

after month. They have regularly taken the matter to the Minister, hoping that by keeping it constantly before him some action will be taken.

I might say that this area is outside my electorate. I prefer to handle problems in my own electorate and let the members in the particular locality deal with the problems there. However, these people have tried other avenues and have not succeeded and so I have taken up the matter.

I leave it at that point. I hope the Government will take a more serious view of the problem for the sake of the people involved.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 3.29 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 14th October, 1976

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### *Postponement*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Hutchinson): I advise members that questions will be taken at a later stage of the sitting, probably after the suspension of the sitting for afternoon tea.

### STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.

### FISH FARMING (LAKE ARGYLE) DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**MR P. V. JONES** (Narrogin—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [2.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to ratify an agreement between the State and Fish Farms International Ltd., which was signed on Thursday, the 7th October, 1976. The 21-year agreement allows the company to stock Lake Argyle with barramundi from a hatchery to be established on Cambridge Gulf near Wyndham. The agreement provides for a number of key points. These are—

That there shall be a phase development of the project over several years with cancellation of the project if the company's obligations are not met.

Recognition by the company that the primary use of the Ord River Dam is the supply of water for industrial, domestic and irrigation purposes, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, and that any change in management of the dam for this primary use which adversely affects the operation of the company shall not give rise to a claim for compensation.

That anglers may capture barramundi in Lake Argyle, up to a total of 100 000 kilograms per year or 10 per cent of the company's annual take, whichever is the greater, that the company may fish commercially for other species of fish in Lake Argyle, and that no other commercial fishing will be permitted for at least six years. There shall be a payment of an annual fee to the State after a period of five years calculated as a percentage varying between 1 and 1½ per cent of the value of barramundi processed, with a minimum payment of \$5 000.

Barramundi occur naturally in the northern rivers, but because of the present dam structures, the species does not seem to have survived in the impounded waters. If the project is successful, the company will not only be providing an industry for the region by way of fish production, but also will be providing a valuable tourist attraction for those interested in angling for this fine fish. There are many technical difficulties for the company to overcome, but the company has displayed considerable initiative and expertise and the Government has every confidence in its operations.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

### TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**MR RUSHTON** (Dale—Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to substitute, for the present Town Planning Court, a tribunal of three part-time members as an alternative to appealing to the Minister. The Bill is honouring a policy commitment to ensure that the rights of appeal are fully available.

Under the existing system—established in 1971—a person who is aggrieved by certain planning decisions of a local council, the Town Planning Board or the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority may appeal either to the Minister or to the Town Planning Court which consists of a judge and two people, one appointed by each party to the appeal.

Since the establishment of the court in 1971, only 11 appeals have been made to this court. In the case of two appeals, the Minister has exercised the power of veto by which he can presently restrain the court from hearing an appeal on grounds that upholding the appeal would be contrary to town planning principles. Only one of the remaining nine cases has actually resulted in a court being constituted and an appeal determined.

It would therefore seem that the alternative of the court is not a popular one with appellants, possibly because it has necessarily something of the formal atmosphere of a court of law and high cost. It might therefore be argued that the simple answer would be to abolish the court and leave appeals to be decided solely by the Minister. On the other hand, it is clearly undesirable that an appellant should have no choice other than to appeal to the Minister.

For this reason the Government has sought to find an alternative which, while giving appellants another avenue of approach, would provide a less formal atmosphere in which, nevertheless, proceedings can be conducted in a manner allowing all parties to present their cases fully so that a fair and just decision can be reached.

In reviewing this situation, the Government has had the advice of the Law Society and the Royal Australian Planning Institute and their guidance and suggestions are greatly appreciated.

The Bill proposes that in place of the present court there shall be a tribunal of three independent members appointed by the Governor. One will be a legal practitioner of not less than eight years' standing and practice—someone with the qualifications of a judge is envisaged. The second will be experienced in town planning matters and the third will have experience in public administration, commerce or industry. One of their number will be appointed chairman by the Governor.

People will be able to appear before the tribunal personally or they may appoint a counsel or solicitor or agent to represent them. As in the case of the existing situation, an appeal made to the tribunal will extinguish the right of appeal to the Minister and vice versa. Each member of the tribunal will be appointed for a term of not more than three years.

The Bill proposes that the tribunal may allow an appeal with or without conditions or it may dismiss an appeal either in whole or in part. Provision is made for every party who wishes to contest an appeal to lodge with the registrar of the tribunal a short statement giving grounds, with a copy to be sent to the appellant not less than seven days before the hearing. An important departure from the present

provisions is that the Minister's right of veto—to which I referred earlier—is repealed.

The tribunal will have the power to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation and to require the production of documents, plans or papers. Proceedings will generally be in public and the tribunal, besides giving parties to the appeal written reasons for its decisions, will also publish them. On questions of law, there will be the right of appeal to the Supreme Court.

I now wish to refer to one other provision of the Bill which introduces a new and most important principle. One of the main obstacles to finding appeal machinery which both preserves the rights of the individual and yet does not erode the broad basis on which planning policies have been established, has been the possibility that a tribunal or court may take too narrow a view in arriving at its determination and fail to consider adequately the long-term or broader effects which a "local" decision might have.

As a step towards some safeguard against this happening, the Bill therefore provides that the Town Planning Board shall prepare, with the approval of the Minister, and publish statements of planning policy, primarily on broad planning issues. Such statements will require also to be approved by the Governor before they have effect and on approval being gazetted they will be forwarded to all affected local authorities.

The object of this provision is to protect Government planning policy. It will be required of the tribunal to have regard to such statements when considering appeals. Similarly, it will be a requirement that local authorities have regard to the statements when preparing or amending town planning schemes.

There is one further safeguard. Where it appears that the tribunal's decision may have a substantial effect on the future planning of the area concerned in the appeal, the tribunal may invite the Minister to make a submission on relevant matters. It will also be open to the Minister—without waiting for an approach from the tribunal—to make his own submission to the tribunal if he considers that an appeal might be determined in a way that would substantially affect the planning of a particular area. The tribunal will be required to have regard for such ministerial submissions.

The matter of town planning appeals is an extremely complex one, the degree of complexity being indicated by the fact that there is no unanimity among those involved in town planning matters—whether as appellants or respondents—on what is the best system. Appeal machinery differs widely within Australia itself and I do not believe any one State would claim that its procedures were faultless.

I submit that this Bill is a substantial improvement on previous efforts in this direction and I commend it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Taylor.

# **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

## *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [2.29 p.m.]: In resuming this debate this afternoon I cannot help but feel that the people of this State will make sure that this is the last Court Budget, if we may term it as such.

Government members: Ha, ha!

**Mr JAMIESON**: Of course many a true word is said in jest.

**Mr Grayden**: So is many a false word.

**Mr JAMIESON**: Of course I have heard that from many people before. I am sure the people of Western Australia will not be involved with a Government like the present one again and there are a number of reasons why it is on the way out. It is on the way out because it has failed to honour its promises, and I will prove this later on.

**Mr Nanovich**: Why not now?

**Mr JAMIESON**: I will do so when I want to. It has failed to recognise and cater for the needs of the people. It failed to care about people and its failure to be frank is very obvious when we examine the Budget speech.

**Mr Grayden**: What is this business of our being on the way out? At the next election there will be a massacre of the Opposition.

**Mr JAMIESON**: That is the Minister's opinion and he is entitled to have it as he is entitled to his opinion about union bashing of which we will hear a little more later.

**Mr Grayden**: We will see who is right.

**Mr JAMIESON**: History always proves who is right. We know that, and the Minister is no more a Nostradamus than I am.

**Mr Grayden**: You know the Whitlam Government has gone, anyway.

**Mr JAMIESON**: We know that many Governments have gone. We know the Brand Government went at one time, too, as have many other Governments. We know that this Government will go because it has tried to make some futile attempts to cover up. This is a cover-up Budget. Last year I accused the Treasurer of covering up on that occasion, and he certainly did. We have only to compare the actual income with the estimate to realise this.

**Mr Nanovich**: You are better at tennis than Nan, and you got beaten at that.

**Mr JAMIESON**: I will take the honourable member on at any time and see how he fares.

The Government has failed in dealing with the urgent problems of the State. It has failed to help the needy and they should certainly be its prime responsibility. The Government has tried to cover up the State's true financial position. I know that this is often a statement made by the Opposition of the day, but I will show from the Auditor-General's report that this cover-up has clearly been attempted. The Government has been greedy in that it has grabbed too much money from the population of this State.

**Mr Bertram**: It certainly has.

**Mr JAMIESON**: The Government has conducted a vendetta against the working people of the State, through the Treasurer and the Minister for Labour and Industry.

**Mr Grayden**: There is not a shred of truth in that statement.

**Mr JAMIESON**: The Minister always says that and I suggest he should go to places where he works better!

We will not be opposing the second reading of the Bill, unlike the Treasurer when he was on this side of the House. We do not have the numbers of course, but we would not oppose it merely for the sake of doing so because this State must have finance with which to carry on. We would not want to impose any conditions on the passing of the Bill as the Treasurer attempted to do when he was Leader of the Opposition. He tried to impose conditions and also to force the Legislative Council to do likewise before passing the Bill in that Chamber.

We will not be attempting to hold anyone to ransom because we realise how much the State requires the finance to be able to carry on its functions. Many people in the Liberal Party do not believe in this. They believe that only Liberals should govern at any time.

