

Legislative Council

Thursday, 12 June 1986

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

WATER RESOURCES: FLUORIDATION

Implementation: Petition

The following petition bearing the signatures of 1 426 persons was presented by Hon. V. J. Ferry—

TO:

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia Request that further fluoridation of public water supplies be not implemented.

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

(See paper No. 159.)

FUTURES INDUSTRY (APPLICATION OF LAWS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

SESSIONAL ORDERS

Adoption: Motion

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.52 p.m.]: I move—

That notwithstanding any standing order or rule to the contrary, the following rules be adopted for the duration of this session—

Time Limit on Speeches

1.1—A member may not speak in the House for more than 30 minutes, and in a committee of the whole for more than 10 minutes each time, on any motion, amendment, or amendment to such amendment:

Provided that on a motion to adjourn the Council, no member shall speak for more than 5 minutes and the whole debate shall not exceed 30 minutes.

1.2—The restrictions imposed by rule 1.1 shall not apply to the Minister or member in charge of the business comprising the subject matter of the debate or to the Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of the National Party of Australia, or to a member speaking on behalf of the said Leaders.

1.3—By leave, a member's time may be extended but in such a case, no member shall speak for more than 60 minutes, and no extension of time shall be sought or granted in a committee of the whole House.

Sitting and Adjournment of Council

2.1—The Council, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business at 2.30 pm on Tuesday and Wednesday and 10.45 am on Thursday in each week. Unless previously adjourned the House shall continue to sit until 6 pm at which time the President shall interrupt the business then proceeding and suspend the sitting until 7.30 pm and the House shall then continue to sit until 11 pm

2.2—Where the House is sitting at 11 pm on any day, the President, unless the House has otherwise ordered, shall interrupt the business then proceeding and any debate then in progress shall be deemed to be adjourned. The business interrupted, and any debate so adjourned, shall be set down for resumption on the next day of sitting.

2.3—If the House be in committee at 10.55 pm the chairman, unless the House has otherwise ordered, shall interrupt the business then proceeding and, without putting any question to the committee, report progress on any matter referred to that committee, and no progress on any matter referred to that committee but not reached at the time of such interruption, and move for leave to sit again.

2.4—Upon the interruption of business at 11 pm., no further business shall be transacted except:

- (a) the receipt of messages and, in the case of a Bill received from the Assembly, the moving of its second reading by the Minister or member in charge;
- (b) a motion to adjourn the Council to a date or time or both that is different from that already ordered,

and upon the conclusion thereof, or if there is no such business, a Minister shall move the adjournment of the House.

(see proviso to rule 1.1 for time restrictions on adjournment debate.)

Address-in-Reply

3.1—Bills may be introduced, or received from the Assembly, and proceed to the conclusion of the Committee of the Whole House stage before the Address-in-Reply has been adopted.

3.2—Except as expressly provided therein, nothing in rule 3.1 shall be construed as authorising the introduction and passage of a Bill otherwise than in accordance with the rules and usages of the Council.

3.3—Standing order 16 is hereby consequentially suspended.

These are simply proposed changes to the conduct of this House. I took the opportunity to provide both Hon. G. E. Masters and the National Party with copies of what I intend to do. I do not think this motion has any political content; it is simply a move to expedite the real business of the House.

Firstly, the time limit on speeches is self-explanatory.

Secondly, the sitting and adjournment times of the Council may require a bit of explanation because someone has already asked me what would happen on Thursday nights, that person having read into the motion that it would mean we would sit as a matter of course after 6.00 p.m. on Thursdays. It does not mean that. Sitings on Thursdays will be conducted as always. If we are to sit after 6.00 p.m. on Thursdays I will get to my feet and inform members, and the Council will then agree or disagree. This motion provides no changes to the adjournment at 6.00 p.m. on Thursday evenings because of the different starting times.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Why didn't you write that into the motion?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I took the advice of the Clerk, who said that the motion covered the situation. In any case, I am telling the House now that is what it means.

The motion then deals with the Address-in-Reply. I do not know how other members feel about this, but on many occasions, when the Address-in-Reply debate has not been concluded, we often find that on either side of the House members are not ready to speak or

are not prepared to speak on a particular day. The length of the day's sitting is very short and we go home before 6.00 p.m.

Standing Orders now provide that the Address-in-Reply should take precedence over other matters. All I am asking is that the House should agree that when we are here, let us get on and debate a couple of Bills, unless we want to run the session as we usually do. In other words, we often go home early, before 6.00 p.m., in the early part of a session and then as the session grinds on we find ourselves sitting here until perhaps 4.00 a.m. and having to put up with all the things that flow from that. When the House is called together, let us make some use of our time.

This motion will not cut down on time provided for the Address-in-Reply; no-one will be denied his or her right to speak in the debate. But if we have other business we could get onto, let us do so. I believe this is very desirable.

The motion should not need much more explanation from me; it will be one of those motions that members should be able to make up their minds on easily. It deals with fairly simple matters that should not require a lot of debate. Members will either be for it or against it. Those members for it will agree with me that it will make life a lot easier for all of us.

The PRESIDENT: In an endeavour to facilitate the proceedings, because this is a long and involved motion, I suggest that we ought to consider it in three different sections. We should deal with item 1, which is the time limit on speeches, conclude our deliberations on that and then move on to item 2, which is sitting and adjournment of Council; once we have concluded that we can then move on to item 3 which is the Address-in-Reply. If any honourable member has an objection would he or she please rise.

Point of Order

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am aware that Standing Orders do permit for the House to resolve itself into a Committee. Quite obviously there will be some debate on the various sections; but members will be able to speak only once. I do not know if the Standing Orders cover this. Perhaps it needs a motion.

The PRESIDENT: That is not the situation at all. The situation is that we have before us a motion to deal with certain things. We have not got before us a proposition that allows this House to form itself into a Committee of the

whole. I simply said—and it does not matter to me—that it might be easier for honourable members to deal separately with the three sections. If we are to get complicated about it we will deal with the entire motion at once. Under my proposition members can certainly only speak on each section once, whereas if we deal with the whole motion members would only be able to speak once on the whole. If members accept my advice this will give them an opportunity to speak on each section.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would ask the House to support that proposition.

The PRESIDENT: It goes to show that great minds think alike. Just to put it on the record, the Clerk has pointed out to me that Standing Order No. 183 gives me the authority to order that we deal with the sections one at a time.

Debate Resumed

Time Limit on Speeches—

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [3.05 p.m.]: I cannot agree with Mr Dans when he said that these amendments were not of great importance. I think they are and I am sure all honourable members in this House think they are. I do thank him for giving the Opposition proper notice of the motion. In fact, I took the opportunity to talk to him in his office and discuss some of the important issues.

I move an amendment—

To delete rules 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 from the motion and refer them to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration and report, the committee to report not later than Thursday, 19 June 1986.

The reason I do that is because it is an important move that the Legislative Council is making. Everyone knows that later in the afternoon it will be moved that the Standing Orders Committee will comprise three members of the Labor Party, two members of the Liberal Party and one member of the National Party. There will be no bias one way or the other in the Standing Orders Committee. I think it will come up with the right decisions.

The motion is not as straightforward as was suggested. I will take the opportunity to discuss matters with Hon. H. W. Gayfer and move for a different time limit; but at the moment we are discussing the Government's time limit of 30 minutes in the House and 10 minutes in Committee. I do not think the 10-minute

period is of any consequence. It simply means one after the other can stand up for 10 minutes. There is no realistic limitation on members speaking in the Committee stage, but in effect there is a proposed limitation of 30 or 45 minutes in the House.

If anyone looks at the record of speeches in this House they will understand what I am talking about. I think all honourable members know that some members tend to speak for a long time. The Labor Party has had its share. I refer to Roy Cloughton who spoke for something like five hours; yet that same member made some very important contributions. There were very few members who did more research than he. We had our share with Hon. Peter Wells who did equally as much research if not more, and certainly spoke for a long time.

There are some members who for one reason or another speak for a long time, and may well consider that that is necessary on a particular issue. Sometimes it is; in most cases members are reasonable. Obviously leaders of parties, especially in Opposition, speak for a long time, and that is not prohibited in the Parliament.

Many other members at odd times may consider it necessary to talk at length for one reason or another. If members look at the records over recent times they will find that few people have spoken at great length, so I do not think there need be the fear that exists in some people's minds. We always remember the long speeches and do not necessarily remember the many short speeches.

The fear I have, and I have seen it happen in the Legislative Assembly, is that time and time again one hears of a member being on his feet at the dinner adjournment and the remark is passed to him, "How much longer have you got to go?" Even if a member has a 45-minute limit he will generally speak for the full time rather than cut his speech short. I do not know why that is so, but it is a fact of life.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: That would only be in the other House.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Attorney General said that, not I. I am serious about that point, and I believe that would happen here. When we talk about a time limit on adjournment debates, motions, and the Address-in-Reply we have to consider the importance of that decision and the effect it will have. It is putting a blanket limit on everything—motions, Bills, and the Address-in-Reply speeches in this House.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You still do not understand that you have lost a whole generation of people.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: All right. All I am saying is that the Standing Orders Committee should look at this matter. It may come up with the same result.

I refer members to a Bill which Hon. Joe Berinson introduced yesterday. It is a two-page Bill with half a page of print on the back. That Bill could be debated for 30 or 45 minutes, or whatever the limit is. Members will recall the amendments to the Workers' Compensation and Assistance Act which I dealt with in this House. They will recall we debated that Bill at length with Hon. Howard Olney who had a tremendous knowledge of the legislation and made a great contribution to its present form. That debate took a long time, and it was necessary to take that amount of time because the Bill affected workers throughout the State. It was a very important document. I am making a comparison between an Act of 166 pages and a Bill now before the House which comprises two pages.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Most of the debate on the workers' compensation amendments was in Committee.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, and I dealt with it. Nevertheless it was a massive document. The debate does not necessarily have to be in Committee; many members want to speak during the second reading debate.

Similarly, the amendments to the Industrial Relations Act were a lengthy document and a great deal needed to be said about them. I am certain I spoke for more than 30 or 45 minutes in the second reading debate on that Bill.

I refer members to the Companies Code. It would be ridiculous to put a blanket cover on the length of time people spoke about that legislation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Tell me how the Assembly operates.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me go on, Mr Dans. If the Leader of the House had been to the Assembly he would understand that our operation is much more efficient than that of the Assembly, and I suggest the average speeches here are much shorter.

Members have a great deal to say when the appropriation Bills and the Budget are debated. So they should, because the documents relating to those Bills concern every member of Parliament. I have copies of last year's Budget papers

here—they are books, running to many pages. Members will have noticed that these documents refer to their electorates and the money being spent there, and the way it is spent. In those circumstances members may feel inclined to speak for a longer period of time.

