) What are the details of this financial arrangement?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) The Crown.
(2) Approximately $21.2 million.
(3) Superannuation Board of WA.
(4) A lease expiring on 30 June 2005.
(5) Payment of rental including interest, repayment of capital and all annual costs, with review of rental each three years.

PUBLIC SERVICE: PUBLIC SERVANTS
Retirement: Age 55

1840. Mr PEARCE, to the Premier:

Is it the intention of the Government during the present session of State Parliament to make the necessary alterations to legislation now in force to enable employees of the Government to retire voluntarily at the age of 55 years without pro rata affecting their superannuation entitlement?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The Government has stated that it accepts in principle the proposal for an early retirement option from age 55 for Government employees provided it is at no additional cost to the taxpayer. Retirement at age 55 without reduction of pension entitlement would be a costly move that could not be justified in view of the already steeply increasing cost of pension payments.

The Government has proposals before it for an early retirement option with actuarially calculated adjustments to pension entitlements. The proposals will be made available for examination and comment to Government employee organisations through the joint Government-employee organisations superannuation committee, as requested by the committee, before any decision is made in the matter.

Because of the need for full consultations with employee organisations, it is unlikely that legislation can be introduced in the current session.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Thornlie

1841. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it intended to acquire more land to extend the site of the Thornlie Technical College?
(2) If so, will he give details of the proposed acquisition?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) The possibility is being investigated.
(2) Not yet available.

POLICE: FIREARMS
Legislation

1842. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

What action has the Government taken to act on the suggested amendments to firearms legislation made by Mr Oliver Dixon in his report on the matter made public in February this year?

Mr HASSELL replied:

As indicated in answer to question 978 in this House, the Dixon Report is still being studied to determine what legislative changes, if any, should be made.
should be recognised that the recommended amendments suggested by Mr Dixon are numerous, and differ considerably from the existing legislation. No action to amend the legislation is proposed until all facets and ramifications of the report have been perused thoroughly, to ensure that any changes are manageable administratively. The necessary work has not been completed. Unfortunately it will therefore not be possible to introduce legislative amendments this session.

BOATS

PA Consulting Services Pty. Ltd.: Recommendations

1843. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Works:

What action has been taken by the Government to implement the recommendations made by PA Consulting Services Pty. Ltd. on boating in this State, and released in February of this year?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The report has been further studied by an inter-departmental recreational boating facilities committee and a position paper prepared for discussion purposes. When all departmental comments have been received, a meeting will be convened to discuss priorities and implied funding requirements.

CENSORSHIP

Uniform Classification

1844. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is it still intended to seek a national uniform censorship classification for publications, as announced towards the end of last year?

(2) If so, what progress has been made?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) and (2) Discussions have been held between the States and the Commonwealth and the matter is under consideration.

LAND AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Consultations

1845. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:

(1) With reference to the land Bill which will enable easement rights to be granted over Crown land, did he consult with the following authorities—

(a) WA Wildlife Authority;
(b) Department of Fisheries and Wildlife;
(c) Forests Department;
(d) Department of Conservation and Environment;
(e) National Parks Authority;
(f) Environmental Protection Authority;
(g) Local government authorities which control reserves; and
(h) Tree Society or any other groups?

(2) (a) At what level of department or authority were such discussions held;

(b) on what date were each of these discussions held;

(c) did any raise objections, and if so which, and what was the nature of such objections?

(3) If these groups were not consulted, why not?

(4) (a) Did he inform these groups that in the case of consent not forthcoming, resumption or further negotiation could take place with the parties concerned;

(b) if “Yes”, what was the response from such groups?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) to (3) An objective of the legislation is to enable a significant improvement on the present position where, when access through reserves vested in some of the authorities listed is required, the only course is to obtain an excision from the reserve in question or to amend the reserve purpose and jointly vest it. The creation of an easement is a far more acceptable proposition; and the availability of this option is known to be considered a firm advantage.

Since, as in the case of excisions, consultation with, and the approval of, the vestee is necessary before an easement may be granted, the legislation will not compromise such authorities.