**Mr Nanovich**: That is not a bad thought.

**Mr JAMIESON**: That often gets one into trouble. It has got Carter into trouble in America so the honourable member had better watch what he is thinking.

As I said, even though we do not have the numbers in another place, we would encourage our colleagues to discharge their responsibility. We would not want them to oppose the Bill.

**Mr Nanovich**: What about talking about the Budget instead of personalities?

**Mr JAMIESON**: How about the member for Toodyay going to Lake Joondalup and swimming to the other side.

We will take the opportunity later to show the Government's inhumanity in regard to certain matters and demonstrate how greedy it has been by making so many imposts on the public of the State. As I indicated earlier, I will also demonstrate the Government's lack of frankness.

Let us examine one of the inhumane features of the Government; that is, its inability to deal properly with the problem of unemployment. Last month there was a slight improvement in the unemployment figures in this State, the figure being down to 19 507 registered as unemployed. That means that over 19 500 people are looking for work.

Can anyone tell me one instance of how the Government has gone out of its way to help to find jobs for the unemployed in this State?

Sir Charles Court: We happen to have the distinction of having a big increase in employment while unemployment in Australia is increasing.

Mr JAMIESON: There has been a big increase in unemployment since the Tonkin Government went out of office. It is still nearly three times as great as it was in those days. That is the problem, and the figure will be even higher when the children leave school at the end of the year. What practical steps is the Government taking to provide jobs for those school leavers at the end of the year? It has submitted no practical propositions at all. Those children will not be able to find jobs because the Government has not provided any security against unemployment although the Premier promised in his policy speech that he would do so.

Sir Charles Court: We have increased employment.

Mr JAMIESON: Increased employment!

Sir Charles Court: Our employment has increased while the employment in Australia has decreased.

Mr JAMIESON: The population of Australia has increased, too. We are talking on a percentage basis. He should get the cold hard facts of unemployment and compare the figures with what they were when the Tonkin Government went out of office.

Mr Grayden: This is the only State where employment has increased over the last two years.

Mr JAMIESON: We get a little tired of the Minister for Labour and Industry making such statements but doing nothing. He is very good at that.

Mr Bertram: He talks nonsense.

Mr JAMIESON: On the hustings the Premier stated very clearly that unemployment is a State responsibility and he has lowered the figure. It has increased. It is of no use his saying that more people are employed. Of course there are more people employed throughout the whole of Australia.

Sir Charles Court: No. The employment figures in Australia went down by 88 000, while we went up 10 000.

Mr JAMIESON: That does not make the position any better. Here is the hyena from Dale!

Mr Rushton: You were going to be frank.

Mr JAMIESON: I am being frank. The Minister is not acknowledging the bad job which has been done in regard to unemployment. The figure has increased and he should explain the situation to the teenagers in Dale who want jobs. He should be doing something about that instead of laughing about the situation and making a joke of unemployment. It ill-behoves him to do so.

Mr Rushton: What happened in the Tonkin Government's three years of office?

Mr JAMIESON: The Tonkin Government looked after them and was prepared to do something about it. It did not ignore the school leavers or laugh at them, as the Minister is doing. I hope he gets his just deserts for laughing at the position of unemployment in this State.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: There is nothing in the Budget to help those who want to get jobs. There is no provision for any additional help to try to encourage young people into groups where they do not get so far away from the line of approach for jobs and become despondent because of the number of times they are refused. Only recently we have seen in the newspapers letters about mothers who had gone with their children when they tried unsuccessfully to get jobs—not because they were not capable of filling them but because of the number applying for the jobs—and they had become completely despondent.

There is nothing so soul-shattering as to be put in this position; and of course the Minister for Local Government laughs about it. He thinks it is funny. I certainly do not think it is funny; I think it is a very serious matter. If the Minister would get off his behind and get on with the job, we would do much better in providing employment for these people.

Mr Nanovich: He is getting praise from your own colleagues, so he must be working very hard.

Mr JAMIESON: Self-praise is no recommendation, but the honourable member seems to accomplish plenty for himself in this regard. The Budget certainly does not show much care about people.

Mr Rushton: Who told you that?

Mr JAMIESON: Look at the position of pensioners. The Government had a report brought down in regard to concessions for pensioners, and what has it done? Nothing. The people in this section of the community are on a very strictly tied income and they have no way to improve their lot without Government assistance. This Government has failed in all ways to assist them, and the same Minister who laughed about the unemployment again shakes his head. I hope he goes out and shakes his head in front of the pensioners in Dale when

they protest about the situation. I hope he does that to show how little he and the rest of the front bench on the Government side care about the pensioners.

Several of my colleagues and I were recently at a meeting of pensioners at which one of the Ministers was present, and for some unknown reason—the matter was not raised at the meeting—the Minister made a speech based on a defence of the Government's action in applying a charge to pensioners for travel in the metropolitan area. It went down like a lead balloon—it crashed to the floor very quickly—and some of the remarks made about the Government because of it were not very complimentary.

Mr Laurance: A derogatory remark was made by one of your members—the member for Balga.

Mr JAMIESON: That was not a derogatory remark. The honourable member knows exactly what happened. The member for Balga said, "Now we have got rid of the pensioners." Do not talk about what is in *Hansard*; members know very well that the unfortunate thing about interjections is that we do not get a chance to show the way in which they are said. There is no doubt that he said it but he did not say it in the vein which the member for Gascoyne is trying to convey.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JAMIESON: It is a rather remarkable performance on the part of the present Government. I think it will go down in the annals of history as being the first Government to take something away from the pensioners. It took away what had been given to them by the Tonkin Government; namely, free transport in the metropolitan area. Why did the Government do it? For the sake of some \$800 000. We will have a look at that later.

It was a heartless decision and one which should never have been made. The Government clearly gives more thought to balancing its Budget and its figures than it does to the people in this State. It is not interested in the people. It wants to deal with figures, and this is all the Treasurer is interested in, having been the ace accountant he was. He is not very interested in people at all.

We could have excused this action had the Treasurer in any way improved the lot of pensioners, but taking away this concession did not at all improve the standard of living of the needy people in the community. The Government did not do anything to make up for the loss of free transport to pensioners. It caused concern to people who should not have been concerned. The Budget shows very clearly that the Government did not need to abolish free travel for pensioners; it shows

that the Government did not need the \$800 000 involved; and it shows that the Government could have afforded something for pensioners, but it did nothing. With all the recommendations which are before the Government, it did not bring forward one proposal to relieve the situation as far as pensioners are concerned.

We will examine a little more fully the surplus of something like \$600 000 which was announced. In other words, it is a surplus achieved by charging pensioners for travel on Government transport, if one likes to equate it in approximate figures. But the surplus was actually very much larger than that, as the Auditor-General shows, and this is the problem we should be examining—the Government's attempt to hide this situation.

The real surplus was about \$15 million and could have been as high as \$19 million, but that was covered up. The Government claimed a surplus of approximately \$600 000 but it had a further surplus of \$8.5 million which it covered up by an accounting trick, and this is referred to in the Auditor-General's report. The Government put the money into the suspense account to pay salaries in the next year. That should have been shown as an amount of cash held at the time. This had not been done previously, and it would make the real surplus about \$9 million. Then, as is shown in the Auditor-General's report, the Government had \$6 million from the investment of Government money in the short-term money market. The \$6 million earned in this way is Government revenue which would normally have been paid into the Consolidated Revenue account.

Mr Bertram: It always has been previously.

Sir Charles Court: It has been used to offset deficits.

Mr JAMIESON: It was put into the loan fund to take up some of the backlog caused by the new federalism. That makes the surplus something like \$15 million.

Mr Bertram: And more to come.

Mr JAMIESON: Those who want to examine it will find it on page 34 of the Auditor-General's report, which clearly shows a surplus of \$11 462 610 as at the 30th June, 1976.

Mr Bertram: It was a cover-up trick.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it was. It was being less than frank to indicate to the public that there was a surplus of only \$600 000. Then there was the \$3.9 million, mentioned by the member for Mt. Hawthorn yesterday, which would have been available to the Government had it not had such a fetish about the Whitlam Government and its action in regard to Medibank. The Government got no further in doing what it did but it cost the taxpayers of this State \$3.9 million. If we add up all those sums, the surplus

is getting around the \$19 million mark. So it seems the Government of this State had money to burn. It should have negotiated and adopted the scheme of hospital benefits etc. under the Medibank proposal much earlier.

I think the only reason the Government opposed that scheme was that the Liberals in Canberra opposed it in the Federal Parliament and the Court Government opposed it to be in concert.

There was no sense in it and it achieved nothing; but it cost Western Australian taxpayers \$3.9 million. If we add that amount to the other surpluses I have mentioned, the total is about \$19 million. So the Treasurer has bundles of money, and he could have done a lot more than he did for those who are in need of help. I am sure the only reason for the delay in joining Medibank was cussedness on the part of the Treasurer, because he wanted to take action against the Whitlam Government. Of course, it was to our detriment. The true size of the surplus has obviously been covered up; and the Government should be required to explain these matters more clearly to the electors.

Sir Charles Court: It is clearly stated in the Budget speech and in the Auditor-General's report.