It is rare that we have long speeches in this House. Occasionally they are made, and occasionally a particular member is responsible. I am thinking of the Supply Bill, for a start.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not oppose your amendment to send the matter to the Standing Orders Committee. You are proving a point to me on your feet.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Fine. If the Leader of the House is indicating he has no objection to my amendment to submit this matter to the Standing Orders Committee I will leave my remarks at that and make further comments at a later stage.

I point out to the Government that although I spoke for some time on the Address-in-Reply yesterday, Hon. Tom Stephens, after pouring a bucket over me once or twice, talked about his electorate and probably made one of the best speeches he has made in this House. He became quite emotional, and he took 53 minutes. If the time limit were reduced to 30 minutes, his speech would have been cut by half. I think his speech needed to be made.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Sometimes if you read the speeches you can see what I am getting at. I am not referring to Hon. Tom Stephens' speech.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I know that, but I think there are complications and areas we should look at.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [3.18 p.m.]: I second the amendment. I want to say a couple of words of caution especially to the newer members who have joined us in the last couple of days. The Standing Orders Committee can only make recommendations to this House, and the House does not necessarily have to go along with those recommendations.

I want to make a number of comments on this particular limit because I am not without some sympathy for Mr Dans in relation to limiting speeches. However, I am not one who will stand by and watch something that has been here for so long tossed out quickly through changes to Standing Orders. These matters should be aired and looked at carefully by the Standing Orders Committee. I have confidence in the committee, and that is the correct place for argument on this matter.

I will listen very carefully to the recommendations that you, Mr President, as Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee make to this House, but I reserve my right to comment on the actual subject matter at a later date.

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.19 p.m.]: I would agree with the amendment, but I saw this motion for the first time today when the Notice Paper came out.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I apologise to you.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the House did not want me to see it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not true.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know I was being discriminated against.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: He could not find your party room.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Pendal has always been able to find it when he wanted to borrow a bob.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: True. I take your point.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: As a guide to the Leader of the House and the Standing Orders Committee, although I support this motion I remind the House of a few examples where this time limit would have been completely unworkable.

Some members will remember when the previous Government brought in the Mining Bill and the Labor Party walked out of the House, leaving the Opposition to one member. This meant that the total rewrite of the Mining Act would have been limited to a 30-minute debate. Members must be joking!

Hon. D. K. Dans: You chose a good example. That Bill was a Committee Bill.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: During the second reading debate on that Bill I cut my speech by half and still spoke for three hours—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Thank God for that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: —because I did not have the stamina. Members of the Labor Party did not have the stamina—they walked away from a sinking ship.

I do not want to hear any nonsense from the Labor Party about limiting time. Let us look at the reasons that this Government has put forward this motion.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I thought you were supporting it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am supporting the amendment moved by Mr Masters to refer this matter to the Standing Orders Committee.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am also.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I remind the Leader of the House that I am not on a 30-minute time limit now and that if he keeps interjecting we may not get through this amendment tonight.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is an example of why I have moved the motion.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I remember occasions when the Leader of the House has asked his Whip not to interject while I was speaking in order to stop me going too long. He is falling for his old trick.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am trying to get in your good books again.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the House had better do that if he wants anything passed.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I mentioned the Mining Bill, but let us get back to the shocking performance of the Burke Government when it prorogued Parliament last year. The Government thought that it would get a rap over the knuckles—and so it will. Time will not make any difference. The Government may be in power for another three years, but it will—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to direct his comments to the amendment before the Chair. What he is saying has absolutely nothing to do with it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I beg to differ.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member can beg to differ, but the facts are that the amendment before the Chair is that certain rules be deleted from the motion and referred to the Standing Orders Committee which will report no later than 19 June. That is the amendment to which the member should be talking.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Certainly; but I am trying to show that Mr Masters has a very good argument. I am trying also to show why Mr Masters has a good argument. I am sure that members in this House would allow another member to develop his argument along those lines. I know that you, Mr President, have always allowed that to occur.

Members can see what has happened since I stood up to speak. There have been several interjections and I know they are unruly.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You should not react to them.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am sure the President would stop interjections if there were a 30-minute time limit applied to each speaker. The Independents do not do these things. If a par-

ticular side of the House wanted to stop a debate by interjections or points of order it could do so and speeches would be cut off at the knees. We have all seen it happen in the other place.

I noted that when the Leader of the House moved the motion—which I will deal with now in order that I will not have to deal with it later—he mentioned that often the proceedings of the House are held up during the Address-in-Reply debate because we have to wait for members. I believe that if we have to wait for members they should miss out.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You would be happy if I got up and moved the adjournment under those circumstances.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: My previous Whip and the Government Whip would tell the Leader of the House that I have always said that when it is my turn to speak I will be ready. I believe that the Leader of the House is encouraging laziness. Members should be ready to speak when it is their turn and I do not think that should be used as an argument. I am sure that Miss McAleer has a list of those members who will speak on this debate.

Point of Order

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr President, on a point of order, may I have an explanation about whether we are dealing with item 1 only or items 1 to 3? If we are dealing only with item 1, I think the honourable member on his feet is endeavouring to include item 3 and that would be wrong.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is completely right and he beat me by three seconds. I was about to draw the attention of Hon. A. A. Lewis to the fact that he is speaking to item 3, but he should be speaking to proposed amendment item 1. Therefore, he may not speak to items 2 or 3. Hon. H. W. Gayfer is perfectly right.

Debate Resumed

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: So, great minds think alike twice! I will adhere to your wishes, Mr President. I am sorry that I have upset you and Mr Gayfer—he is getting more touchy with old age.

The only reason I brought up this matter is to give notice that I will move an amendment in order that the entire motion be referred to the Standing Orders Committee and that it in turn reports to the House on whatever date is

arranged between Mr Masters and Mr Gayfer. I believe that Mr Masters' solution to this matter is, at this time, the best solution.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [3.29 p.m.]: It is the National Party's opinion that a time limit should be imposed on speeches. For obvious reasons it now appears that the motion before the House will be referred to the Standing Orders Committee.

With your permission, Mr President, I would like to indicate to the House that the time limit considered by the National Party would be 45 minutes, not 30 minutes. It would have agreed to the 10-minute limit when in Committee because it believes, as Hon. Gordon Masters has already stated, that this time is sufficient as the Committee stage can be repetitious. Most of the Bills we debate in this House are Committee Bills and until now members could speak for as long as they liked.

The only other alteration suggested by the National Party relates to item 1.3 which states that, by leave, a member's time may be extended; but in such a case no member shall speak for more than 60 minutes. It was my party's intention that this time limit should be 75 minutes.

It had been my intention when speaking to the motion to circulate amendments which are now with the Clerk at the Table. I apologise for their not being circulated, but they would have been lost in the paper work which is in front of members, and Mr Lewis would complain that he did not receive a copy. It was intended that they would be circulated at the appropriate time.

Amendment put and passed.

Sitting and Adjournment of Council—

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.30 p.m.]: As I indicated previously, I think the three sections of the motion should be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. I do not think the Leader of the House will disagree with that. Some anomalies must be sorted out in this whole motion and I am sure that with some goodwill we can reach agreement.

In fact, I believe the sitting hours should be from 10.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. five days a week and we should then have a fortnight off. Members could then get some work done in their electorates. The Parliament of Fiji operates under those conditions and I understand from the Clerk that it would be perfectly legitimate and easy for us to do the same. The Standing Orders Committee should look at such suggestions which would enable the Ministers to

spend some time in their departments during the session. The system could work on a week-on, week-off basis.

I move—

That proposed rules 2.1-2.4 inclusive be deleted from the motion and referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration and report, the committee to report no later than Thursday, 19 June 1986.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [3.32 p.m.]: I second the amendment.

It was not my intention at first to submit this part of the motion to the Standing Orders Committee but on reflection I think it is probably a good idea.

It is obvious that the Liberal Party intended to suggest different sitting hours and there seems to be a great deal of agreement and every opportunity for some sort of compromise to be reached. Obviously, some members of the National Party have difficulty with the times proposed as we do in regard to the committees and regular meetings which are held. In view of the structure of the Standing Orders Committee, these matters could be taken into account as well as the effect changed hours will have on the way we operate at present.

As a matter of fairness we should agree to Mr Lewis's amendment and perhaps a better arrangement than we have at present can be submitted.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [3.33 p.m.]: I emphasise the point made by Mr Lewis and I hope the Standing Orders Committee will take it into consideration. The temptation has been in the last few days to alter the times of the days we currently sit and much debate has occurred about the starting time.

Mr Lewis has raised a much larger issue; that is, whether we should sit for five days and then spend five days doing electorate work. The House could sit for more than three days a week and then not sit for a whole week. That is something like the Federal Parliament which I understand sits for two weeks in a row and then has one week's break.

I hope the Standing Orders Committee will extend its thinking on this subject to include the possibility of completely rearranging the structure of the sitting times of the House.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [3.34 p.m.]: I am reminded that whatever the Standing Orders Committee may decide will only come

back to this place as a recommendation. If the suggestion is that we shall sit for five days in a week, there will be some argument about it.

I suppose it is a foregone conclusion that this item will be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. I remind the House again that with regard to the sitting and adjournment of the Council the National Party would like its views recorded for the benefit of the Standing Orders Committee. We were in agreement with the times set down by the Government. We were quite content with those times except for one detail; that is, we believe that the House should rise at 5.30 p.m. on Thursday. Our reason is pretty clear. It gives a member 2½ hours' travelling time to the country and allows him to attend one meeting each week on a Thursday, perhaps 150 miles from Perth or in that vicinity. When the House rises at 6 o'clock it is too late for a member to service his country electorate or to gain any benefit from Thursday night. At present country members have only Monday, Friday and Saturday night to take part in activities in their electorates. The present arrangement may suit some members, but it does not suit all members.

It would also enable those who are lucky enough to have aeroplanes into their electorates or rail transport to catch the evening flight or train. Of course, some of us are not fortunate enough to have those facilities in our electorates.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [3.36 p.m.]: I point out to members that under the present rules there is no guarantee that we finish at 6.00 p.m. on Thursday or that members can arrange to attend meetings or functions on Thursday nights.

Amendment put and passed.

Address-in-Reply—

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.37 p.m.]: I move—

That proposed rules 3.1-3.3 inclusive be deleted from the motion and referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration and report, the committee to report no later than Thursday, 19 June 1986.

I move this amendment because it is silly to take this part of the motion out of the items to be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. According to Mr Gayfer I have illegally made my comments about the Address-in-Reply but I believe this should also be referred.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [3.38 p.m.]: I second the amendment to the motion.