(4) Answered by (1) to (3).
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

STATE FINANCE: PAYROLL TAX

Abolition

674. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that at a meeting in Adelaide last Friday, the Federal and State Labor leaders established a working party to find ways of eliminating payroll tax because of its effect as a disincentive to employment?

(2) Will he initiate similar moves in the Liberal Party with the aim of creating more employment opportunities for the half a million Australians who cannot find work?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) I am aware that this proposal in relation to payroll tax has been tried before without success under Labor Governments in the Eastern States. The indications have been clear that it has not created any more work in the States concerned. I have not studied closely the arrangements in relation to the South Australian operation. We always are looking at ways in which to reduce payroll tax. We have been in touch in the past with the Federal Government in an effort to see whether it would replace payroll tax with another tax.

We have a very firm indication from the Federal Government it would not do that. It was not prepared to replace it in any way with a further Federal tax. This was raised in a letter from the previous Premier to the Prime Minister at that time. We will continue at all times to look at ways in which we can improve the situation.

HOSPITAL

Wickham District

675. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it proposed to reduce staff levels at the Wickham District Hospital?

(2) If so, in what categories?

(3) Is it proposed to replace trained nursing sisters with nursing aides?

(4) If the answer to (3) is "Yes", will adequate trained nursing staff be available to service the needs of outpatients and normal theatre requirements?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I thank the member for adequate notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

(1) The staff establishment was adjusted as at 30 June 1982, to reflect patient activity. The hospital's current excess staffing will be reduced by normal attrition. If there is a sustained increase in workload, the staff establishment can be reviewed.

(2) Nursing Administration Domestic Services Maintenance

establishment adjustments within these categories result in a net reduction of the equivalent of one staff member.

(3) It is proposed to achieve a better balance between the two categories by normal attrition. The resultant numbers will involve a reduction in the hours of trained nurses available and an increase in the hours of nursing aides available.

(4) Yes.

POLICE

Function: Osborne Park

676. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

(1) Did police attend a function at the premises of Economic Distributors in Osborne Park on the evening of Friday, 22 October.

(2) If "Yes"

(a) at what time did they attend;

(b) what caused them to attend;

(c) how many police attended and how many police vehicles were used;

(d) how many people were at the function;

(e) how long were the police in attendance;

(f) what action did the police take as a result of their attendance at this function.

Mr HASSELL replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) 10.00 p.m.;

(b) information received;

(c) seven officers, five vehicles;
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(d) approximately 300;
(e) approximately 45 minutes;
(f) liquor was seized under search warrant, and a person in
charge is to be prosecuted for unlawfully dealing in liquor.
Some gaming material also was found on the premises, but
the owner of the equipment could not be located at the
time. Inquiries are continuing.

POLICE

Function: Osborne Park

677. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

(1) Further to any previous question, will the
Minister please confirm that gambling
equipment was confiscated by police at
the function previously referred to.
(2) Where did the police take this equip-
ment after confiscating it?
(3) Where did police take the funds that
also were confiscated when they visited
the function and can the Minister con-
firm that the function was organised to
raise money for the Liberal Party or one
of its candidates?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) to (3) The member for Fremantle knows
he has given me no notice of this
question. I do not have any of the details
to which he refers, because as he would
know, I am not apprised of the daily op-
erations of the police.

Mr Parker: You would have been briefed as
a result of the first question.

Mr HASSELL: I do not know any of the de-
tails in the member's second question. I
have not been briefed.

Mr Parker: You do not want to be, either.

Mr HASSELL: I have not been briefed on
any of those details. I was briefed with
information to answer the question of
which the member gave notice. If he
puts the second question on the notice
paper, it will be answered.

WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN
WATER AUTHORITY

Vehicle Fleet

678. Mr HERZFELD, to the Minister for
Water Resources:

Has there been, or is there anticipated to
be, any reduction in the size of the
Metropolitan Water Authority's motor
vehicle fleet?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Within the terms of an economic drive
and to implement improvements in ef-
ficiency, the Metropolitan Water Auth-
ority commissioned private consultants
to examine the cost-benefit pertaining to
the motor vehicle fleet. As a result of the
report of those consultants, it has been
decided to reduce the number of motor
vehicles by 67 units, which will result in
a saving in capital outlay of nearly
$500 000, and a saving of about $90 000
in ongoing expenses.

Mr Parker: That will leave the authority with
about 900 vehicles, will it not?

Mr MENSAROS: Yes. Notwithstanding
that decision, I have instructed the auth-
ority to examine ways of implementing
further reductions without, of course,
reducing services to the consumers. That
consideration is of paramount import-
ance, and I believe the interjection of the
member for Fremantle was made with
that in mind. I add that recently the
management of the fleet was made more
efficient by replacing the old manual re-
cording system with a computerised
system.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Equity Sale

679. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Resources
Development:

I refer to his statement in this House
yesterday that the proposed involvement
of two Japanese companies in the
North-West Shelf LNG processing plant
would clear the way for finalisation of
LNG sales contracts to Japan. I ask—

In view of the warning given
yesterday by the Managing Direc-
tor of Woodside Offshore Pet-
roleum Pty Ltd. (Mr Charles
Allen) that the possibility of direct
Japanese equity did not guarantee
that companies would sign con-
tracts to buy the gas, what basis did
the Minister have for his statement
to this House yesterday?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Obviously the member for Yilgarn-
Dundas did not listen to my reply
yesterday, because I did not say two
companies were involved. In fact, the statement did not say that; the statement said that discussions had been held with two companies. I also said it was not a final agreement.

Mr Grill: You play with semantics. What about answering the question?

Mr P. V. Jones: I made it quite clear the statement did not say that. I also made it clear in answer to the Leader of the Opposition that it was not a final agreement.

Mr Grill: Are you going to give me an answer, or not?

Mr P. V. Jones: What Mr Allen said was perfectly correct in that it has not cleared the way in the manner which the member for Yilgarn-Dundas suggested I said in my answer yesterday. Indeed, I went to great pains to say it was not a final agreement. The discussions were held with a view to finalising the form of the one-sixth Japanese equity in the project which now has been offered. When that agreement is finalised, it will clear the way to bring to finality the remaining points which must be discussed. As I have told the member on several occasions, one matter which still is to be finalised relates to the Japanese involvement in the shipping part of the exercise; the proposal clarifies that aspect. So, this goes a long way towards clearing the way. However, I was quite specific yesterday that, in itself, the announcement did not represent the final form of the agreement with the company.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR RECREATION

Newspaper Advertisement: Photograph

681. Mr Davies, to the Premier:

(1) Has he seen an advertisement inserted by a photograph frame manufacturer in The West Australian of Monday, 25 October in which advertisement appears the now well-known photograph of the Hon. R. G. (Bob) Pike?

(2) Is this novel use of a Minister's photograph the latest initiative on the part of the Government in generating income for the State?

Mr O'Connor replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No. However, it is such a good photograph I am surprised many more people have not used it.

TABLED PAPERS

Confidential

682. Mr Blaikie, to the Premier:

(1) Were the papers referred to in a recent speech by the member for Kalgoorlie, and tabled at the request of the Premier, of a confidential nature?

(2) If so, what action does the Premier propose to take?

Mr O'Connor replied:

(1) Yes, the documents were supposed to be of a confidential nature. However, members of the Australian Labor Party frequently leak such documents, which is a great pity.

(2) The only thing I can do is to express disappointment at the next Premiers' Conference that some people have breached the confidentiality of that meeting.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Ord River Scheme: Statutory Body

680. Mr Brian Burke, to the Premier:

(1) Does the Government have any plans for the establishment of a statutory body—another one—such as a commission or an authority to oversee development of the Ord region?

(2) Have any discussions on such a proposal been held in the Ord region?