Mr JAMIESON: The pensioners are entitled to be angry with the Government after what it has done. Of course the Treasurer has presented a rosy Budget; with the huge amounts he has ripped off the public it is no wonder State finances are rosy. After the increases in taxes and charges that have applied over the last few years, it is no wonder the Treasurer has plenty of money to spare and to hide in reserve accounts.

The Budget tries to cover up the increases that have been made in taxes and charges, and the Treasurer boasted in his Budget speech that the Budget contains no increases in taxes and charges. Of course, there is nothing left to increase. Had he increased any charges, he would have had people storming the fountains at the front of Parliament House and wanting to take on the Government in physical combat.

The Treasurer, in his Budget speech, said that as a result of the gain obtained from the new tax-sharing arrangements and by careful attention to priorities, the Government is able to bring down a balanced Budget without any increases in State taxes and charges. What an empty and idle boast that is when one examines the situation in detail. It is true, of course, that nothing was increased in the Budget; but when one examines the previous increases one finds there is really nothing left to increase. All the increases were made before the Budget so that the Treasurer could bring down a nice, soft Budget, in view of the approaching election.

It is interesting to note that in the three months prior to the Budget four individual Government charges were increased. Water rates were increased by 20 per cent, sewerage rates by 10 per cent, metropolitan bus and rail fares by 33.3 per cent, and hospital charges by 100 per cent. Those are only the few which were increased immediately prior to the Budget; and they represent only part of this Government's appalling record of increasing taxes and charges.

Since the Government came to office it has put up just about everything it could get its hands on, despite its pre-election promise to curb rates, taxes, and charges. Certainly it has not done that.

Let us look at a few of the increases which have occurred. Electricity rates increased by 12.5 per cent in 1975-76, making a total increase during the term of office of the Court Government of 66.5 per cent, and an increase of two-thirds more than was the case under the Tonkin Government. State Shipping Service rates have increased by 20 per cent in recent times making a total increase of 50 per cent in the term of this Government. Westrail freights increased by 17.5 per cent, making a total of 64.5 per cent under this Government, although when the previous increases were made it was not known as Westrail.

Metropolitan water rates have increased by 31.2 per cent in recent times, making a total of 45.8 per cent during the term of office of this Government. Last year excess water rates were increased by 56.6 per cent, making a total increase of 103.3 per cent—and yet the Treasurer talks about no increases being made in the Budget.

Metropolitan sewerage rates increased on the last occasion by 32.5 per cent, making a total increase of 77.4 per cent during the term of the present Government. Metropolitan drainage rates have increased by 33.3 per cent during the same time. State Government Insurance Office comprehensive insurance premiums have increased several times, and the last increase was 20 per cent, making a total increase of 60 per cent under the Court Government. Metropolitan State Housing Commission rents rose by 31.9 per cent in the last increase, making a total average increase of 48 per cent. The rents are now nearly 50 per cent more than they were during the time of the Tonkin Government.

Mr P. V. Jones: What does "total average increase" mean?

Mr JAMIESON: There are new houses, medium to old houses with some amenities, and then old houses; and the average increase in rent for those has been 48 per cent.

Mr P. V. Jones: Yes, I wanted to know if you could explain it.

Mr JAMIESON: Well, I am glad the Minister now knows I can explain it.

Mr P. V. Jones: Fine, but what has it to do with the State Budget? The increase does not appear in that.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it does not; but it is still a charge, and I am indicating all the charges the Treasurer has increased. He said he would not have to increase charges, but this is just one of many increases which have been applied.

State Housing Commission country rents have increased by an average of 30.8 per cent. The most recent increase in State abattoir slaughtering fees was 15.2 per cent, making a total of about 40 per cent under this Government.

That is not a full list of all the increases, but it picks out most of the heavy ones. It indicates the appalling record of a Government that promised to curb rates, taxes, and charges.

Mr Rushton: Did you take into account the Whitlam inflation?

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, I did. Inflation in this State has been aggravated by the charges that the Ministers of this Government were prepared to increase. The rate of inflation in this State is far greater than the national average, so do not try to get away with that one.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: A shocking record!

Mr JAMIESON: The list of increases does not include some other taxing measures such as the 3 per cent surcharge on the turnover of the State Energy Commission, the Fremantle Port Authority, and the Metropolitan Water Board. Of course, that surcharge in itself is highly inflationary because it has to be passed on. It resulted in increased charges to people using the services, and now those authorities are finding it difficult to exist and are coming to the Government for money.

The tobacco licences, which amount to a tax, came into effect in the latter half of 1975-76. The best estimate I can make of the increase in revenue from all these sources during the year 1975-76 is about \$83 million, which is a fairly heavy slug on a population of just over one million. Therefore, the Government's idle boast about not increasing taxes and charges is indeed a very big cover-up.

There is, however, an even bigger cover-up in the Budget. A section of the Treasurer's speech was headed, "The Present Climate". He used fine words about the state of the economy to try to cover up his Government's most spectacular failure to honour its undertakings, and its failure to beat inflation in Western Australia.

This is where I am always at variance with members opposite. While I have never said the things they allege I have said, I have indicated I believe that when

there is a world inflationary trend it is no good thinking we can fight it off or run along with it and use all the power we have to minimise its effect.

Sir Charles Court: Australia need not have had it, of course.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it did, and this is where the Treasurer differs from his Treasury officers. They have told me time and time again that they are sick and tired of trying to tell the Treasurer that Australia cannot exist as an island in the world economy. It cannot.

Sir Charles Court: I would be very interested to hear that.

Mr JAMIESON: They would be a moral to tell the Treasurer, I am sure!

Mr O'Connor: To which Treasury officers are you referring?

Sir Charles Court: The Whitlam Government generated inflation in Australia quite unnecessarily.

Mr JAMIESON: And of course the Brand Government generated inflation in this State for its own purposes.

Mr Clarko: At 3 per cent versus the Whitlam Government's 13 per cent?

Mr JAMIESON: As I have often pointed out, we need to examine this Government's failure to live up to its promise to beat inflation.

Mr Clarko: Trade union affiliation charges went up by 30 per cent in one hit yesterday.

Mr JAMIESON: What is the honourable member talking about? They have not been changed for the last three years.

Mr Clarko: Did they not ask for twice that amount?

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Kar-rinyup is wrong again. Sometimes he is very close, but on this occasion he is wrong again. The Treasurer went on to say in his Budget speech—

As I have said on several occasions, controlling inflation must be the essential first task of all governments.

Before the last election, the Treasurer said he could beat inflation on a State by State basis, but, of course, we have seen just how badly he has failed in that objective. At that time, the Whitlam Government was not in office and he could not say that he did not know what was in store. The Treasurer continually tries to blame Whitlam, but on this occasion he must take a little blame for failing to carry out his election promise to control inflation. He gave the very clear impression inflation could be beaten in Western Australia, and in his Budget speech he made the unequivocal statement that controlling inflation was seen by his Government as an essential task. Again, this is nothing but a cover up because nothing of the sort has occurred.

I mentioned a short while ago the problems the Treasurer faced in this regard. During his term of office, it is quite obvious from the figures that he has presided over the worst inflation rate to occur in Australia. Since March, 1974, the national average inflation rate has been 36.6 per cent, while in Western Australia it has been 41.2 per cent, the highest in Australia. If as the Treasurer claimed, inflation could be beaten on a State by State basis, why has Western Australia had the highest inflation rate in Australia? I suppose the Treasurer will reply that unions caused the increase, or will make a similar mundane statement. Western Australia's inflation rate since March, 1974, has been 4.5 per cent higher than the national average.

Let us contrast this record with the performance of the Tonkin Government. During its three years of office, Western Australia's inflation rate was the lowest in Australia; in fact it was 4.8 per cent lower than the national average. Therefore, it can be seen that, despite the Treasurer's pre-election promise that he would control inflation in Western Australia, and that inflation could be controlled on a State by State basis, he has failed by more than 9 per cent even to equal the Tonkin Government's record in this area. Obviously, this Government has failed miserably to live up to its promise to control inflation.

I turn now to the area of Budget concessions. The Budget contains a number of undertakings and provides for concessions which the Opposition probably could applaud; however, other "concessions" need to be put into perspective. The Government has claimed great credit for its decision to provide concessions in the areas of probate duty and pay-roll tax, but this is another area where it has been less than frank. It has claimed that the estimated cost of these proposals for the 1976-77 financial year will be \$2.75 million. However, according to the Budget papers placed before the House, revenue from those two sources is estimated to increase in the 1976-77 financial year by some \$12.5 million. That is some sort of concession! The Government is to provide a concession, and will still gain an additional amount of revenue from those areas. Although I am sure the concessions are quite welcome where they are applied, they do not amount to very much.

Sir Charles Court: You try to tell the people they do not mean much in the case of property passing from spouse to spouse.

Mr JAMIESON: They do not mean much in the overall Budget figures. The Treasurer is crowing about the fact that he is prepared to lose \$2.75 million in the 1976-77 financial year by providing these concessions but an examination of the

figures reveals that in those two categories alone, the estimated increased income will be \$12.5 million. What has the Treasurer given away?

Sir Charles Court: Do not talk like that.

Mr Bertram: You could have cut out the lot.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course the Government could have cut them out.

Sir Charles Court: That is about the most spurious reasoning I have ever heard.

Mr JAMIESON: It is not spurious; it is reasoning based directly on the figures presented by the Treasurer himself, and if he cared to examine the figures he would come to the same conclusion.