This is an important move. It is perhaps more important than the other items because the Opposition intended to resist the Government's proposals quite vigorously. By submitting it to the Standing Orders Committee for its recommendation it may be possible to iron out some of the problems existing.

It is interesting to note of course that all sorts of devices have been used during the time of the Liberal Government and under a Labor Government in recent years to suspend Standing Orders to allow certain Bills to proceed and to enable the introduction of Bills.

One way or another urgent Government legislation has been dealt with before the completion of the Address-in-Reply. In respect of the proposition that Government business may take precedence over the Address-in-Reply it must be remembered that the Government may, if it wishes, push the Address-in-Reply aside and get on with other business.

It is important that we bear in mind what Parliament is about. Parliament is for members of Parliament who represent the people in their electorates. Parliament was not established for the convenience of the Government or the Ministers. This is a House for members of Parliament who are elected to represent their electorates and they are able to speak about whatever they wish. During the Address-in-Reply most members to a certain extent talk about their electorates.

Hon. Tom Stephens is now in the Chamber. Last night he talked at some length and with some emotion about his electorate. That is what the Address-in-Reply is about, if that is how members care to use it. Members may use the Address-in-Reply for other purposes, as I did last night when I referred to the economic crisis which is of importance to the whole community. Members make their own decisions as to the topics they discuss when speaking on the Address-in-Reply.

I would hate us to reach the stage that has been reached recently in the Legislative Assembly where the Address-in-Reply has been pushed aside and members have been asked on occasions to make their speeches on that motion in the middle of the night. That is not fair to the members or the people they represent.

I know many members become irritated by some of the speeches made on the Address-in-Reply. Certainly I know that is the case in re-

spect of Ministers, because I have been a Minister. However, the Address-in-Reply is a function of Parliament and it is traditional that members should be able to have their say when speaking to that motion, whether they talk about the economy, the rural crisis, or whatever. That is the important aspect about the Address-in-Reply.

Hon. D. K. Dans: There is no suggestion that you will not be able to speak in the Address-in-Reply. It just means that, when we have no other speakers on it, we will be able to deal with a Bill.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That opportunity exists already.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I realise that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans may give an assurance that, as far as he is concerned, people will be given an opportunity to make their speeches on the Address-in-Reply at the appropriate time. However, times change. The pendulum swings and Governments change. Regardless of any assurances Mr Dans or I may give, they will make little difference in years to come.

In the other House the tradition of the Address-in-Reply was spoilt. Members became very upset, because they were asked to speak in the middle of the night. That was most unfair.

I have information as to what happens in other Parliaments in respect of the Address-in-Reply and I shall make that available to the Standing Orders Committee. The Address-in-Reply is accommodated in different ways, but its importance and tradition is preserved in Parliaments throughout Australia.

There are grave dangers in the motion we are debating and I oppose it strongly. If it is necessary to deal with urgent Government business, the Standing Orders Committee could consider proposals put forward by the Government, the Opposition and other people who may have ideas as to more suitable ways to handle the matter.

However, in all of these arguments I am absolutely committed, as are all members of the Opposition, to the preservation of the Address-in-Reply, because of its importance and traditions and particularly because of the opportunity it affords all members, especially new members, to do what they have to do; that is, to properly represent their electorates.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [3.44 p.m.]: I support the amendment. I share my leader's concern as to what may happen to the

Address-in-Reply in the event that we adopt the Government's approach. Governments will organise the Notice Paper in such a way that the Address-in-Reply will come on for debate at 10.00 p.m., 11.00 p.m., or midnight. Nobody will be sitting in the gallery listening to what is being said, so the Opposition will lose the opportunity to make points about subjects which are not being debated in legislation.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: In case it escapes your attention, they do not take any notice anyway, because the speeches are so long and barren.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is a reflection on the people in the gallery.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Before afternoon tea I said that I objected to what the Government is proposing with respect to the Address-in-Reply simply because I believe it will do in this House what it has done in the other House; that is, relegate the Address-in-Reply debate to a most insignificant part of the day—the very end of the day—so that Government business will take precedence from the beginning of the session through to the end.

However, I support Hon. Sandy Lewis's amendment that this motion be referred to the Standing Order Committee rather than be rejected at this time. There may be a compromise that will satisfy both sides.

As Hon. Des Dans pointed out, there are times in the early part of the session when the House adjourns simply because it has no business. I wonder whether a compromise might be considered by the Standing Orders Committee along the lines that we agree with the proposition of the Government, with the proviso that the Address-in-Reply debate is always Order of the Day No. 1 on the Notice Paper every day until it has been disposed of.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I personally can see nothing wrong with that. That is what I had in mind.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is, each day on which the Address-in-Reply is debated, it is automatically Order of the Day No. 1 on the Notice Paper. Then Government business can proceed until the end of the Committee stage. We will need to write it in, to make sure that is, in fact, what happens. Once the Address-in-Reply debate has been completed we can then continue with the normal procedure in relation to business.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Can I ask you what happens when there are no more speakers for that day?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, I am sorry. Each day when there are no more speakers, we proceed with Government business, up to the stage the Leader of the House provided for in his amendment, which is the end of the Committee stage.

I think that may be a reasonable compromise and I hope the Standing Orders Committee will consider it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, it is commonsense.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That would cover the problem I have—that the Address-in-Reply becomes relegated—and it would also cover the problem of the Leader of the House, which is that Government business cannot get off the ground although we find from time to time that we have nothing to do.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [4.04 p.m.]: It is fairly obvious that this section of the motion also will go to the Standing Orders Committee, and there is not much that we can say to prevent that being done. However, I am a little amused because if the whole motion had been dealt with in total, we would have finished this debate at 4.20 p.m. with all of it going to the Standing Orders Committee.

The National Party was going to move for the deletion of this section, for many of the reasons that have been referred to. In the main, it would possibly have been perfectly all right while Hon. Desmond Dans is Leader of the House; but if some sinister person were to get that position—someone with a ulterior motive or someone who wanted to bring his own thoughts into action—it could well be that the Address-in-Reply would still be on the Notice Paper when the Parliament was prorogued.

Also, I always think that new members do want to be heard in a debate such as the Address-in-Reply. I have heard many of them speak in this debate and I believe this gives them the chance to do so. If the Address-in-Reply were to be put right back, a member's maiden speech might be given on a very controversial Bill—a Bill on which we would not be able to hold our peace and give the member our quiet attention.

There is something rather sacrosanct about the Address-in-Reply debate, even though many of us become very bored with it when members go from town to town and village to village around their electorate, and speak for two hours. That was one of the reasons for our wanting to impose a time limit. Nevertheless, we feel that the the Address-in-Reply is rather important.

Further, we believe that traditionally it would be a lack of courtesy to the Governor to hold it up or have the power to hold it up until the last day of sitting, and that is what it would imply.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That was not my intention.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I know it was never the intention of Hon. Des Dans. He is far too upright a person to have any scurrilous ideas such as that. However, and as I have already said, others will eventually take his place and I do not know whether we can trust them.

The Address-in-Reply is an important debate, and something that the new members need as a vehicle for getting things off their chests; and I was surprised to hear Hon. Gordon Masters say that the Opposition was really interested in its deletion. He said it was not fair that members should be called on in the middle of the night. There, I think, he was rather waxing eloquent on the Government's reason for not having precedence to go on late at night. Something else should be put on in those hours, after the Press has gone home.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is what happened in the other House.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: For this reason, perhaps the matter should go the Standing Orders Committee. We will not object. Indeed, it would be futile for four lonely people to object to the masses assembled against us.

Amendment put and passed.

The PRESIDENT: The result of the amendments is that all the motion will go to the Standing Orders Committee.

MINING (VALIDATION AND AMENDMENT) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.10 p.m.]: On behalf of the Attorney General, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill has as its prime purpose a proposal to confirm and validate the renewal of certain mining leases which were approved under the old 1904 Mining Act and which were deemed to be mining leases under the Mining Act 1978 on the coming into operation of that Act on 1 January 1982.

Under the transitional provisions of the 1978 Act those deemed leases continued in force subject to the covenants and conditions under which they were granted, provided those covenants and conditions were not inconsistent with the 1978 Mining Act, and otherwise, subject to the 1978 Act. This meant that they otherwise assumed all the liabilities, requirements and privileges of the 1978 Act, including a right or renewal which had existed under the 1904 Act, anyhow.

The subject mining leases were—

- (i) goldmining lease 2329W, Paddington goldmine, on the Broad Arrow mineral field of which the lessee was Pancontinental Gold Mining Areas Pty Ltd;
- (ii) coalmining lease 533 at Collie in the Collie River mineral field of which Western Collieries Ltd was the lessee;
- (iii) goldmining lease 1342Y at Bulong in the East Coolgardie mineral field of which Charles Barton Cecil Jones was the lessee; and
- (iv) goldmining lease 5798Z at Comet Vale in the North Coolgardie mineral field of which Robert James Donovan, deceased, was the lessee.

In each of the subject instances an application for renewal of the lease was made after its expiry on 31 December 1985 and there was good and sufficient reason why the lease should be renewed in that the lessee had substantially observed the requirements of the lease and there was no valid reason to assume that the lessee would not continue to do so.

The Pancontinental case involving the Paddington goldmine—goldmining lease 2329W—was of course the most notable of these and received widespread coverage in the newspapers.

Members will recall that goldmining lease 2329W was the centrally located lease of the Paddington goldmines's operations and, had the Minister for Minerals and Energy not taken prompt action in approving its renewal, the jobs of some 100 employees would have been at stake and the operations of this major mine would have ceased in the meantime. As it is, the action taken by the Minister in renewing the lease is subject to challenge in the Supreme Court because another party, Wingate Holdings Pty Ltd, believes that renewal cannot be legally substantiated.

It is significant to say that this lease, even though it was subject to ongoing mining operations, was pegged by no less than six persons within a matter of seconds after midnight on the dates on which those persons believed the lease expired.

In all cases, application for renewal of the subject leases was made after the expiry date of the lease. These dates are—

- (a) Pancontinental—3 January 1986
- (b) Western Collieries—16 January 1986
- (c) Charles Barton Cecil Jones—15 January 1986
- (d) the Public Trustee for Robert James Donovan deceased—17 January 1986.

The prevailing authority to effect such lease renewals in legal terms under the Mining Act is not clearly put. In fact there are opposing legal views as to whether the Minister has such authority. One of those views was that the subject leases which were all granted under the 1904 Mining Act and which were deemed to be mining leases under the 1978 Act could be renewed under that Act on expiry in accordance with provisions of section 78 and regulations 29 and 104.

Section 78, as it then was, merely stated that the Minister may, from time to time, upon receipt of due application in the prescribed form, renew a mining lease for successive terms of 21 years.