Mr O'Connor replied:

(1) and (2) Not to my knowledge.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Ord River Scheme: Statutory Body

683. Mr Brian Burke, to the Premier:

I am not sure whether I heard the Premier aright in his answer to my last question and I now ask another question about the Government's lack of plans to establish an authority to oversee the development of the Ord region. It is as follows—
(1) Is the Premier aware that such an authority was promised by the Government at the last election?
(2) What steps have been taken either to implement or to abandon that policy?

Mr O'Connor replied:

(1) and (2) I thought I answered the last question quite clearly. My answer to this question is, "Yes, I knew it was in the policy."

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Industry

684. Mr Herzfeld, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in The West Australian of 20 October reporting an Australian Labor Party initiative to appoint an independent assessment group to review and investigate applications for Government subsidies to industry?
(2) Does he see any merit in the idea?
(3) Will he give consideration to establishing such a body himself?

Mr MacKinnon replied:

Before answering, I have just one correction to make to part (1) of the member's question: The report appeared in The West Australian of Monday, 25 October.

Mr Davies: He could not read your writing.

Mr Brian Burke: That is the first time I have heard a question corrected by the person answering it.

Mr MacKinnon: The Leader of the Opposition will not chortle when he hears my answer, which is as follows—

(1) The article referred to by the member for Mundaring commences with the following statement—

A WA Labor government would appoint an independent assessment group to investigate and evaluate all applications for government assistance to industry.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burke, said that the assessment group would include private-sector specialists in corporate financing in industry and commerce.

I also draw the member's attention to my answer to question on notice 1408 of Tuesday, 21 September this year, asked of me by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The question sought information in respect of the membership of the finance review committee. The Leader of the Opposition obviously does not know what is happening in his own party or, for that matter, in this State, so for his information I repeat that the finance review committee is made up of people such as Mr Tom Perrott, who is a managing director, and a very well-respected and leading finance man in Western Australia; Mr Watson, who is a bank manager, and is similarly well respected; Mr Smith, an accountant; and, three Government officials. So, the committee comprises specialists in accounting, industry, and commerce.

Mr Parker: Which one is the specialist in corporate finance?

Mr MacKinnon: My answer continues—

(2) and (3) Yes, I agree with the idea; indeed, it is the same as the proposal initiated by this Government on 13 April 1981.

Mr Parker: Which one is the specialist in corporate finance?

The Speaker: Order!

Mr Parker: Which one is the specialist in corporate finance?

The Speaker: Order! I specifically indicated to the member for Fremantle that he should desist from interjecting. However, he chose to continue. If that sort of disregard for the authority of the Chair continues, I shall be forced to take appropriate action.

Mr MacKinnon: It is just another example of the inability of the Opposition to read plain English and to understand the policies this Government has under way. In addition, it highlights the complete disarray of members opposite when their leader and deputy leader do not know what is happening in a very important area of Government policy.
EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS
Bentley and Tuart Hill: Travel Arrangements

685. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Education:

Last evening, when answering a question
from the former Minister for Education,
he referred to what appears to be the
new concept of a "nominated school". I
ask—

(1) Would the Minister indicate what
he means by the expression
"nominated school"?

(2) Who identified the nominated
schools, to whom, where, and
when?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) and (2) I am quite surprised the member
for Mt. Hawthorn would think I had
that sort of information at my fingertips.
Even he should realise that although my
initials are "J.C.", I do not have those
capacities. If the member wants an
answer, let him put his question on no-
tice.

SMALL BUSINESSES
Dividends

686. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

I refer to his party's promise prior to the
last State election that his Government
would seek discussions with the Federal
Government on the abolition of the re-
quirement for private companies to pay
out dividends equal to half their annual
net earnings; the removal of the require-
ment of small businesses to pay pro-
visional tax; and, the reform of tax al-
lowances for depreciation of assets. I
ask—

(1) When have these matters been
raised with the Federal Govern-
ment, and what was the nature of
the suggestions?