Mr Stephens: As a matter of interest, what is the Labor Party's policy on probate reform?

Mr JAMIESON: Our policy will be announced when I feel it is time to announce it.

Mr Sibson: Obviously you have not worked it out yet.

Mr JAMIESON: I interjected on the Treasurer when he was presenting his Budget speech to the effect that some of the proposals contained in the Budget were socialistic. I am not a mad socialist, but I accept the inevitability of socialism; that fact has been apparent in the Budgets brought down and in the actions taken by every Government since I have been a member of this House. I do not run away from that fact or try to claim it is a bad thing.

However, of course, while it always claims socialism is a bad thing, the Court Government has shown itself quite prepared to do a lot of things which could be described as socialistic. The Budget provides for assistance to many schemes which are socialistic in concept. The country people never accept that this is the case, but any project where the Government uses State funds to achieve an objective for the benefit of the people is socialistic in concept.

I have a list of these Budget proposals, and would like to read them to the House. The Government intends to provide assistance for tree-pulling schemes for apple growers, grants for community sport facilities, and increased funds for youth camps and recreational facilities. Of course, the last two programmes probably have been introduced in an attempt to rebuild the Liberal Party's shattered credibility in the sporting world after the failure of the Federal Liberal Party to follow the lead set by the Whitlam Government in providing aid to sporting organisations.

Mr Thompson: Is that why you took to the tennis court yesterday?



Mr JAMIESON: Yes, but I am afraid the court was not built from funds provided by the Whitlam Government. The programme of assistance to sporting organisations and sport and recreational facilities, of course, was commenced on a Federal basis by the Whitlam Government. However, unfortunately, it was another one of those cases where it does not matter how good the programme may have been; because it was tainted with Whitlam the Treasurer wanted to get rid of it.

The Budget provides for a new scheme of aid to child care institutions, community health services, and a pilot scheme for training farm and station workers—all good socialistic measures. It will also provide for living-away-from-home allowances for country apprentices attending courses in the city and will increase grants to charitable and community service organisations. These are all good projects which the Opposition is happy to support.

However, they clearly indicate the public should take everything the Treasurer says regarding socialism, not with a grain of salt but with a big handful of the best 99 per cent Leslie salt.

Mr Coyne: We could have used some of that salt up in Laverton last week, with the scare tactics you were putting over.

Mr JAMIESON: That is quite incorrect. The honourable member should check the statements made by the two Ministers concerned, because they are the ones who should be criticised.

Let us consider the habit of the Treasurer and the Minister for Labour and Industry of adopting the union-bashing procedure in which they often indulge. Nobody connected with the iron ore industry that I am aware of, with the exception of the Treasurer on the sidelines and to a lesser extent the Minister for Labour and Industry and the Minister for Industrial Development, has done that. The other Cabinet Ministers have kept away from this issue, and they did so quite wisely. They ought to talk to the Treasurer about what harm he is doing to the work force of this State by his tactics.

The most sickening aspect of the Budget was the Treasurer's decision to use it as a vehicle to continue his bitter campaign of hatred against the trade unionists of this State.

Mr Grayden: That is absolute arrant nonsense.

Mr JAMIESON: They are merely words and words, and they just flow out of the Minister's mouth. It does not matter on whom the words fall, or what harm they create; they do not mean anything. It is time the Treasurer woke up; the

constant attack on the men and women of this State is doing nothing to solve the industrial relations problems.

Mr Laurance: What have you done to solve them?

Mr JAMIESON: What has the honourable member done to help? He should tell us something about the insurance industry and how formerly he sold insurance. He should tell us what is good for the State.

Mr Thompson: I would like you to fight an election on the issue of the trade unions.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Kalamunda says he would, but he would be the one to run away from the trade unionists, although when he was a trade union member he accepted the good conditions that the trade unions won for him.

Mr Sodeman: He can give you a beating at tennis!

Mr JAMIESON: He might or he might not. The constant attacks by the Treasurer on the men and women of this State are certainly doing nothing for the industrial relations problems. We have to get down to solving them properly. By that I do not mean the Treasurer should merely talk at the work force; they should be talked to, because they are human beings and should be respected. The Treasurer himself expects respect, so he should give respect where it is deserved. The fact is he does not, and he is getting himself into trouble with his comments.

In this respect he tried to get the Japanese on side with him. I had long conversations with the Japanese, and they told me that at no time would they lay the blame on the trade unionists.

Mr H. D. Evans: Who said that?

Mr JAMIESON: The Japanese people connected with Nippon Steel Corporation. They indicated to me clearly that they would not go along with the criticism of our work force. If it is claimed that the Japanese said anything to the contrary, it would be taking their words completely out of context and using them wrongly. The Japanese have said that they wanted a more peaceful atmosphere to be preserved in the industry, and they did not lay the blame on one side or the other. If only the Premier knew how much the work force and others in the districts where the iron ore is produced desire industrial peace he would adopt a different attitude.

Sir Charles Court: You have never heard me criticising the work force in general, but I have criticised the militant left-wing unionists.

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier has criticised the work force. The Liberal Party is obviously trying to whip this into an election issue, instead of trying to solve the problems, particularly those in the Pilbara where most of the present-day industrial troubles arise. It is a despicable tactic aimed at looking after the electoral welfare of the Liberal Party instead of the economic and social welfare of Western Australia.

The Treasurer should be very careful about kicking the communist can and making fatuous claims about Russia giving instructions to our trade union leaders.

The situation is becoming ludicrous. The other day when a conciliation commissioner asked a trade union secretary whether a decision along certain lines would do, the union secretary said, "I cannot answer you. It takes rather a long time for me to get a reply from Moscow, to enable me to tell you whether or not I can accept that!" The commissioner replied, "I do not think we will take much notice of what the Premier has said!" It is getting to a ludicrous stage when such things occur almost daily.

Mr Sodeman: You are trying to suggest that there is not an element in the work force that is setting out to disrupt and break down industry and the employment situation as it is, to the detriment of the genuine worker?

Mr JAMIESON: The honourable member should go to a few places in his electorate to meet the work force. He has been noticeably absent whenever I have been in the area and attended rather important functions. Some people have been wondering why he was absent.

Mr Sodeman: You say that I have been absent while you were there? In fact I stole the limelight from you.

Mr JAMIESON: If the Treasurer has any evidence that there is such action taking place among the unions he should bring it forward. I believe it is a complete fabrication. If the Treasurer has any evidence of this he has a duty to make it public so that it can be investigated and the trouble removed. I suggest it is a figment of his imagination. He has no evidence of this and he should be careful about what he says.

There is another reason that he should be careful. He has a Western oriented mind, and does not appreciate the world scene. He might or might not know that the USSR is the biggest producer and exporter of iron ore, and Western Australia comes next as the biggest exporter. He should be careful about kicking the communist can too much. He should have regard for the fact that the Japanese—if he knows enough about the world scene

—are involved in some of the big developments in the USSR. If he is not careful the Japanese will be turning to other countries to get iron ore, but they will not be turning to the right-wing countries which the Treasurer talks about all the time, such as Brazil and others.

It is a pity he does not take time off from his hatred to study the economics associated with these areas. Very clearly the USSR is the biggest iron ore producer and exporter. When the ambassador of that country was here some time last year he made a statement that Western Australia was the second largest iron ore exporter in the world.

The USSR produces a considerable amount of iron ore. I do not have the latest figures; whereas in 1975 Western Australia was producing something like 95 million tonnes per annum, the output in the Soviet Union at the same time was 223.2 million tonnes per annum. I imagine it would be in line for the USSR to come to some agreement with the Japanese, for the Japanese are closely tied to the USSR in major developments in the centre of that country.

The Treasurer should be very careful about kicking the communist can and throwing the international scene around. He has been doing this for a considerable number of years, but has not been getting anywhere with it. I would have liked to see him talk to a certain group of people at the recent opening of one development of the Mt. Newman Company. They were the people wearing hats behind the roped-off area. I would have liked him to say to them, "You are being led by communist union leaders." If he had said that he would have been surprised at the result. I am sure they would have taken their hats off and thrown them at him.

Sir Charles Court: I talked to those people.

Mr JAMIESON: I know, but the Treasurer did not say to them what he has said to us about the trade union leaders. They are respectable people.

Sir Charles Court: They did not let me know they were not satisfied. I have been up there more often than you have.

Mr Grayden: Do not some members on the opposite side of the House contribute to the Communist Party funds?

Mr JAMIESON: Who contributes to the Communist Party?

Mr Grayden: Some of your members who sit in this House.

Mr JAMIESON: Go and jump in the lake.

Mr Grayden: Have a look at *The Tribune* of the 11th August.

Mr JAMIESON: Go and jump in the lake. The Minister for Labour and Industry is being just too stupid and I will not reply to his interjections.

Sir Charles Court: Have a look at the published list.

Mr JAMIESON: The situation is the same as if I were paying a subscription to a Liberal Party magazine, and was then accused of being a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr Grayden: You are not denying that at least one of your members makes a substantial contribution to the Communist Party?

Mr JAMIESON: I certainly do not admit it. I do not know him; what is his name?

Sir Charles Court: Have a look in *The Tribune*.