Regulation 29 reads—

Application for renewal of a mining lease shall be made in the form No 9 in the first schedule and lodged at the office of the Mining Registrar, together with the duplicate instrument of lease (if issued) at any time within the final year prior to the expiry date.

The notable part of this regulation, of course, is a requirement that an application for renewal must be lodged prior to the expiry of the lease. However, to my mind, regulation 104 which reads as follows, provided a discretion to alter this requirement—

The time required by these regulations for any act to be done by the applicant for, or holder of, any mining tenement may be extended by the Minister or a Warden, as the case requires, for reasonable cause, proof of which lies on the applicant or holder.

The opposing view which is reiterated in the Supreme Court proceedings is that there is no authority under the Mining Act to renew the

leases which had already expired and that the use of regulation 104 is precluded because it is inapplicable as respects an application for renewal of a lease.

The Bill is designed to remove any doubts as to the validity of the Minister's action and to place beyond doubt the facts that the renewed titles to the leases remain valid, that any property such as minerals derived therefrom remain vested in the respective lessees and any action in continuing to mine the land as a result of the renewal of the leases is valid and legal in terms of the Mining Act.

Further clauses have been inserted in the Bill which proposed to give the Minister power to refuse future mining tenement applications when he considers that those applications comprise recently expired leases for which an application for renewal has been lodged and should be granted, or that, in the public interest, the mining tenement application in question should not be granted.

In order to positively achieve the objectives mentioned it has also been found necessary to include in the Bill a provision which will prevent any action at law in any court by parties other than the lessees of the renewed leases to obtain a mining tenement of the land in those leases or to obtain property in any mineral mined therefrom. It is proposed that any application for such a mining tenement will be devoid of any effect under the Mining Act and will, as a consequence, lapse.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. N. F. Moore.

STANDING ORDERS

Revocation and Substitution: Motion

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.17 p.m.]: I move—

1. Chapter XII (SO's 121-141) be revoked and the following standing orders substituted:

CHAPTER XII (PETITIONS)

12.1—Manner of presentation

12.1.1—A petition is presented by delivery to the Clerk or tabling in the Council, and in either case the member presenting it shall endorse his name across the petition before presenting it.

12.1.2—Where a petition is presented by tabling, the member presenting it shall confine himself to naming the parties

promoting it, stating the number of signatories, its subject matter or a summary thereof. The petition shall then be brought to the Table without any question being put.

12.2—Members to present petitions

12.2.1—No person other than a member shall present a petition, and no member shall present a petition from himself.

12.3—Clerk's certificate required

12.3.1—A petition is not presented or capable of being presented unless the Clerk:

- (a) in a case of presentation by delivery, certifies at the time of delivery; or
- (b) in a case of presentation to be made by tabling, certifies not less than one hour prior to tabling;

that the petition complies in all substantive respects with the requirements of this Chapter.

12.4—Rules governing petitions

12.4.1—A petition shall be:

- (a) addressed to the president and members of the Council;
- (b) in English or accompanied by a certified English translation;
- (c) legible, and unamended whether by insertion or deletion or interlineation;
- (d) signed by the person or persons promoting it and if such person, or 1 or more of them, is a corporation, the common seal of the corporation or corporations shall be affixed to the petition;
- (e) couched in reasonable terms and devoid of statements that would constitute a breach of the Council's standing orders or, irrelevant material.

12.4.2—A petition shall state the number of signatories and contain a prayer or formal request at the end.

12.4.3—A petition shall not:

- (a) have any other document attached to it;
- (b) quote or refer to a discussion on any question considered by either House in the same session;

(c) bear other than original signatures, or have signatures pasted on or otherwise attached to it or to sheets (if any) bearing additional signatures;

(d) seek a direct grant of money from the Council.

12.5—Certain petitions not receivable

12.5.1—The Council will not receive or consider a petition whose subject matter constitutes or discloses a cause of action and the promoter has not exhausted legal remedies otherwise available to him.

12.6—Petitions to be notified

12.6.1—As soon as practicable after presentation, the following information shall be printed in the Notice Paper relating to a petition:

- (a) the name of the promoter;
- (b) the number of signatories;
- (c) a description of the subject matter;
- (d) the name of the member presenting it and the manner of presentation;
- (e) the date of referral (if any) to a committee;

and upon presentation of the committee's report, the same information, together with a summary of the committee's findings and recommendations (if any) shall again be printed in the Notice Paper.

2. That Chapter XIV (SO's 153-157) be revoked, and the following standing orders substituted:

QUESTIONS

14.1—Questions to Ministers and Members

14.1.1—Questions may be put to:

- (a) a Minister relating to public affairs with which he is connected, to proceedings in the Council, or to any matter of administration for which he is responsible;
- (b) a member except the President relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the Council of which the member has charge.

14.2—Notice of Question

14.2.1—Except as provided in SO 14.4.1, written notice of any question, signed by or on behalf of the member giving notice, shall be delivered to the Clerk's Office not later than one hour before the time appointed for the House to sit on that day.

14.2.2—Notice of any question delivered later than the time provided for in SO 14.2.1, but before the time appointed for the House to meet, may be included in that day's notices of questions.

14.2.3—Oral notice of any question to which SO 14.2.1 and SO 14.2.2 apply may be given at that day's sitting at the time provided for in SO 115.

14.2.4—Notice of a question supplementary to one for which a reply has been provided shall be included in that day's notices of questions if it is delivered to the Clerk within one hour of the time appointed for the House to meet.

14.2.5 Except as provided in SO 14.2.4, notice of any question delivered later than the time appointed for the House to sit on that day shall be included in those notices (if any) delivered on the following day.

14.2.6 Each notice shall be published in a supplementary notice paper according to the date of delivery and the order in which it was so delivered:

Provided that where SO's 14.2.2 and 14.2.4 apply, it is sufficient compliance with this standing order to include such notice in the supplementary Notice Paper for the day following that on which it was delivered.

14.3—Replies

14.3.1—A reply to any question on notice is given by delivering it in writing to the Clerk's Office.

14.3.2—Each reply shall be published in a supplementary Notice Paper immediately following the question to which it relates.

14.3.3—Replies shall be concise, relevant, and free from argument or controversial matter.

14.4—Oral questions without notice

14.4.1—A member may ask an oral question without notice and the minister or member concerned, if it is one that in his opinion should be answered immediately, may thereupon answer the question and, if not, request that it be placed on notice.

14.4.2—Unless the House otherwise orders, the President:

(a) at 5 p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday; and

(b) at 4 p.m. on Thursday;

(c) on any other day, at such time as may be agreed to by the House,

shall interrupt any business then under consideration and call on questions without notice. At the conclusion of questions without notice the House shall resume the business so interrupted.

14.4.3—The Leader of the House may terminate oral questions without notice on any sitting day by requesting the President to proceed to the next item of business.

14.5—Rules governing questions

14.5.1—Questions shall be concise and not contain:

(a) statement of facts and names of persons if they are predominantly descriptive and their omission does not affect the sense or render the question unintelligible;

- (b) (i) arguments;
- (ii) inferences;
- (iii) imputations;
- (iv) unnecessary epithets;
- (v) ironical expressions;
- (vi) hypothetical matter;
- (c) discreditable references to either House or its members, or any offensive or unparliamentary expression.

14.5.2—Questions shall not:

- (a) seek an expression of opinion or a legal opinion;
- (b) quote or refer to speeches made in either House during the same session, or proceedings of a committee not reported to the Council;
- (c) refer to a case pending adjudication in a court of law;
- (d) anticipate discussion of an order of the day.

14.5.3—The President may disallow any question that is the same in substance as one already answered, disallowed or to which an answer has been refused in the same session.

3. That standing order 170 be revoked and the following standing orders be substituted:

MOTIONS FOR DISALLOWANCE

170. Subject to SO's 49 and 173, a motion for disallowance of a regulation takes precedence of all other business from the time that it is moved but the debate thereon may be adjourned or otherwise interrupted pursuant to a rule or practice of the House.

170A. If a debate is adjourned or interrupted its resumption shall be made the first order of the day for the next sitting and similar provision shall be made in respect of any subsequent adjournment or interruption of the debate until the question is resolved.

170B. Where, at the expiration of 10 sitting days (exclusive of the day on which the motion was first moved), or upon a prorogation of Parliament, the question remains unresolved, then, in case (a), the question shall be put and determined without further adjournment on the next succeeding sitting day, and in case (b), the regulations shall thereupon be disallowed and the question deemed to be resolved in the affirmative.

4. That standing order 117 be revoked.

The PRESIDENT: The amendments to the Standing Orders simply adopt the sessional orders that we used in the last three sessions. They come in four different parts. I recommend that we deal with them separately in four different parts. Unless the House otherwise orders I will take firstly the section dealing with petitions.

Chapter XII (Petitions)—

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [4.20 p.m.]: On behalf of those of us who have not had the benefit of seeing these proposed changes before this afternoon, I ask why there is this unholy rush to put through these changes. I can see no obvious objection to them at the moment, but it seems to me that we could have left consideration of them for another day or so and put up with the agony of people reading questions and petitions. However, I am quite willing to accept, Sir, that you have given them thorough thought and they are the sessional orders that came before us last year. I just think it is unfair to expect a member of a party who has not seen the proposed changes to be able to pick them up and understand them in the time that has elapsed since the Notice Paper was issued about 2.30 p.m. today.

Question put and passed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We will now deal with section 2, which relates to questions. The question is that the amendments as proposed be agreed to.

Questions—

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [4.21 p.m.]: The problem with the taking of questions is that they are often taken at such a time as interrupts a member's speech. If we are to have new sitting times for the House, perhaps the Standing Orders Committee might look

again at the matter of when we should have questions with a view towards eliminating the interruption of members' speeches.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.22 p.m.]: I echo what Mr Wordsworth has said. I know that on some occasions speeches were broken into and I think that we should be able to have some mechanism to prevent that happening. It is not a good thing for anyone to be interrupted by question time when making a speech.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.23 p.m.]: I believe that the Standing Orders Committee should look at the matter, but I think that the mechanism is already in place because the House is the master of its own destiny. It need only be sought that question time be postponed until after a member's speech. Members of the House would have noticed the great difficulty we had on Tuesday in reverting to the old system and how good the new, streamlined system is. It was nonsensical for members to have to ask the questions orally each time. It must be borne in mind that those members who like to hear the sound of their own voices can still do so under the Standing Orders.

I welcome the new system. I think it is time it was written into the Standing Orders, rather than be followed as a sessional order as it was last session. It will make the running of the House more streamlined and it will reduce the amount of time that is wasted.

Question put and passed.

The **PRESIDENT**: Having disposed of the section on questions, we will now deal with the third section which deals with motions for disallowance.

Motions for Disallowance—

Question put and passed.