(2) Will the Premier table documents
and correspondence in connection
with each such response?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) If the member were really
serious about his question, he would
have placed it on notice; certainly, he
could not have anticipated I could have
provided him with specific dates of
meetings with the Federal Government.
If he is serious about his question, I ask
him to place it on notice.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT
Investment Rate

687. Mr HODGE, to the Premier:

I assure the Premier I am serious in re-
quiring an answer to my question with-
out notice. In the 1980 Liberal Party
policy speech it was claimed that West-
ern Australia would have a projected
daily investment rate of $5 million for
the period between February 1980, and
the mid-1980s. I now ask—

What is the current daily level of
project investment in Western Aus-
tralia?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Did the member want the investment
rate as at yesterday, or today? The
question without notice is so inane it is
almost unbelievable.

Mr Bryce: Your predecessor would have
known the answer.

Mr O'CONNOR: No-one would know the
answer, on a daily basis.

Mr Brian Burke: You gave the answer last
night; you said it was $2 million a day.

Mr O'CONNOR: I said it was $2 million a
day in respect of the North-West Shelf
gas project; the Leader of the Oppo-
sition did not listen to that answer,
either.

Mr Brian Burke: If you know it in respect of
the North-West Shelf gas project, surely
you know it in respect of the State as a
whole.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the Leader of the Oppo-
sition—whom I suspect asked the mem-
ber for Melville to ask this question—is
unaware of the reply I gave last night,
let me refresh his memory: Approxi-
mately $2 million a day is invested in
the North-West Shelf gas project. How-
ever, I do not know the total investment
in the State as of today. If the member
for Melville cares to place his question
on notice, I will provide him with an answer.

PORTS

Deepening

688. Mr SODEMAN, to the Deputy Premier:

In order to continue the exercise of, "They say this" and, "We said that", I ask—

(1) Is he aware of the substance of a statement made this morning by the Opposition spokesman on mining?

(2) What action has been taken by the State Government in respect of feasibility studies into the deepening of Port Hedland and other ports in Western Australia?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) and (2) I should like to answer, "Yes" or "No", but I believe the question is worthy of a little more than that.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You are the laughing stock of the Parliament!

Mr RUSHTON: I listened to the news at 7.45 a.m. today—

Mr Bryce: I didn't think you would be out of bed by then!

Mr RUSHTON: —and I was amazed to hear a statement of projected Opposition initiative by the Labor Party's spokesman on mining issues. He made a projection as to what the Labor Party would do if it were elected. Most of the statement related to the portfolio of my colleague, the Minister for Resources Development, but the last paragraph mentioned a matter which has been dealt with already by the Government or Government instrumentalities. It reads as follows—

Finally a Labor Government would undertake feasibility studies into deepening Port Hedland and other ports, completing proposals for further infrastructure and port facilities, and making the best use of existing infrastructure.

I should like the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite to be aware that the State Government has supported the Port Hedland Port Authority in its programme of continuous monitoring of the need for improvements to the port.

In 1981 the port authority, with Government endorsement, engaged a firm of consultants at a cost of some $77 000 to provide a blueprint for the further development of the port. The consultant's report is expected to be available shortly.

The port authority recently has been considering the deepening of existing channels with a view to enabling existing vessels to load more cargo and thus improve freight earnings and also to enable larger vessels to use the port after deepening.

The authority has considered dredging options in conjunction with its consultants. Obviously the port authority is and will continue to do everything possible to facilitate the movement of iron ore through the port in larger quantities. The major companies are both represented on the port authority and are able to contribute significantly to the planning of any further development of the port that may be required.

The situation in respect of the development of other ports for the export of iron ore is under continuous scrutiny by the Government, and where necessary feasibility studies have been or are in the process of being undertaken.

In this respect only recently I have indicated my approval for the Geraldton Port Authority to employ a consultant to look into the feasibility of further developing, including deepening, the Geraldton harbour and its approaches.

Mr Brian Burke: What are you doing at Albany?

Mr RUSHTON: The Port of Albany has been deepened already.

Mr Bryce: The Labor Government did that.

Mr RUSHTON: No, it did not.

Mr Bryce: We were responsible for that.