Mr JAMIESON: Let us have his name. This is another spurious excuse similar to those given by the Treasurer. The Minister has made the accusation; let him name the person concerned. He has every protection under the privileges of Parliament to make his accusation. Of course, he will not, and that is typical of him. The coward in the castle, always.

Mr Grayden: Well, have a look in *The Tribune*.

Mr H. D. Evans: The Minister has not yet substantiated one of his attacks.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JAMIESON: Japan is one of our best customers, and the Japanese are vital to our efforts in the Pilbara. I am sure we all want the Japanese to have a continuity of supply; that is the main objective of the people generally in this State. Problems occur from time to time. I have spoken to representatives of the media who have returned from having a look at the scene in the Pilbara. Many of those persons have not been associated with the trade union movement, but they all come back with this same opinion—that there is not any one particular cause of the trouble which occurs. However, the Treasurer always states that the trouble is organised by Russia. I heard the statement on the David Frost programme, and I nearly jumped out of my car. I thought, "How silly can he be?"

The Russians would have to stretch their lines of communication to get this far. The Treasurer has not yet mentioned the Chinese, although he may change his mind next week and accuse them.

Mr Bertram: It will be their turn next.

Mr JAMIESON: That could be so. We have been selling some wheat to China, but we do not sell very much to Russia. I suppose we can afford to kick out at that

country every now and again to indicate that we are not friendly with the communists. Next week the boot could be on the other foot and the Treasurer might want to kick the other country.

The development in the north is a joint project and the two countries should get together. We would probably then find out why the Treasurer is adopting his present attitude. We have to remember that our customers could be considering an alternative source of supply rather than continuing to purchase from a country which is prepared to hit out all the time.

While on that subject, earlier this year the Minister for Industrial Development had a few well chosen words to say about Shigeo Nagano. The Minister said that when speaking with Mr Nagano in Japan he was told that Japan would far rather negotiate with the Liberal Party than the Labor Party in government. I did not think a man in the position occupied by Mr Nagano in Japan would be so undiplomatic as to adopt that attitude. However the Minister was adamant that the statement had been made, so I wrote to Mr Shigeo Nagano. His reply to me was as follows—

Dear Mr Jamieson,

Your letter of September 9 has been received together with a page from the Parliamentary Reports.

It is difficult for me to clearly grasp the context in which my name was mentioned during the legislative debate. I appreciated, and still do, the very good relationship which existed between myself and the Labor Government under the leadership of Mr. Tonkin. The same friendly and cordial relationship exists between the present Government under Sir Charles Court and myself. I have met Mr. Tonkin during his premiership and have always held high regards toward him.

If there were any elements of misunderstanding, I could only suppose that my statement, to the effect that I prefer negotiations between private firms be left, if possible, to the initiatives of private firms, may not have been correctly communicated through the translator.

Yours sincerely,  
SHIGEO NAGANO

That opinion is entirely different from the one expressed by our friend, the Minister for Industrial Development. He would have us believe that the Japanese preferred to do business with the Liberal Party rather than the Labor Party.

I have also discussed this matter in Perth with representatives who have been negotiating for the Nippon Steel Corporation. I spoke to them on several occasions before I received the letter from Mr Nagano. They assured me that what was stated by the Minister for Industrial

Development in this Parliament could never have been intended. So, I suggest that the Minister for Industrial Development should not go around trying to make trouble. The letter I have quoted gives the lie to his statement that the Japanese prefer to deal with one Government, rather than another.

The Treasurer has gone outside the normal sphere in his union bashing, and involved the Civil Service Association. I am sure the Civil Service Association could not be accused of having a Soviet influence or Soviet leaders. I do not think it has, anyway. Some of its members may subscribe to magazines, but I do not intend to look for those persons because I have more important things to do. The editorial in *The Civil Service Journal* of September, 1976, was headed, "Patient no longer" and, in part, read as follows—

In a late development just prior to going to press, a Special Meeting of General Division Supervisory Group representatives was held at Association Headquarters. The Council Room was packed to capacity, despite a Public Service Board directive that all in attendance would have their pay stopped. That directive was totally provocative. At the same time it was completely illustrative of the Board's lack of understanding of a situation that they have wilfully allowed to develop over the last few years.

The supervisors had requested an increase in pay, but through the board, the Government had been tardy in meeting the request. The organisation was forced to take direct action. The next thing we will hear is that the association has been affected by this Soviet influence.

When the members of the Civil Service Association institute their work-to-regulation campaign, and ban overtime—as they propose if they do not get any satisfaction—they will be labelled as communists in the community. Of course, all that those people are doing is standing up for their rights, and they are entitled to do just that.

Sir Charles Court: The Government has not been involved in that issue, of course.

Mr JAMIESON: It should have been; do not tell me that. If that is the case the Treasurer should not be in his present position.

Sir Charles Court: If we were involved you would want to know why.

Mr JAMIESON: The Treasurer would have been aware of what was going on because it would have been reported to him by the Public Service Board.

Sir Charles Court: If we had been involved you would have said we should not be meddling.

Mr Nanovich: Hear, hear!

Mr Davies: The Wanneroo Wombat!

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, the Wanneroo Wombat! In the course of his Budget speech the Treasurer said—

The irresponsible few are so obsessed with their own power that they seem prepared to deny jobs for the unemployed and employment opportunities for the thousands of young people leaving our schools and tertiary institutions.

What a lot of nonsense! If the Treasurer takes the time to talk to the representatives of the media, who have recently been to the north where there have been problems, he will be told just how wrong was his statement.

I want to turn to another matter which is right away from the Budget, and that is the matter of Standing Orders. Mr Speaker, I know that I have interested you in this subject because I have asked a few questions about it from time to time; I want the House to be sure it knows where it is going.

There are methods in this community where people can, for their own purpose, hide behind privileges that should not be available to them, and which they would not use if they were playing the game and were prepared to face up to their responsibilities. I have seen these methods used in regard to matters with which I have been associated.

In 1973 a meeting was held here of top line legal people, one of whom was England's Lord Chief Justice, Lord Widgery, who had a few words to say on this matter. I have here an article headed, "Writs to stifle are wrong—top Judge", and it commences—

It was wrong to stifle comment on public issues by issuing a writ on the subject of dispute, England's Lord Chief Justice, Lord Widgery, said in Perth today.

"I regard that an abuse of the law of contempt of court," he said.

Of course we carry the law of *sub judice* into the Standing Orders of this Parliament, and we carry with that law the requirement of protection when a writ is so issued. In a particular case this has prevented debate on one subject from September, 1972, until today. No action has been taken by the plaintiff on that writ, and no action at all has been taken since 1975. Certainly the writ is still in force today because I checked on it as late as this morning. The writ, and what it contains, stymies criticism of at least two members of the Ministry. Surely the law of *sub judice* was never intended to do this.

While it is not my intention to mention any individuals, no doubt you, Sir, and others, have knowledge of what occurred. It does those people no credit to hide behind the privilege of *sub judice* for such a long time.

If someone has a case, he should force it to law; but if he does not have a case he should be prepared to face up to the consequences of the withdrawal of the writ. However, no-one has the right to stifle debate by this means, and we should ensure that before very long our Standing Orders in relation to *sub judice* matters are amended so that there is a terminating point.

I have accumulated quite a file on this matter, and I am prepared to show it to you privately, Mr Speaker. I assure you that some of the things in it would make your hair stand on end. On this occasion I am merely complaining that the right thing has not been done and it does no credit to the people associated with that particular action.

Mr Bertram: It reflects on the Parliament.

Mr JAMIESON: Such action reflects on the Parliament because we are not able to debate matters of public interest and the actions of individuals in the Parliament. As I have said, the Lord Chief Justice of England stated very clearly that the principle is wrong.

Some of the people associated with the writ to which I refer would be very quick to quote the Lord Chief Justice on other matters, and so I suggest to them they should be very wary in this regard.

The writ was taken out a long time ago, and probably it is outdated in many ways. A debate on the subject concerned would have been of much greater public interest at an earlier stage. No doubt at some future time, when it is suitable politically, the writ will be withdrawn. However, surely that period of time should not be in excess of four years as it has been on this occasion.

Mr Davies: Convenient!

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it is convenient.

Mr Davies: Abusing the law.

Mr JAMIESON: It is abusing both the privileges of Parliament and the law of the country.

In conclusion I would like to return to the Budget. I repeat that it is a cover-up from start to finish. The people will not be fooled by the Budget because its disguise is a little too threadbare. I was able to instance a large increase in revenue in two particular fields where the Treasurer claimed concessions had been granted. These concessions had not really been granted at all—they were variations of the application in those particular fields. However, the revenue had actually increased.

In my opinion this Budget will drive the final nail into the coffin of the present Government. Again, of course, I am not

Nostradamus—I can only make a prediction on my knowledge and the present indications. History will prove who is correct, and I feel sure that on this occasion history will record the fact that people are not prepared to accept the intolerance of the Government to the section of the community that most needs help. The people are not prepared to accept indefinitely that the trade union movement is to blame for everything.

Incidentally, while on this subject of union bashing, having talked to some of the top people in the iron ore industry, I know that the Treasurer's belief about communist cells activating strikes from time to time is not shared by them. I have spoken to people in top management positions in all groups and I discovered that while one company may have a fetish about a particular union, another company will have a fetish about a different union. So it is fairly obvious there is no central line of action emanating in this region. It appears that the problems in this area reside both with management and the trade unionists, and that the strikes are not being organised from far afield as the Treasurer would have us believe.