Standing Order No. 117—

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The Clerk has just pointed out to me with respect to section 4—namely, that Standing Order 117 be revoked—that as we have referred the previous proposals in regard to the adjournment at 11.00 p.m. to the Standing Orders Committee, we ought not to proceed to revoke Standing Order 117 until the Standing Orders Committee has reported on the other matter.

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [4.25 p.m.]: I move—

That part 4 be given to the Standing Orders Committee to report on 19 June.

Question put and passed.

Motion, as amended, passed.

DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

Election

On motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House) resolved—

That Hons. John Williams, Robert Hetherington, Garry Kelly, and Mark Nevill be Deputy Chairmen of Committees.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Election

The following members were elected to sessional committees, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House)—

- (a) Standing Orders Committee—Hon. John Williams, Hon. Robert Hetherington, Hon. Garry Kelly, Hon. Mark Nevill, and Hon. J. N. Caldwell.
- (b) Library Committee—Hon. P. G. Pandal and Hon. T. R. Helm.
- (c) House Committee—Hon. H. W. Gayfer, Hon. John Williams, Hon. Robert Hetherington, and Hon. Graham Edwards.
- (d) Printing Committee—Hon. C. J. Bell and Hon. S. M. Piantadosi.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL: COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Select Committee Report: Motion

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.30 p.m.]: I move—

That consideration in Committee of a report on a committee system for the Legislative Council, tabled in the House on September 18 1985, be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

I do not propose to speak very long, because it is unnecessary, but it is necessary to give a little background to the restoration of this item to the Notice Paper. Members who were here last session will have noted that there was then an item on the Notice Paper for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider a better committee system in the Legislative Council. Because of the prorogation of Parliament no opportunity was given for a discussion on what I

consider a monumental work for the improvement of the procedures of this House. The Select Committee that was formed to look into the committee system had terms of reference which, for the record read as follows—

... a committee was appointed "... to inquire into and report on:

- (a) what committees of this House additional to those already in existence might be appointed with a view to the more efficient, proper and orderly passage of the business of the House including the support of its review and investigatory function;
- (b) the constitution, manner and form of operation of any such committees;
- (c) such other matters as may be appropriate including proposed rules relating or incidental to the appointment and management of any such committees ...".

That order was made on 23 August 1983. The Select Committee reported to this House by way of an interim report on 3 April 1984 and its final report was tabled by me in this House on 18 September 1985.

I have pleasure in recording that the other members of the committee were Hon. J. M. Brown, who was co-chairman with me, Hon. I. G. Pratt, and Hon. Mark Nevill. I wish to acknowledge the very considerable amount of work these members undertook during the course of the study.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the House that audible conversation is out of order and I suggest to strangers in the gallery also that audible conversation is out of order.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I have pleasure in acknowledging the very efficient and considerable assistance given to the committee by the Clerk and the other officers of the House.

The result of the committee's recommendations is of prime importance to the future operation of the Legislative Council. One hears at times that change is needed in the parliamentary system and I submit that this report is worthy of consideration by all honourable members, because it relates to a vast improvement in the work that is part of the Western Australian Parliament. It is not electoral reform, it is reform of parliamentary procedures; there is a vital difference. It is designed to assist the work of members in representing their areas of responsibility in this State to enable them to achieve a better result

through the Parliament. It has been pointed out to the members of the committee in their deliberations in many places that Parliament is a place where members should represent their people. Through a better committee system I am sure the people in the electorate will feel more ably represented and certainly the members of Parliament will be better informed on a multiplicity of subjects.

The report is a sound base on which the role of the Legislative Council may be better understood. That is important. There is a distinction between this Chamber and the Legislative Assembly; their roles are in some ways similar but there are very distinct differences in their operation, and so there should be.

I wish to record the composition of the Select Committee that brought forward this bipartisan report: two Labor members and two Liberal members. Although we had earnest discussions on various points and differing opinions from time to time, I emphasise to the House that the report was unanimous and it is, therefore, appropriate that members should study it and in the fullness of time recommend it for adoption by this House.

I thank the Government for furthering the cause of this House. The report is non-partisan and I think we could all benefit from its recommendations. I look to the Government to assist this House to implement those recommendations which the House decides to adopt.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Fred McKenzie.

[Questions taken.]

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 11 June.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [5.05 p.m.]: In the first instance, I must offer my personal congratulations to the five new Labor MLCs and the Liberal MLC, and to my National Party colleague, Hon. John Caldwell, MLC, whose electoral stature and personal sincerity will go a long way in this honourable institution. I trust that the stay of all our new colleagues in this place will be not only of benefit to their provinces and the State, but also of satisfaction to themselves.

To those who were with us last year and for various reasons are not now with us, I wish them well for their parliamentary labours, and all happiness in the future.

We of the National Party of Australia wish, at the start of this session, to make it abundantly clear that while we will respect the traditions and the disciplines of this institution, we will be using the Parliament to the utmost to gain every benefit possible for the rural sector. Nobody has a better understanding than our rural-based National Party members of the anguish and heartbreak out there, and the almost despair in the minds of the farmers, the businessmen, and the employees alike as this terrible recession gathers momentum. It is with this indelibly printed on our minds that we will review and decide the legislative arguments of both sides of this House.

We are naturally a non-socialistic party and believe in the free enterprise system, yet with an orderly marketing structure. However, this does not mean that we will not have sympathies with some of the Government legislation as it comes before us. Our belief in the preservation of the family unit is paramount and is the base plank of our constitution.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that audible conversations are out of order.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I remind the Opposition members that the expressed views of their hard right and, indeed, the majority of Liberals at election time, and such voiced utterances as heard at shire council level and in shire council chambers—as by the Federal member for O'Connor—that the Liberal Party will never, never form a Government with the National Party, are utterances that will long be remembered when the opportunity presents itself for the conservative parties to coalesce for the formation of a non-socialistic Government; for indeed, that is our long-term goal.

While on the subject of elections, I make the observation that the Labor Party is not lily-white either, with its fun and games and derisive electoral comments.

By way of the Governor's Speech, the Government has indicated its dire recognition of the economic straits that are with the agri-

cultural sector and that face the State and the nation as a whole. Indeed, the Governor was quick to mention that—

Despite this favourable economic performance, the difficulties confronting certain sections of the economy, particularly the rural sector, are recognised by the Government.

In the latter part of his speech, the Governor said that the Government—

... has instigated a series of initiatives aimed at offsetting the effects of high interest rates and believes that it is imperative that action be taken to prevent more farmers being forced off the land.

The Government is currently reviewing problems associated with non-farm businesses in rural areas and has implemented measures to help country people face the social difficulties resulting from readjustment.

Finally, the Governor said that the Government recognises that despite the economic downturn, agriculture must, and will, continue to be of profound importance to Western Australia. He said that the Government is firmly committed to maintaining its support for the primary producing sector and that its legislative programme will demonstrate that commitment. Indeed, we eagerly await that legislative programme. I will not hold my breath while I wait, but I am very glad that His Excellency included that in his speech and I am sure that he would not let anybody down. I will be interested to hear the controversy that will occur with regard to differing opinions about this country's economic downturn, especially with regard to agricultural industries and the way they are situated at this moment.

In *The West Australian* of 11 June an article stated that there was some joy in rural statistics—that the economic position of Australian farmers had continued to deteriorate, but there were signs that produce prices were indeed on the increase. It stated—

However, there were some bright spots, with better prices being received for hay (up 18.3 per cent), vegetables other than potatoes (up 12.9 per cent) and fruit other than vine and citrus (up 8.5 per cent).

I have not heard so much malarky in my life. I did not think there were sufficient hay burners around. However, it was perhaps of some solace to me to read in the *Daily News* of the same day that—

W.A. farmers have had to bear the brunt of rising costs and falling prices, according to the Government's own research unit.

In the past year, interest charges have jumped 39 per cent, fertiliser costs 18 per cent and the cost of machinery, equipment and motor vehicles by 12 per cent.

And farmers have seen their returns from products and livestock fall significantly—in WA, by the biggest amount in Australia.

The figures are contained in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics' latest quarterly survey results.

I am glad to see that the Press has given some coverage to this matter.

I am sure that the Prime Minister's address to the nation was received with interest by a great number of people, especially the lead writers for *The West Australian*. On the front page of this morning's paper Mr Hawke's speech was well covered, but nowhere in that report was any emphasis given to the downturn in agriculture.

The point I am making is that it is apparently of no significance whatsoever to *The West Australian* to report the facts as they really are. Hence my mention of the Press releases which appeared in the newspapers of 11 June in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister, in the second paragraph of his speech said—

Let me first put the position as concisely as possible.

Our exports of commodities such as wool, wheat, coal and iron ore have, for a long time, been a major source of our national income.

While the prices we pay for our imports have continued to rise, the prices we get for these exports have for a considerable period been gradually, and now dramatically, declining.

This most recent turnaround in the terms of trade has slashed three per cent off our capacity to maintain existing living standards.

The plight of the farmers and other exporters is not something for them alone to bear—it must mean restraint for all of us.

Those interested had to turn to page 15 of *The West Australian* to read that the Prime Minister had made some mention of the issue which I believe is causing the problems in this country.

I refer to an interesting document titled, "Quarterly Review of the Rural Economy", in which Dr Andy Stoeckel, Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, said—

With poor prospects for many rural industries, the proportion of farmers facing financial difficulties has increased considerably since 1978-79. Over one-third of BAE-surveyed farmers are estimated to have negative farm incomes in 1985-86. It should be stressed, however, that even in relatively good years a significant proportion of farms have low farm incomes.

High real interest rates and relatively poor medium-term prospects for some industries have caused land values to fall sharply in some areas, such as the cereal belt of Western Australia.

Herein lies the second problem. The current situation will not go away very quickly. Recently I attended a conference in Sydney which was sponsored by the University of New England and attended by professors from Monash University and other Eastern States seaboard universities. Many notable people attended, and one would have recognised a well-known ex-Liberal politician, Mr John Hyde, from the questions he raised.

One of the speakers at the conference made a point which was particularly frightening. He said that the grain belt could last for only between five to 10 years. If that is the case, the deficit budgeting which is now being undertaken by our grain producers would not give them much hope—especially when one considers and takes notice of the statements made by such learned gentlemen.

It must be realised by Governments of all colours that it is not only we in the country who will suffer. It is not only we who will suffer when farmers walk off and leave their farms. It is not now possible for farmers to close their gates and do nothing on a farm as it was during the Depression. If it reaches the stage of more people leaving their farms or being evicted from them the kickback will get to the metropolitan area. It will hit so hard that the Government will wish it had taken full cognisance of the situation some time ago.