Mr RUSHTON: In conclusion, I indicate this proposed Labor Party initiative is in fact about two years old.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Reserves

689. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

I refer to an interjection the Minister made in the speech by the member for Kimberley today. The Minister queried whether the member agreed with rec-
ommendations in a report on reserves under the control of the Department for Community Welfare. I ask—

(1) Does the Minister confirm that he previously refused to release that report publicly?

(2) If so, does the Minister's interjection on the member's speech earlier today indicate he has changed his mind and now intends to release that report?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

(1) and (2) It is obvious the member completely misunderstood the interjection I made when the member for Kimberley was speaking. I suggest that, at a later date, he check that interjection. He will then realise just how foolish his question is.

Mr Wilson: Are you going to alter it?

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS
North-West Shelf: Equity Sale

690. Mr GRILL, to the Premier:

(1) What is the Government's attitude towards the proposed sale of Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty. Ltd.'s portion or part of its interest in the processing and sale side of the LNG project in the North-West Shelf?

(2) In view of the fact that the Government has been long aware of Woodside's finance problems, what steps has the Government taken to prevent a diminution of Australian equity in the project?

(3) How can the Government defend its lamentable record of promoting Western Australian equity in its own resource development?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) The Government has kept in close contact with Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty. Ltd. to help it all the way through, realising the large number of local investors who are shareholders in that company. In order that I might give the member full details of the matter, I request he place the question on notice.

NATURAL DISASTER: DROUGHT
Declared Areas

691. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Primary Industry:

My question refers to an article in the media which indicated that a meeting of the drought consultative committee would be held on 26 October. As a consequence of that article, I ask him—

(1) Were any shire areas drought declared and, if so, which ones?

(2) Were any applications for drought relief received; and, if so, how many?

(3) How many of those applications are being considered actively?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) to (3) This matter was referred to in The West Australian this morning and in the Daily News this afternoon. No applications were received for declaration of shires as such, but applications were received for declaration of parts of shires. Declarations were made in respect of farms in the Northampton, Morawa, and Dalwallinu area as one group. Applications for a few farms in the Mullewa and Perenjori areas were deferred, and further declarations were made in the Gnowangerup-Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe area. A total of 75 farms were drought declared and the total number of applications was 95.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Steel Production

692. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

I draw the Minister's attention to the Government's undertakings in the field of industrial development at the time of the last election and ask him—

(1) Does he recall or has he conveniently forgotten the Government's 1980 election undertaking to intensify pressure for steel production in Western Australia on a scale which would double Australia's output?

(2) Why was such an undertaking given when, even in 1980, the recession had begun to be apparent throughout the world steel industry?

(3) Is it still the Government's aim to have steel production on such a scale in Western Australia?

(4) If so, what are the Minister and his department doing about it?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

(1) to (4) As the member would be aware, it is the Government's intention to try to
encourage the development of a steel industry in this State—

Mr Bryce: On that scale?

Mr MacKINNON: —and that is what we have been trying to do in association with the Italians.

Mr Bryce: On that scale?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not appropriate for the Minister to be asked a question and then be subjected to interjections while he is attempting to answer it.

Mr MacKINNON: However, the direct responsibility for the development of the steel industry as a resource-related industry falls within the portfolio of the Minister for Resources Development, and I suggest the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should address his question to that Minister who I am sure will endeavour to answer it.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Ord River Scheme: Statutory Body

693. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

I understand from the Premier's previous answers that the Government has abandoned its promise to establish an authority in the Ord Valley. I ask—

(1) Was the abandonment of that promise a phenomenon of tonight's question time or has he announced previously the fact that that promise will not be fulfilled?
(2) Can the Premier outline why the Government thinks it is not now appropriate to proceed with that promise?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) Again a misleading interpretation by the Leader of the Opposition. I have not said that the promise was abandoned; and he knows that very well.

Mr Brian Burke: Let me just ask you—

Mr O'CONNOR: I will answer this.

From time to time the Leader of the Opposition comes in with misleading statements in the House. It is most unfortunate that he sinks to this level.

Mr Brian Burke: You said the Government had no plans to do so.