Mr Davies: Do you think their considerations are more objective than those of the Treasurer.

Mr JAMIESON: I think they are. Many of the problems are humanitarian ones which need never have occurred had we seen some more responsive reaction from the opposite side. When a big new industrial complex is set up, the unionists usually expect a little flak for a period of years. However, after that time they expect things to settle down. Members will note that I have made certain suggestions about ways to overcome the problems in this area. Of course, in his usual way, the Treasurer pooh-poohed my ideas, I suspect because he feels that anything done in the Pilbara would have to be subject to decisions made in the Soviet Union and transmitted back, so he says, to the unions in the areas.

I am sure he will go on believing that. I do not know where he gets these ideas from. Certainly he has not been able to produce any evidence that this is in fact the situation. One must hope that in the long run he will either apologise to the unions and say, "I was wrong", or produce the proof.

Mr Davies: Did he ever produce that Pilbara plan?

Mr JAMIESON: We produced a Tonkin Pilbara plan because we were so concerned that there should be a plan and something should be done.

I return to the Metropolitan Water Board, the Fremantle Port Authority, and the State Energy Commission and remind members that they are three organisations which must apply charges. They are all

required more or less to finance their own way, subject to the loan funds to which they have access, and the present Government saw fit to place on them an impost of 3 per cent of their income. That impost had probably the greatest bearing on the inflationary trend which has occurred over the past three years. The inflationary trend will continue if these charges are imposed by the Government of the day. I think it is high time the Government did what it said it would do; that is, curb rates and charges and ensure it does not make these heavy imposts.

There is one further matter to which I will refer. I am sure it must come up, and I dealt with it previously. I refer to the new federalism plan. The Premier has given no indication of it but if the Federal Government is to begin collecting taxation on behalf of the State Governments on the 1st July next year it is fairly obvious there must be an early session so that the tax laws can be altered. This matter has not been dealt with or referred to. We are sure this will be necessary because it is one of the deals to which the Premier was a party and which initiated the new federalism, as it has so often been termed.

When the 1st July comes the taxation laws will have to be amended because neither the Commonwealth nor any other Government can collect pay-as-you-earn taxation retrospectively. There would be a howl if any Government tried to do so. This matter was not mentioned at all in the Treasurer's long speech on the Budget.

Mr Davies: Do you think it was deliberate?

Mr JAMIESON: I am sure the Treasurer would want to forget about it, but we will ensure that the people of this State are reminded of it at an appropriate time because they, too, will want to know what is going to be done, what the rates are likely to be, how they will compare with the rates of taxation imposed in the more populous States of Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland, and how they will be hit by them.

Sir Charles Court: What taxes are you talking about?

Mr JAMIESON: The taxes which will need to be imposed on the States and collected by the Commonwealth, and the taxing powers to be given to the States.

Sir Charles Court: Are you talking about this mythical double tax?

Mr JAMIESON: Yes.

Sir Charles Court: There will be nothing of the sort.

Mr JAMIESON: It will not be double the amount but it will be a second tax. If we have one tax now and another one is imposed, we will have double tax.

With those remarks, I support the Bill.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.*

MR SIBSON (Bunbury) [4.04 p.m.]: I rise to say a few words in the Budget debate, and I would like to commence by saying I believe this is probably the best Budget ever to be brought down in Western Australia.

Mr Bertram: Have you read it?

Mr SIBSON: I say that with the utmost sincerity, and it is borne out by the fact that after listening to the Leader of the Opposition for the past hour or so we found he was unable to tear the Budget to pieces. When a Budget is brought down following a balanced situation in the previous year, and when the new Budget indicates positively that another balanced situation will be achieved, that reflects great credit on the Government, the Treasury officials, and all others involved.

It is all very well for the Opposition to complain about things that are not done; but, after all, the survival of any Government is built around the amount of money that is available to it and its ability to repay loans and to service debts it incurs. The way this has been done in the past year and is projected to be done in the present year is a credit to the Government.

Certainly there are many areas in which this Government would have liked to do more, and the situation of pensioners is one of them. Here again the Government can do only what can be done with the finances available to it. We are still going through one of the most critical periods of financial difficulties, spiralling costs, and inflation that we have ever known, and the Government is worthy of high commendation for surviving in such a situation.

Mr Jamieson: That was a queer statement to make about pensioners when you had such a surplus.

Mr SIBSON: No-one wants to see pensioners improve their lot more than members on this side do; we want to see them get more.

Mr Davies: They couldn't get any less than they've got from this Government.

Mr SIBSON: My parents are pensioners, my wife's mother is a pensioner, and many of my friends are pensioners. Naturally it is in our interests to do everything possible to assist these people.

My experience with pensioners—and I have had considerable experience over a long period—is that their fundamental philosophy as a result of their experience of life is that the rent should be paid and that they should spend only as much as they have and only as it becomes available to them.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You get enough free lunches!

Mr SIBSON: When one talks to pensioners one finds they say they are aware of the situation we are in; and despite

that their lot has been improved and is still being improved. Most pensioners are aware of this and are responsive to it. Naturally at all times they are looking to improving their lot. All people do that; members in this House from day to day endeavour to improve their lot; that is a natural reaction of everybody living in our community.

I commend pensioners for the responsible attitude they have adopted in these matters and I decry the people who try to make political mileage out of them.

Mr Jamieson: You try being a pensioner and see how you finish up.

Mr SIBSON: Those people are insulting pensioners who for many years have worked hard and have gone without, and yet they still realise and understand what the economy is all about.

Mr Bertram: Have you met any pensioners?

Mr O'Connor: You should join them.

Mr Skidmore: Have you met any pensioners like the ones I met this afternoon.

Mr SIBSON: I have no objection to pensioners meeting and voicing their opinions, just as I have no objection to students and unions voicing their opinions. Members of Parliament voice their opinions, so why should not pensioners do the same?

Mr Bertram: They are, loud and clear.

Mr SIBSON: That is a good thing, and we learn from it. I conclude my remarks on this subject on that point. I believe most pensioners are responsible and understanding people who have lived in our community for a long time. They know what the story is and, to a certain extent, they are prepared to go along with it.

Another issue which I should like to discuss is unionism. Members opposite might ask what this has to do with the Budget. I believe it has a great deal to do with the Budget, as I will show in due course. One of the most outstanding features of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition was his reference to union bashing. This has become a cliché of recent times with the Opposition.

However, this Government always has been aware of and is responsive to the attitudes of unions. We believe unionism is a very desirable and worth-while part of our life. But, it is absolutely unacceptable that a few people—namely, the union hierarchy—should be prepared to hold the States and the Commonwealth to ransom at the expense—

Mr Davies: You cannot just talk vaguely about them; you have to name them.

Mr Jamieson: Who are they?

Mr SIBSON:—of the rest of the working community.

Mr Jamieson: Who are these people?

Mr SIBSON: The Leader of the Opposition knows who they are.

Mr Jamieson: You tell us. You are so good at talking about them—tell us one.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I believe the union hierarchy is being completely unfair to the rank and file members.

Mr Bertram: Which union is that?

Mr SIBSON: The rank-and-file members are not encouraged to take part in the affairs of their unions to the extent they should.

Mr Skidmore: What are you talking about? Of course they are!

Mr SIBSON: They are not encouraged to take a vital interest in their unions.

Mr Skidmore: You are quite wrong; unions send out circular after circular.

Mr SIBSON: I intend to place the blame fairly and squarely where it belongs; namely, on the rank-and-file unionists. However, I should qualify that remark: For a long time in Australia, unionists have become complacent because, generally, particularly in Western Australia, unions have been of a docile nature, prepared to go along steadily, accepting the reasonable things of life. However, in latter years we have seen a complete and drastic change in this attitude of which I believe the rank-and-file unionists are not completely aware.

I am not saying this in any derogatory sense; I am simply saying that it is the responsibility of the rank-and-file unionists to become familiar with the activities of their unions. Having been a unionist at one stage, I realise the responsibilities of being a union member. I had a very clear experience in this direction, where the hierarchy of a particular union was prepared to lay down certain standards, rules, and regulations without reference to the rank and file.

Mr Bertram: What did you do about it?

Mr SIBSON: I did plenty about it, and that is the point I am trying to make.

Mr McIver: What union was that?

Mr SIBSON: It was the Collie Miners' Union.

Mr McIver: The hierarchy made decisions without reference to the rank and file?

Mr SIBSON: On plenty of occasions, announcements were made with no reference at all to the union members.

Mr Bertram: Your Premier does the same thing here.

Mr SIBSON: I am discussing unions at the moment. Many times decisions were made at the top level, without reference to the rank and file. I blame the rank

and file for this because if they are prepared to allow the union hierarchy—whether it be an industrial union, a farmers' union, a school teachers' union or any other union—to take whatever action it sees fit without consulting the rank and file, the hierarchy will take such action; in other words, it will get away with precisely what it is allowed to get away with. I am trying to get a message across to all our unions; let them talk to the housewives and see what they think about this situation.

Mr McIver: When was the last time the Collie miners went on strike?

Mr SIBSON: The Collie Miners' Union has never been on strike since the rank and file stranglehold was broken.

Mr Jamieson: The rank and file! You do not know what are you talking about.