When I come to the metropolitan area it worries me to see evidence of a false Utopia, particularly in the densely populated areas. Somebody said recently, perhaps it was the Governor, that this year the income from the casino is expected to be \$4.2 million. However, no mention was made of the difficulties facing the greyhound racing industry which is having some trouble attracting crowds to its meetings. The problem is such that Hon. Arthur Bickerton, who was a Minister for three years with the Tonkin Labor Government, is having a great deal of trouble with the members of the Western Australian Greyhound Racing Association after telling them that in future they must hold their meetings on Thursday nights. It is an unfortunate situation but it is felt that if the meeting night is changed to Thursday, attendances will perhaps be better than they have been on Saturday nights.

We should also consider the America's Cup programme. If I may say, without being accused of being a knocker, the hysteria associated with the America's Cup is such that a mass of people have already reached a high pitch of excitement and they believe that all the money being spent on the event will bring about a marvellous lifestyle for those living in the metropolitan area. It has been a tremendous boost to everybody's hopes that millions of visitors will come to Western Australia and that this state of euphoria will last forever and a day. I worry about this situation.

I think it is just as well that we have the America's Cup event to look forward to because without it there would not be much indeed, bearing in mind the situation in the agricultural area and the dependence of the metropolitan area on it. It will be a shame if we find in two or three years' time that we have used a great deal of taxpayers' money to build a number of white elephants in the metropolitan area to promote the America's Cup. By all means we should promote it; it is good for the State. However, bearing in mind the heavy expenditure so far I hope we are not going overboard with the project.

I hope that we are not living in a fool's paradise. Certainly the situation in the agricultural areas is now having an effect on the metropolitan area and it is gathering momentum.

If a line were drawn directly from Brisbane to Adelaide it could be seen that 85 per cent of the Australian population is in the south-east corner of Australia and is represented by 85 per cent of the politicians in Australia. I believe there are more politicians within 14 miles of

the Sydney town hall than there are in Western Australia. Western Australia is of significant agricultural importance in every facet of the industry and provides at least a third of Australia's total produce, but in the present circumstances how are we to get the message through to those who make the decisions in Canberra? We are not receiving the sympathy or the understanding that we should from Canberra. One can understand that when one considers that there are civil servants employed by the Public Service in Canberra who are fourth generation public servants. Many of them have never been away from Canberra and do not know what it is like beyond the hills. It is a great tragedy.

I am well-known for my opinion on the Nullarbor Plain. One statement has been quoted often: There is only one thing wrong with it, it is not big enough. If it were bigger it would move us further from the Eastern States. If indeed we could float away so that we could make our own decisions, particularly those affecting our commodities, our future well-being and the running of this State as a whole, that is precisely what we should do.

I do not believe that enough people recognise the importance of agriculture to the Australian economy. The Federal and State Governments do not appear to understand the situation. I advise members that it is estimated that the EEC at present is subsidising wheat in the countries surrounded by the Common Market to the tune of US\$2.20 a bushel, that is about US\$80 a tonne. The Americans in turn are subsidising their grain at about US\$1.20 a bushel or somewhere in the region of US\$45 a tonne. The Canadians are subsidising their market to the tune of about 35c a bushel or US\$13 a tonne, mainly by transport subsidies and interest subsidies on wheat advances. In Australia the industry is not subsidised at all.

It is often suggested that it would be beyond the financial resources of the Commonwealth to subsidise the industry, but the problem is that we are caught in the bind of the American and EEC fight that has developed to quit their grain mountains at all costs. We shall be caught in this web and become embroiled in the fight that is taking place, as indeed will Canada.

It is well known that President Reagan of the United States has said that America has lost its car industry and its steel industry and he is damned if it is going to lose its agricultural industry. I was in America last year and that statement was repeated to me on several occasions. Barges full of grain worth \$20 million

were moored along the Mississippi River and not one ship left the huge grain port of New Orleans. For more than a week no ships left the port and that would indeed make the American President sit up straight and say that he is not going to be beaten by the EEC on this issue.

Consequently the Australian Wheat Board is having to go out and get a fair price for our grain hoping that it will bring a fair return with the devaluation of the dollar and hoping it can be done without any subsidy because some people believe that we cannot afford a subsidy on grain. Instead, we go out and fight the Americans and the EEC and expect to sell our commodities.

It is very interesting to note that in England at the present time there is a stockpile of four million tonnes of wheat, Germany has eight million tonnes and the EEC has 16 million tonnes. They are all storing wheat that cannot be sold. It will eventually have to be flogged.

On the credit side the Australian Wheat Board has been making some fairly significant sales. But there is a long way to go with our mountain. This could give rise to the academics from the Monash and New England Universities stating that the problem of the wheat glut will be with us for the next five to 10 years.

There are some courses that could be adopted. First of all internationally, I believe we must continue to encourage another round of GATT talks—the general agreement of tariff and trade. I understand that Federal Minister Dawkins was in Korea doing just that last week. Regrettably I saw nothing, no food for thought whatsoever about the success or outcome of those all-important trade talks. Indeed, I imagine it would be made difficult for America and others who are prepared to undercut in order to get rid of their grain. Nevertheless, the GATT agreement is there and if the agreement is to be abided by, it should be looked at and reported on fully. It saved us before and there is every possibility of it saving us again.

The second thing that could take place almost immediately is a wooing of Indonesia. That idea seems to be abhorrent to some people. Indonesia's capital is 250 miles off the northern shore of Western Australia. It has about 190 million people, give or take a few million, on 290 islands. It is by no means a backward country. Bogasari has the second biggest flour mill in the world. The biggest flour mill is in Sri Lanka. The wheat going into

Indonesia is largely from America. Western Australia is closer to Indonesia than is America yet we cannot compete because of transport costs.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We don't buy anything from them.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I was coming to that Mr Dans. That is quite true. It is a matter of trade. Much of this could be rectified. Tourism is trade.

Three years ago I went to Indonesia and spoke to a Mr Yap, the head of Bogasari mill, and also to the head of the Government food agency. He asked why he should deal with Australia, he said that two Bogasari ships had been tied up for 123 days in our waters because of industrial strife. He said why should he leave Indonesia open to that risk, why worry about Australia when Australians fly over Indonesia every time they go for a holiday to the bright lights of Singapore, Bangkok or Hong Kong. Australia does not patronise Indonesia; it is not in the ambit of holidaymakers from Australia.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Bali gets a fair share.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I admit that, but he was speaking of Jakarta and the mainland. Because of our association and the work of a few of us, we brought the Australian-Indonesian conference here last November. That was accomplished because some of us went to Bali, looked at the conference there, and decided to try to cement the relationship. There will be another conference in November. Indonesia is eager for people to visit and to talk with them about trade and other things. In fact, our very livelihood is right there, yet we do not send missions of members of Parliament—many of whom I am sure would pay their own way to go there—to talk with the Indonesians. We are closer to Indonesia than we are to Melbourne. We should try to get an understanding of their problems and enhance a closer relationship between us.

This has been suggested by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association—as you well know, Sir, because you are a supporter of the idea—but we do not seem to be able to get such a scheme off the ground. I think this Parliament should forget the party problems and work together to try to sell our State and create a diplomatic air with our near neighbours so as to give a boost to our profile in Jakarta and other places. Let us forget the problems.

In this case it is not the philosophy that counts, it is the money we want. We need it urgently. We are not getting enough income here; we have to get it from somewhere. Nationally we have problems. We have problems that are built into our government system, into lending institutions and the like. Nationally, we talk about wage restraint. We hold down wages for a while and then gradually it gets more difficult. Wages rise again and we try to hold them down. It will be harder and harder now to hold wages down and yet it has to be done. That money will come from nowhere. As the Governor said in his Speech, building in the metropolitan area is increasing all the time. We are riding high on a wave of expectancy from the America's Cup and other activities.

I do not mind seeing it; the people need to be happy. But for heaven's sake, do not let us put the people up in the top of the tree and then chop it down.

I was a little bemused by one particular section of the Governor's Speech when he commented on the State's economic performance. He said—

The performance of the Western Australian economy continues to be stronger than that of other States with the value of retail sales, building activity and the number of new motor vehicle registrations achieving growth rates well above national levels.

This idea that new vehicle registrations represent the panacea for everything that is wrong with the country always gets to me. I had a look at the latest registration figures to April of this year. I found that the figures since November 1985 show a decline since then from that month's 5 757 new vehicle registrations. The figure for last April was 4 162, which is 1 595 registrations below the November 1985 figure.

I found that South Australia was 1 344 new vehicle registrations behind where it was last year. Queensland had 1 820 new vehicle registrations; New South Wales had 2 710 new vehicle registrations. The only State to show an increase, funnily enough, was Victoria with 749 more new vehicle registrations in the same period.

So where do the figures come from which show that our new vehicle registrations indicate a good economic performance, one stronger than that in other States? On seeing that statement in the Governor's Speech I expected to see some huge growth rate

indicated, but instead I found deficit figures which in no way relate to the figures in the other States.

We are facing a bigger problem than ever because of the three per cent productivity issue—the Prime Minister gave fair notice that it would be a problem. He seemed to be virtually telling the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that it could continue with the case as long as the commissioners were good boys and did not phase it in too quickly.

The other day I noticed an article about Senator Chipp's wanting to retire from politics with some honour. After what he did with the fringe benefits tax, it is about time he did retire.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is certainly one of the reasons he is thinking of retiring, because he knows he has no future now in Australian politics. I doubt that the Australian Democrats as a party have any future.

Nothing could be more stupid than this fringe benefits tax when we consider its effect on the agricultural industries. Mr President, no doubt you are aware that the Bill has been passed and that it even gets down to the nitpicking stage where, if a farmer must go to town to buy a part for a piece of machinery and his wife happens to want to go shopping and they happen to take the family car rather than the farm utility or whatever, the farmer's log book for that car must record the percentage of the trip devoted to shopping and the percentage devoted to obtaining the machinery part. The log book must also show why that particular vehicle was used for the trip rather than the utility.

Someone has said we cannot read that sort of requirement into the legislation. That person is wrong, because I happen to be closely allied with an institution in this State that has many vehicles on the roads, and their log books are already being used.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Bureaucracy gone mad.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: A lot of drivers are complaining bitterly about the work they have to do after their tea each night, settling up the log book requirements to make out the proportions. I take much pleasure in telling them that it is the Government they possibly voted for that is causing the problem.

One thing Governments can never do to the public and expect them to be comfortable with it, is to require the public to fill in forms and so on. I well remember the road maintenance tax, which Hon. David Wordsworth was tied up with. We did not like it, did we Mr Wordsworth? It almost caused our Government to lose office. Eventually it was thrown out purely and simply because the whole industry—the Transport Workers Union and everyone else involved—was up in arms about having to fill in all the forms and more or less having someone looking over its shoulder at the odometer of its vehicles—all for the purpose of chasing the road maintenance tax. The road maintenance tax will have nothing on the fringe benefits tax.