Mr O'CONNOR: I did not.

Mr Brian Burke: You said, "Not to my knowledge."

Mr O'CONNOR: Correct—"not to my knowledge". If the Leader of the Opposition reads the question, he will find that I did not say the Government had abandoned it inasmuch as it—

Mr Brian Burke: I did not ask you whether the Government had abandoned it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition just said I said so. He does not know what he said three minutes ago.

Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Parker: Are you seriously suggesting, if there were plans for a statutory authority, you would not know about them?

Mr O'CONNOR: Although no final agreement has been made, discussions have been held between the Minister for Lands and the Ord River farmers in connection with this issue. To my knowledge, no finalisation has been reached. There has been no abandonment of the policy decision by the Government, nor any suggestion of it.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Ord River Scheme: Statutory Body

694. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

The Premier now tells us that, to his knowledge, discussions have been held between the Minister for Lands and the Ord River farmers. In answer to my first question on this subject tonight he said that, to his knowledge, no discussions had been held—

Government members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: No discussions had been held—

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The second part of the question asked clearly whether discussions had been held with the Ord River farmers; and the answer was, "Not to my knowledge." Now we have the Premier saying that, to his knowledge, the Minister for Lands has had discussions. What is the truth of the matter?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Both of the answers were correct.
Mr Parker: Completely contradictory.
Mr O'CONNOR: In answer to the first question by the Leader of the Opposition, I said, "Not to my knowledge"; and that was correct. I then checked with the Ministers; and I was given by the Minister for Lands the advice which I have now given to the Leader of the Opposition.
That lets him know that, again, he is wrong.

HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH
Mt. Lawley Annexe

695. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Can he confirm that the Mt. Lawley Annexe of Royal Perth Hospital is to close definitely on 1 November?
(2) Can he give an assurance on behalf of the Government that none of the 89 employees of the annexe will lose his job as a result of its closure?

Mr YOUNG replied:
(1) and (2) I have already advised this House that the Government had made it very clear, as part of its Budget strategy, to the teaching hospitals and the non-teaching hospitals, that any reductions of staff numbers that had to take place were not to take place by dismissal. That is the Government's policy, and that is what has been said to the teaching hospitals.
I reaffirm that I do not know the exact date of the closure of the Mt. Lawley Annexe of Royal Perth Hospital, but I understand it is imminent.

Mr Hodge: Will you give an assurance that no-one will lose his job?
Mr YOUNG: To make it absolutely clear to the member for Melville, I indicate it is the Government's policy, in directions to the teaching hospitals as part of the State Government's Budget strategy, that the hospitals are not to reduce staff by methods of sacking. The member for Melville now is asking me whether I can give a guarantee that nobody will lose his job. I have told him what is the Government's strategy. Royal Perth Hospital is obliged to follow that strategy by agreement between us and Royal Perth Hospital, and if somebody is dismissed from the Mt. Lawley Annexe for some purpose not associated with the Budget strategy, the member will be on his feet claiming that I have misled him.

Mr Brian Burke: He would be right, too.

HEALTH: NURSING HOME

Penn-Rose: Inquiry

696. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Health:

My question refers to the suppression by him of the Penn-Rose papers. Will he give us a reply on this matter before the resumption of the debate on the Penn-Rose motion; and, if not, why not?

Mr YOUNG replied:
What does the member for Mt. Hawthorn mean when he asks when I will give my reply on this matter? I already have replied to it three times.

Mr Bertram: You know what I mean—on 21 September.

Mr YOUNG: Perhaps the member would just tell me what he means.

Mr Bertram: On 21 September, a question was asked.

Mr YOUNG: Can the member tell me what it was?

Mr Bertram: It was to do with the delivery of the papers, documents, transcript—all evidence before you in this inquiry.

Mr YOUNG: I have answered that question three times. I have advised the member for Mt. Hawthorn that I asked the Attorney General to advise if there is any reason that I should not make those documents available. There is a pretty clear reason that a Minister who conducted such an inquiry would ask that question. I have not had a response from the Attorney General yet.