Mr SIBSON: I shall correct that statement: Since the hierarchy stranglehold was broken. I am only sorry the member for Collie is not here, because he would understand what I am talking about. He was the one who had to clean up a lot of the mess which was made at that time. If members opposite talked to the people in the street, particularly the housewives, they would find there is a definite move against the standover tactics being adopted by some of the stronger unions in this State.

Mr Bertram: And the Government is doing nothing about it.

Mr SIBSON: The Government is doing plenty about it. The Minister for Labour and Industry has stood in his place in this House on many occasions to tell members about what is happening, and about the nonsense of having continual rolling strikes. If members opposite cared to talk to the housewives and the sensible man in the street they would know and understand that the people of our State are worried about where our unionists are going.

I reiterate that the trade union movement is an essential and important part of our society, but that the rank-and-file members unfortunately are not taking enough interest in the affairs of their unions or fighting hard enough to protect their own interests; these are the people who are concerned about where unionism is going. Talk to any staunch Labor man over the age of 70 years, and he will verify what I am saying.

Mr McIver: There are not many of us left.

Mr SIBSON: He will say that although he has been a staunch supporter of the Labor Party all his life, he is worried about where the unions are going.

Mr Bertram: I spoke to one at lunch time, and he did not agree with you.

Mr SIBSON: There are exceptions to every rule.

Mr Bertram: He was the Premier of our State at one time, and he took the view that the Government is trying to win an election on the union issue.

Mr SIBSON: That is not a bad issue on which to fight an election. Members opposite obviously are extremely worried about what would be the outcome of an election fought on that basis, and if they cared to talk to the man in the street they would find their fears were justified; the ordinary working people are very concerned at the situation.

Mr Bertram: Of course they are—you are making sure they are!

Mr SIBSON: Not only the people in business and multi-national corporations are concerned about where unions are going; the ordinary, little person, the housewives, the union members and the small businessmen also are worried about this trend. Where in the past small businesses have been able to employ up to 20 workers under a very acceptable and workable agreement between the owner and his employees, we find today that this system is being broken down.

Mr Skidmore: That is right. You cannot have mutual agreements because they are all covered by State awards.

Mr SIBSON: I agree that this is the case, and these mutual agreements have been broken down against the wishes of the employees.

Mr Skidmore: That is a lot of rubbish; the unions go into court on behalf of these workers and argue with the business people for better wages and conditions.

Mr SIBSON: I should like to tell members opposite what was said to me by an 18-year-old lad I picked up on the way home one night.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker; if we can convince members opposite to keep quiet for a moment and listen to what I have to say, I will tell them what this sensible 18-year-old lad said to me.

He said, "I work for a firm which employs some 70 people. Our boss is having a hell of a battle to keep us all employed. The union representative came to see us the other day and told us we had to have a \$12 a week rise. I asked the union man what would happen if our employer could not pay the extra \$12 a week to his 70 employees, and went broke, and he replied, 'I do not care about that.'"

Mr Skidmore: That is what the Industrial Commission said. It is not concerned with whether the employer can pay; its task is to ensure that the employees receive decent wages and conditions.



Mr SIBSON: The expert on everything is having his say again. He can come to this place and be an expert on everything; that is very good. But how can he say that a union representative should have the right, the privilege and the insensitivity to say such things to people who know damn well that their jobs are in jeopardy? They know the situation; their employer has laid it on the line. He has told them exactly what the financial situation of the company is and where the problems lie; and he has requested and obtained their co-operation.

Mr Skidmore: Did he ask the employer to pay the award rate of wages?

Mr SIBSON: The member has missed the point.

Mr Skidmore: Don't blame me. You should explain it to me.

Mr SIBSON: I am very sorry.

Mr Skidmore: If the member for all knowledge could not understand it is obvious that nobody else could!

Mr SIBSON: The union representative said that the time was ripe to go for a \$12 a week rise and his union was going to ensure that it was brought into being.

Mr Bertram: Did you tell the young man to oppose it?

Mr McIver: How can a union bring in a \$12 increase?

Mr SIBSON: The member can have his say in a little while.

Mr McIver: How can a union increase a wage by \$12? Be sensible.

Mr SIBSON: Nobody said that the union said that would happen.

Mr McIver: You are saying it.

Mr SIBSON: The union advocated that it should happen.

Mr McIver: It must have had strong reasons to do so.

Mr SIBSON: Nobody is arguing with that. The point I am trying to get across is that this 18-year-old lad was trying to make his way in society, had accepted the challenge that he must work a little harder for his employer in order to keep his job and believes in the philosophy of unionism, but he was completely disgusted by what the union representative told him.

Mr McIver: Ask him in two years whether he is still of the same opinion.

Mr SIBSON: Actually it is two years ago that he said this and I was talking to him three days ago.

Mr Nanovich: The member for Bunbury is always a mile in front of them.

Mr Skidmore: He is two years behind.

Mr SIBSON: This is not a new problem. It has been going on for far too long. It is time some sense was brought into the

situation as far as union leaders are concerned. I do not decry union leaders. I have worked with them. I know that many of them are responsible people, but there must be rationalisation in everything and workers must be encouraged to accept responsibility and a challenge. I should also like to say that after two years that firm has come through with flying colours and all those employees are still employed.

Mr Bertram: Did they get their \$12?

Mr SIBSON: The member knows whether they got the \$12 because he is an expert on awards. I cannot tell him because he says I know nothing about it.

Mr Bertram: I am asking you.

Mr SIBSON: The argument about union bashing, as it is called, is a complete facade from the Opposition. I think I am correct in saying that the Leader of the Opposition's only real point about the Budget was concerned with union bashing, and I do not think union bashing is mentioned in the Budget. I cannot find it anywhere. That is the only thing he really complained about in the Budget.

Mr Davies: You are so dense you don't even know what it means.

Mr Skidmore: Where are unions mentioned in the Budget?

Mr SIBSON: I said I cannot find it. Having had my little run on those matters, I should now like to come back to the Budget.

Mr McIver: You were derailed on that line.

Mr SIBSON: As I said previously, the Budget is probably the best we have ever seen in Western Australia, particularly in light of the financial and other conditions we have had to come through.

Mr Bertram: Including the taxes.

Mr Bateman: The Budget was introduced 12 months ago and went up and up and all the prices went up and it was hog-wash and a whitewash—

Mr SIBSON: The member can have his say later.

Mr Bateman: I will. Don't worry about that.

Mr SIBSON: If I could interject for a moment, I should like to touch on the aspects of the Budget which affect my electorate. I was pleased to see that an amount of \$2.3 million has been allocated for continuing the harbour works at Bunbury. As members know, the harbour was opened by the Premier earlier this year. It is a \$42 million project that provides an outlet for produce from our region. It has provided an international port that can attract ships from all over the world to take the products we are now producing or may be able to produce in the future. I refer particularly to alumina and wood

chips. As members know, the wood chipping industry has been fraught with all sorts of problems.

Mr McIver: Introduced by the Tonkin Government.

Mr SIBSON: Exactly! The industry was introduced by the Tonkin Government and was rubbished at a later date by the very same people. That is real justice!

Mr Davies: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr SIBSON: I believe the situation with regard to wood chips is a credit to the company involved and to the people in the timber industry generally, particularly the Forests Department and its workers because of the way in which they fronted up to the terrible onslaught that was brought against the industry. That onslaught was certainly unprecedented and unjustified.

Mr Bertram: What was that?

Mr SIBSON: It will go down in history as one of the blots in our time.

Mr Bertram: What are you referring to?

Mr SIBSON: The absolute condemnation of the wood chipping industry. I have had some experience in the forestry industry, the timber industry, and particularly the rural industry. When one understands the fundamentals of this type of operation it makes one very annoyed to hear people who have never had any direct contact with the industry, or even made an attempt to have that contact, tell us how an industry is going to rape the country and wreck industry. They have told us of the dreadful things it will do. But their ideas are based purely on assumption and on what they have read in one or two books. I believe that is a terribly devastating thing to happen to an industry which has brought solidarity to the forestry and timber industries, has brought an export industry to our State and has provided income and jobs for many people.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr SIBSON: In my view it is inestimable that people can be absolutely dedicated to wrecking that industry. I have nothing against people being environmentally concerned. I believe the leaders in environmental protection are the foresters. They are the people who were implementing the industry and at the same time doing everything possible to ensure the protection of the environment. They are ensuring not only the protection of the forests as a timber producer but also the ecology, the flora and fauna, the water reserves, wildflowers and everything contained in the bush. Their one real ambition and dedication is to preserve all that and at long last to find a use for the marri gum or the red gum, as it is better

know. I have burnt thousands and thousands of tons of that tree and I have always asked myself whether I could find a use for it.

Today we have a use for that timber. This has brought about far better management of the forests, a far better return to the Forests Department, a complete regeneration of the karri forests with a minimum of loss in timber, and the minimum amount of work involved in cleaning up the forest after the clear-cut has been done.

In this regard I would like to put forward one or two points. One could go on for hours speaking of this topic. Sometimes we hear people say, "Beautiful karri logs are being put through the wood chipper." The people involved in this industry—the Bunning family—have been engaged in it for longer than I can remember. They are astute business people; and there is no way in the world they will put a saw log through a chipper if they can put it through as a saw log and make more money. That fact bears consideration.