The fringe benefits tax will be one of the most horrendous things ever to hit the rural community. We need it like we need a hole in the head. It is totally unnecessary. We cannot afford it, nor the three per cent productivity tax. We cannot afford the CPI increase that may flow on; we cannot afford the 2.3 per cent which will apply from next January. Above all we cannot afford the capital gains tax and all that it will mean when it is introduced.

Something is radically wrong with the system when the Prime Minister in his address, in his second paragraph, can recognise the importance of the agricultural industries, and here in our Governor's Speech this State Government also shows that it recognises the importance of agriculture but then goes ahead and introduces all sorts of legislation which will adversely affect rural areas and add extra taxes rather than take any away. This sort of action seems to be part and parcel of this Government's policies.

I am glad to see Hon. Mark Nevill here as I move on now to my final point, something which hits home to farmers here; I refer now to financial institutions. The financial institutions have been making magnificent and fabulous profits out of us in the rural areas. They have been able to provide soaring dividends over the last few years representing 25 and 30 per cent profits. They have been able to achieve this by the Shylock-type attitudes which they adopt towards interest rates. It is absolutely beyond the pale. If those financial institutions have never asked to be subjected to nationalisation, then they must be hovering on the brink of just that right now.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mark Nevill: Talk to the Mayor of Kalgoorlie.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am not interested in the Mayor of Kalgoorlie.

In June 1981 the prime interest rate offered to farmers by financial institutions for amounts of over \$100 000 was 15 per cent; in June 1982 it was 17.5 per cent; in June 1983 it was 15 per cent to 16 per cent; in June 1984 it was 14 per cent to 15 per cent; in June 1985 it was 16.75 per cent to 17.25 per cent; and it peaked last November 1985 at between 20.25 per cent and 21 per cent.

On top of that there have been rewrites of interest in land purchase loans which were taken up at 13 per cent or better in 1980-81. They have lifted simply because of the elasticity of the clauses in the agreement with the banks no longer pegging interest rates when the deal was done. They have lifted from back-lending rates to on-lending rates of 20 to 21 per cent. That figure has tapered off at present to 17.5 per cent.

Hire-purchase rates went up to 24.69 per cent, and the rates on lease money ranged from 24 per cent to 30 per cent. Overseas loans were taken out, and they have proved to be a calamity as a result of the plummeting Australian dollar. That has caught many a farmer in the snare. It is a great shame that this has happened and I have heard people saying that farmers went and bought their property or a type of business and made their calculations in doing so. So they ask why they should worry about the farmers.

I remind the House that farmers were encouraged and aided and given every sympathy by the banks and Federal politicians. They were told to get big or get out. The banks provided easy lending money, and financial institutions and insurance companies offered the golden dollar around. Then when the farmers had taken up the loans, interest rates went up.

Coming from a country town that has known its bank and its banker for many years, and has no quarrel with them, when I look at what has happened I wish to heaven some other people had taken what used to be old advice and not got tied up with one bank. Banks after all are only lending houses that are selling money. Banks have been so proud of their association with a particular district and town, and I sympathise with the young bank managers who have to convey the bad news to the farmers in those towns today. I have no sympathy whatever with the institutions behind the managers

because they have been most unsympathetic towards the problems which have befallen agricultural areas.

I have lost my faith in the banking institutions as a result of the evictions and lock-outs and people walking off their land because they could not get a sympathetic hearing.

The State has endeavoured to supply a good deal of money following its election promises. It now amounts to \$75 million at the State level together with Mr Kerin's package deal of \$25 million. That sounds a fabulous package deal and if farmers were able to utilise that money it would be a good deal. Unfortunately there is a problem because most of the money is still sitting there and is not out in the field where farmers could use it to their best advantage.

For example, \$13.08 million was advanced for the rural adjustment scheme; \$3.6 million was advanced for special carry-on loans; and \$18.23 million was advanced for drought aid. The sum of \$40 million was later provided for interest rate relief. That sounds all right, but from questions asked and investigations made we have found that up to 30 May, of the 426 applicants for drought relief to the Rural Adjustment Finance Corporation, only 183 have received consideration. That figure represents 42 per cent of the total number of applicants.

Leave granted to continue speech at the next sitting of the House.

Debate thus adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVERS

Licences: Format

6. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Why has the formal driver's licence form been replaced with a less impressive computer print-out on a near blank piece of stationery, headed in very small print "Commissioner of Police", which does not even give his address?
- (2) Is the Minister confident that the public and others using drivers' licences for identification will treat and recognise this new innovation as a Government licence of some standing?
- (3) Is such letterhead used for other purposes possibly making it easier to forge or procure?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The format used for production of a driver's licence has been altered as a result of providing standardised stationery for use with the Police Department's on-line computer system. The stationery is used for both motor vehicle and motor driver licences and represents a cost-saving measure in its versatility for both.

The variable information pertaining to a vehicle or driver's licence is printed by the computer.

The renewal advice forwarded for driver and vehicle licences shows an address to facilitate payment.

- (2) I am confident that the document is recognised as a driver's licence.
 - (3) The stationery is used for all types of receipts produced at a licensing centre with on-line computer facilities.
- There is no greater possibility of this letterhead being easier to forge than previous licence receipts.

ENVIRONMENT: SWANBOURNE HOSPITAL SITE

National Trust Classification

8. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Planning:

With regard to the Swanbourne Hospital, why is the Minister accepting only a part of the National Trust's classification and ignoring the trust's classification of the hilltop as a conservation area?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Government undertook a detailed architectural assessment of each of the buildings on the site, and it was concluded that the group of buildings was of architectural interest only, rather than each building being of a quality which deserves protection.

A separate architect's report on the costs of restoration and conversion of the buildings confirmed this opinion.

The Government agreed with the National Trust's specific classification of Montgomery Hall, the administration building, and the director's residence, and decided to add the north and south attendants' quarters to complement Montgomery Hall and administration centre and thus create a group of the best buildings indicative of the overall area.

DAIRYING: MILK

Quotas: Transfer Moratorium

11. Hon. C. J. BELL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

With regard to the moratorium placed on the transfer of milk quotas, imposed by the Minister and the Dairy Industry Authority last year—

- (1) Has the Minister issued a new policy guideline to the industry?
- (2) When was it issued?
- (3) What are the details of that policy?
- (4) If not, when will a new policy be issued?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The Minister has received submissions from the Dairy Industry Association and expects to announce new guidelines shortly.

GAMBLING: LOTTERIES

Instant: Income

14. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) What has been the total annual income from instant lotteries in each of the four years since the legislation was sponsored by the O'Connor Government?
- (2) What has been the total amount allocated to—
 - (a) culture, and
 - (b) sportin each of those years?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 1982-83—\$32 000 000
1983-84—\$42 347 750
1984-85—\$38 000 000
1985 to May 1986—\$32 000 000—includes \$2 500 000 America's Cup
- (2) (a) 1982-83—\$2 850 000
1983-84—\$3 350 000
1984-85—\$3 000 000
1985 to May 1986—\$2 650 000
(b) 1982-83—\$2 850 000
1983-84—\$3 350 000
1984-85—\$3 000 000
1985 to May 1986—\$2 650 000

AMERICA'S CUP

Police Force: Back-up

16. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is it correct that the WA Police Force is to receive interstate back-up from other police forces during the America's Cup period?
- (2) If so, from what States will extra police come?
- (3) What number will be involved?
- (4) At whose cost will they travel to, and operate in, WA?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Northern Territory.
- (3) Six.
- (4) Western Australia will pay allowances and Northern Territory will pay salaries.

MS MAUREEN KELLY

Report: Tabling

17. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services:

Further to my question 237 of Wednesday, 26 September 1984, will the Minister advise—

- (1) Is the report of Ms Maureen Kelly now available for tabling?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The report is still under consideration.

MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

G. H. D. Dwyer Report: Comments

20. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

I refer to the Minister for Agriculture's appearance on the "Current Affair" TV programme on Monday, 9 June 1986 and his comments in regard to the G. H. D. Dwyer report.

- (1) When was it made public?
- (2) When was it commissioned?
- (3) When was it completed?
- (4) Will the Minister table a copy of the report?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (3) The G. H. D. Dwyer report was presented to the Minister for Agriculture on 29 January 1986 with the request that it not be made public at that time because of the confidential aspects of some of the development proposals. The report has recently been made available for reference purposes at the State Government Information Centre.
- (2) 27 May 1985.
- (4) The report will continue to be available for reference purposes and documents relevant to the sale will be tabled.

FORESTS: SHANNON RIVER

Designation

22. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Why is the area of the Shannon called the Shannon Forest instead of the Shannon State Forest?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The area at the Shannon is called the Shannon Park because it is to be managed as such.

INDONESIAN VISAS

Government's Action

23. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to the reported action on 24 April that the Indonesian Government averted a crisis in the WA travel industry "When it reversed its stance over the visas row", and ask what action, if any, did the Minister take to express to Indonesian authorities the State's grave concern over Indonesia's provocative action?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The conduct of relations with foreign Governments is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

FORESTS: SHANNON RIVER

Visitor Usage Survey

24. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Has a visitor usage survey been done at the Shannon recreation site—

- (a) before completion; and
- (b) since completion?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (a) Yes. An estimation was made in 1984-85, based on traffic counters at the site.
- (b) No. However, traffic counters will be set up in the near future.

FORESTS: SHANNON RIVER

Visitor Usage Survey

25. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Has a visitor usage survey been done at the Shannon recreation site—

- (a) before completion; and
- (b) since completion?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The answer to this question is the same as that for question 24.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: UNEMPLOYMENT

Rates

26. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

What was the percentage rate of unemployment in Western Australia as at—

- (a) 31 December 1980;
- (b) 31 December 1981;
- (c) 31 December 1982;
- (d) 31 December 1983;
- (e) 31 December 1984; and
- (f) 31 December 1985?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) 6.6 per cent
- (b) 7.2 per cent
- (c) 9.1 per cent
- (d) 10.4 per cent
- (e) 8.5 per cent
- (f) 7.8 per cent

LAND

Stream Reserves: Forestry

27. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Have trials commenced to ascertain whether or not there will be a detrimental effect on water supplies and fauna due to cutting of stream reserves?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Ongoing trials are being conducted and assessment of results is continuing.

FORESTS: SAWMILLS*Pine: Viability*

29. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) What is considered the minimum amount of pine required for a pine mill to be viable?
- (2) How many hectares of south-west pine would the amount in part (1) represent?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Viable mills are currently operating on intakes of 8 000 cubic metres per annum.
- (2) 800 hectares of *Pinus radiata* provided that the forest has an even distribution of age classes.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT*Accounting Methods*

31. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Have local authorities been instructed to institute new accounting methods in place of the cash flow system?
- (2) If "Yes", what is the expected increase in costs to the authorities?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes. The 1985 local government accounting directions became effective on 1 July 1985.
- (2) The implementation of the new accounting directions may bring an initial increase in workload as councils familiarise themselves with the new system. Once this has been achieved the new system will provide a more detailed and accurate account of a council's current financial position.

MINISTER FOR THE SOUTH WEST*Office: Personnel*

32. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The South West:

- (1) Will the Minister please advise the names of all personnel and the positions held by each person engaged in his ministerial office at Bunbury?

- (2) What additional staff will be added, if any?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Mr Peter Beeson—Executive Officer.
- (2) Secretary-stenographer.

FORESTS: SOFTWOOD*Properties Leased*

33. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) How many properties have been leased under the department's softwood growing scheme?
- (2) How many hectares do the leases cover?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Five leases are being negotiated.
- (2) Not applicable.

COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT*Staff*

34. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Community Services:

How many people were employed with the Department for Community Services as at—

- (a) 30 June 1985; and
- (b) 31 May 1986
 - (i) at Bunbury; and
 - (ii) at all other centres in the south-west, with each detailed separately?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (a) and (b) Response to the question is detailed in the following table—

Country South Directorate

South-West Division
30 June 1985

FULL-TIME Establishment	Filled	PART-TIME (a)		TOTAL Establishment	Filled
		Establishment	Filled		
Bunbury Regional Office	4	2		4	2
Bunbury Office	12	12	1	13	13
Busselton Office	2	2	2	4	4
Collie Office	3	3	6	9	9
Manjimup Office	3	3	4	7	7
Total	24	22	13	37	35

31 May 1986

FULL-TIME Establishment	Filled		PART- TIME (a) Establish- ment	Filled		TOTAL Establish- ment	Filled
Bunbury Regional Office	7	5 (1 comm. 19/6/86)					
Bunbury Office	16	13	7	7	7	23	
Busseton Office	3	2	2	2	2	5	
Collie Office	3	3	7	7	7	10	
Manjimup Office	3	3	3	3	3	6	
Total	32	26	19	19		51	

(a) Employed 15 hours per week or less

EDUCATION: TERTIARY

Collie School of Mines: Redevelopment

35. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

When will the \$800 000 stage 2, of the Collie School of Mines take place?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Not yet determined.

EDUCATION: "EVENING STAR"

Cost

36. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

How much did the sailing vessel *Evening Star*, purchased by the department, cost?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The actual purchase price for the *Evening Star* was \$336 000 to which were added delivery costs, import duty, and cost of upgrading.

The *Evening Star* was purchased by the Youth Sailing Foundation which will raise funds by charter and sponsorship of the vessel and otherwise so that the vessel will, in due course, be handed over to the Education Department for little or no cost to the Government.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER
EDUCATION*Narrogin: Establishment*

37. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

When is it intended that a start will be made on the construction of the

technical education establishment at Narrogin?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Narrogin project is included in the list of 1986-87 capital works submitted for consideration by Government. Subject to its inclusion in the capital works programme, construction will commence in October or November 1986.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Collie: Hall-gymnasium

38. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

When is it expected a start will be made on the new hall-gymnasium at the Collie High School?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Documentation on this project is proceeding now and it is anticipated that tenders will be called when this aspect of the work is complete.

EDUCATION: PRINCIPAL

Accommodation: Kukerin

39. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

When is it intended that a new house be built for the principal at Kukerin?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Kukerin house is listed on the 1986-87 replacement programme by the Government Employees' Housing Authority but will depend on the allocation of funds by the Government for this programme.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Pemberton District: New Building

40. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

Is it the intention of the Government to build a new Pemberton District High School in the next financial year?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Consideration is being given to relocating the school. The timing of any work in this regard is dependent upon funding being available in a future financial programme.

ROAD: SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY

Shannon Reserve: Clearing

41. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

What is the reason for the clearing of a 50-metre strip along the South Western Highway south of the Shannon recreation site?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Only karri scrub has been cleared to provide an edge for aerial prescribed burning which will take place during 1986-87.

Clearing of trees has not taken place.

GAMBLING: TWO-UP

Collie Sports Club

42. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) When was the decision made to allow the Collie Sports Club to play "two-up" after the race meeting held on Saturday, 19 April 1986?
- (2) Will this practice remain a permanent feature at the conclusion of the Collie races?
- (3) Will "two-up" be extended to cover other race clubs such as Narrogin which is a similar distance from Perth?
- (4) Is it possible for this game to be extended to other areas of sport in the Collie area that have traditionally played "two-up" after their events?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The permit was issued on 19 March 1986. The permit was issued in error as Collie is not outside the 200-kilometre radius from the casino as specified in the Race Meetings (Two-up Gaming) Act 1985.

- (2) to (4) No.

LAND RELEASES

Small Rural Holdings: Collie

43. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Lands:

When is it anticipated that the release of 80 small rural holdings will be made in Collie?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

There are no proposals before the Minister to release 80 small rural holdings in Collie.

AGED PERSONS: SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRE

Collie: Construction

47. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services:

With regard to the Senior Citizens Centre in Collie—

- (1) Has a site been chosen?
- (2) Have plans been drawn up?
- (3) When is it expected tenders will be let?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (3) This development was a commitment made in the "Bunbury 2000" project and the question should be referred to the Minister for The South West.

SPORT AND RECREATION: FACILITIES

Grant: Collie Shire Council

49. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Has the Collie Shire Council been given a grant of \$350 000 for the construction of sporting and community facilities at Roche Park?
- (2) If so, under what conditions has the grant been given?
- (3) Who are the other contributing bodies?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) A grant to the Collie Shire Council for \$350 000 has been approved.
- (2) The normal conditions pertaining to the community sporting and recreation facilities fund.

- (3) The Shire of Collie by way of revenue and, if necessary, through a loan.

The shire is also negotiating with mining companies for contributions.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Harris River: Federal Finance

51. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Federal Government indicated to the State Government whether it is prepared to make the finance available for the Harris River Dam?

- (2) If so, how much is being made available?

- (3) If not, will the State commence construction of the dam?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) A decision on when the construction of the Harris Dam will commence is dependent upon an environmental clearance and financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Harris River: Site

52. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has a site been chosen for the Harris River Dam?

- (2) If so, where?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Answered by (1).

Point of Order

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Hon. Sandy Lewis felt that one question was out of order numerically and the reason is that I asked a question yesterday regarding the assessment of rates and taxes on the Midland Abattoir. I notice that question does not appear.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I have not got it.

The PRESIDENT: I take it the member is rising on a point of order which is that it appears that a question which the member placed on notice does not appear on the Notice Paper.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: That is right.

The PRESIDENT: The answer is that something has gone wrong and we will have to investigate the matter. I assure the member that the system will be improved.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Unemployment Benefits: Working for Payment

14. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Further to her reply yesterday indicating opposition to young people working for the dole, has she read the 1985 Federal Government report on a survey of more than 2 000 young people in Australia which revealed that more than 60 per cent of young people favoured working voluntarily in parks or reserves, with the aged, or generally doing something for the dole money?

- (2) If she had not read this article, is not her response out of sync with the wishes of young people and the Prime Minister?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) No, I have not read the report.

- (2) I make the point that the question of benefits and pensions is definitely a Federal Government matter.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Welfare Funding: Cuts

15. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services:

Does the Minister support the move by ACOSS—Australian Council of Social Services—to campaign to oppose cuts in Federal Government welfare funding?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Again this is a Federal Government policy matter.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Welfare Funding: Cuts

16. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services:

Does the Minister know that the WA branch of ACOSS receives a State grant from State taxpayers, and therefore should not it be a matter that concerns her?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

It is true that the body the member refers to in this State is called WACOSS—the WA Council of Social Services. It is also true that this body receives a Government grant because it does very good work. I have not read the report, I repeat.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Food Vouchers: Misuse

17. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Is the Minister now in a position to inform the House whether she has inquired into the problem that exists in regard to the issuing of food vouchers?
- (2) If the Minister is not in a position to answer my question, when can we expect to get an answer?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) and (2) Inquiries are under way in regard to the matter.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Play Group, Meekatharra: Building Use

18. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Can the Minister recall receiving correspondence from various groups in Meekatharra concerning the letting of a building for the use of a certain community play group and also from the Shire of Meekatharra concerning the production being staged over some six weeks?
- (2) If the Minister can recall it, when can these bodies expect an answer?
- (3) Will the Minister by invitation accompany me to Meekatharra to iron out the problem?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (3) I do recall the correspondence and, if my memory serves me correctly, some responses certainly have been forwarded.

PORTS AND HARBOURS

Fishing Boat Harbour: Learmonth

19. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that in the last Government's Budget for the 1986-87 financial year, there was provision for a fishing boat facility to be built at a situation called "Kailis Fisheries" at Learmonth?
- (2) If the Minister is so aware, is commencement of this work still expected in this financial year, or is it planned to delay construction of the structure?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not conversant with what happened in the previous Government under the previous Minister for Works, but I remind the honourable member that construction of jetties—and that is what he is talking about—is the responsibility of the Minister for Transport.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Re-establishment

20. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of the absence of a motion to re-establish the Standing Committee on Government Agencies, I ask when the Leader of the House intends to give notice of the motion indicating the composition of this committee?
- (2) I also ask why it was not moved at the same time as the other motions setting up Standing Committees?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I intend to give notice of motion as soon as possible, and that may be early next week.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Re-establishment

21. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House:

Can he indicate why there is a delay in the moving of this motion, in view of the fact that the other motions have already been moved?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

That is privy to the Government and I do not intend to answer that question.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Weight Limits

22. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister assisting the Minister for Women's Interests:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the decision by the New South Wales Equal Opportunity Tribunal which removed limitations on the level of weight which can be lifted by women in the workplace?

(2) Has the Government of Western Australia sought to change any similar restriction in this State?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) and (2) That matter is being examined by the Government in this State.

AGED PERSONS: SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRES

"Bunbury 2000": Departmental Responsibility

23. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services:

Following her answer to question 47, which is about the senior citizens centre in Collie, and to which the Minister said that there was a commitment made in the "Bunbury 2000" project, am I to understand that no senior citizens centres that were mentioned in the "Bunbury 2000" project have anything to do with her department?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I would say that senior citizens centres mentioned in the "Bunbury 2000" project come under the jurisdiction of the Minister for The South West.

AGED PERSONS: SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRES

Regional Administration

24. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services:

Further to my question about senior citizens centres, do all senior citizens centres outside the "Bunbury 2000" project come under the jurisdiction of the regional administrators?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Perhaps the honourable member would like to put that question on notice, and I will get an answer for him.