Sometimes we hear irresponsible people showing a photograph of a log and saying, "This is the kind of beautiful log that is going through the wood chipper", but when we check the log we find that it is full of gum, shake, or fire burns. That makes it a second-grade log. One wonders what is behind this campaign.

Mr Davies: We are glad to know that those people will get the most profit out of the logs.

Mr SIBSON: The honourable member would be an idiot if he did not think those people would be aiming for the greatest profit. I am sorry for him and his colleagues if they think otherwise.

Mr Laurance: Members opposite want to nationalise the industry.

Mr Davies: Tell us something about insurance.

Mr SIBSON: Any man who puts a log through a saw is always looking for the maximum output from the log, not only because of the monetary gain but also because of his dedication to the industry in trying to get the best possible use from the log. On Friday nights it is common to hear talk at the local hotel among the timber men. Often the comment is this, "Last week we got only 31 per cent out of the logs, but this week we got 35 per cent, and with a bit of luck next week the percentage could be higher because we are in better timber country."

Mr McIver: What about telling us about the need to preserve the timber?

Mr SIBSON: That is even more important, because of the importance of the forest products to the State.

Mr Bertram: How is the unemployment situation in Bunbury?

Mr SIBSON: If the honourable member wishes we can have a session on the unemployment situation, but I do not think we should deal with that question at the present time.

Mr Jamieson: No time like the present!

Mr Coyne: Tell us more about the logs opposite!

Mr Jamieson: What about combining the logs and the member for Karrinyup?

Mr SIBSON: The alumina industry which has been established at Pinjarra and is currently exporting its products through the Ports of Kwinana and Bunbury is to be commended for the move the company made when this Government was successful in convincing it that the outlet at Bunbury should be looked at. That was one factor which helped to establish the international harbour at Bunbury.

Lately a move was made to build another refinery at Wagerup. Whilst this project is at the absolute embryo stage, I am confident that given the opportunities and the things that are needed to make this a workable proposition, we will see it become a reality in the long term.

I do not want to deal with matters affecting the Wellington electorate. I am using this instance merely as an example to illustrate what that industry will mean to Bunbury, because any money that is spent in establishing an industry anywhere in the region, particularly an industry which produces goods for export, will bring a great deal of benefit to my electorate.

It would create employment, establish ancillary industries, and bring about other developments. It would increase real estate values, and create job and career opportunities. That is most acceptable to my electorate, so when we hear there is a move for a new development in our region we are heartened. I say this to emphasise the importance of this region of the State, the centre of which is Bunbury.

The growth of the Bunbury region has become self-generating, particularly in Bunbury itself where as a result of steps taken by this Government in recent times self-generation of industry has become so evident that one needs to drive around the town and the region almost daily to keep up with the expansion. One would have to ask, "What is this and that building, and what is this and that project?" This has been brought about absolutely by the beneficial, self-generating growth as a result of the initiatives put forward by the Government.

I believe that is what government is all about. Governments are not elected to provide everything that is required in the community; they are elected to initiate

and to encourage self-generation of industry. That has happened in the Bunbury region, and as a consequence has enabled small industries and businesses to start up.

Today in Bunbury there is a business which started off as a one-man show. The person concerned worked from 5.00 p.m. to midnight on it, after he knocked off from his normal job. Today that industry employs 70 people, and it has expanded at a fantastic rate over a short period of years. There are many examples of similar industries, which have been established through the confidence engendered by this Government.

I would like now to make some comments on education. We have heard, particularly during this session of Parliament, remarks from members opposite which I consider to be unreal, ridiculous, and beyond all comprehension with regard to education. The efforts that have been made by members opposite to cloud educational issues are unacceptable, and it is all the more perplexing because there are many members opposite who were formerly teachers in the education profession.

One area of education with which I am concerned is the newly instituted pre-primary system. This sector of education was evolved by the present Government; it was put before the people and sold to them. The Government explained to the people what it intended to do with pre-primary education. It was to be an addition to the educational scene; and I believe it was absolutely essential to introduce it.

Pre-primary education allows or will allow every child at the age of five years to undergo pre-primary experience. We have heard dreadful stories from members opposite about the Government forcing this aspect of education on the young children. That is utter rot, because the express purpose of this exercise is to enable the people to look at it, study it, and get to understand it. If the people themselves—and by that I mean the parents—accept it, then they would be the ones to decide when, how, where, and by what means this addition to the education system would be introduced.

Despite all the criticism against and all the noise made about it—I believe the criticism was made about it because the Opposition realised how beneficial this form of education was—we find that when we go to areas where pre-primary education has been initiated there is no way in the world that we can withdraw it.

Mr Blaikie: It has been an outstanding success.

Mr SIBSON: No doubt the honourable member will know about that.

Mr Bateman: It is one of the greatest election gimmicks of all time.

Mr SIBSON: The member for Vasse knows all about it because he has had experience of pre-primary education in his electorate, as has the member for Gascoyne. I have visited the building where pre-primary education is provided at Carnarvon, and I have spoken to the little children there. They told me how terrific it was.

Mr Davies: Did they say, "Thank you"?

Mr SIBSON: The honourable member should give them a little credit. I also spoke to the parents and the teachers. If one tried to take pre-primary education away from Carnarvon I am sure the people there and the member for Gascoyne would be up in arms.

Mr McIver: You wait until they want funds for it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: I do not think the situation will be any different from the usual hassle. Whenever I have been to a department to request funds I have had to wait my turn. I have had to submit a case and then await the results. The situation will be no different in this regard.

Several members interjected.

Mr SIBSON: Under Labor policy the money was spent like water and the State and nation were sent to rack and ruin.

Mr Bateman: You are making a fool of yourself. Sit down.

Mr SIBSON: In the Budget, provision has been made for additional staff for schools—in all, 1 000 people.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: How many additional students?

Mr SIBSON: Let us consider the criticism levelled in this area. The student-staff ratio has been reduced in a sensible manner in a short period of time by this Government.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: As a result of Whitlam Government money.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: I believe that the message which must be conveyed to those 1 000 additional staff and to all people in the teaching profession generally is that no longer can they sit in their ivory towers. I am not directing my remarks to all teachers because many of them are genuine and are very able in their profession. However, unfortunately some believe that the teaching profession is a god unto itself. This situation has been allowed to creep into the profession. I believe that teaching should be recognised as a profession and not be connected with an industrial union.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr SIBSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The message which must go out to teachers is that they must be prepared to do a little extra. They have very favourable working conditions these days and their pay is good. However, I believe that in many ways we can look for a little more effort from them.

I know that they will agree that the parents could inject a little more enthusiasm into the field of education and I would go along with that, but I believe it is up to the teaching profession—I call it a profession because that is what it is, not an industrial union—to accept the challenge and apply a little more effort to ensure that the students who leave school can read, write, and spell. This is a vital part of our education system which has broken down. Some school leavers just cannot spell properly and they do not know how to add up. This is one of the challenges the teaching profession must face squarely.

My time has almost expired although I had many more topics on which I wished to speak. Perhaps I dwelt a little too long on one or two subjects.

I would now like to commend the Government, particularly the Premier who is the Treasurer, for the way in which he has presented the Budget to the State—

Mr Bateman: What Budget?

Mr SIBSON: —and the way in which every area possible has been covered. I have a list of 21 items on which I could dwell and demonstrate that more money has been spent on them than has ever been spent before. Yet we still hear nonsense from the other side that nothing has been done to help the people.

Mr Bateman: Absolutely nothing.

Mr SIBSON: The Government has injected funds into the private sector to provide employment opportunities, and this is what government is all about.

Several members interjected.

Mr SIBSON: There is no talk about propping up weaknesses. Money is to be spent on capital works to create jobs and career opportunities.

Opposition members: Rubbish!

Mr SIBSON: That is the fair responsibility of the Government and it has accepted that responsibility.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: Anyone in Bunbury and the surrounding districts who wants a job can get one.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Are you saying that all people on the dole are dole bludgers?

Mr SIBSON: I did not say that. I said that jobs are available.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: It is a matter of whether a person is prepared to take a job or is prepared to sit back and take the dole.

Several members interjected.

Mr SIBSON: I know there are areas where no jobs are available, and an effort is being made by the Bunbury people to overcome that. I have never referred to dole bludgers and I do not intend to. That is a different issue. I am talking about unemployment in Bunbury. We have it there the same as it exists anywhere else. Unfortunately we inherited our employment problem because people come not only from all over the State, but from all over the Commonwealth in an effort to seek employment. This is our problem.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Budget.

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

(Continued on page 3172).

## BILLS (2): RETURNED

### 1. Security Agents Bill.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

### 2. Artificial Breeding of Stock Act Amendment Bill.

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

## QUESTIONS (27): ON NOTICE

### 1. KALGOORLIE REGIONAL HOSPITAL

#### Improvements: Recommendations

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Further to the Minister's answer to question 3 of 5th August, 1976 concerning development of Kalgoorlie regional hospital, will the Minister please advise whether negotiations with St John of God Hospital, Kalgoorlie, have been completed?

(2) Is he able to indicate when the staged development referred to in his answer to the said question is expected to commence?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Negotiations are continuing.

(2) No. As indicated in my answer to question 3 of 5th August, 1976, planning is dependent upon the result of negotiations relating to the utilisation of beds at the St John of God Hospital, Kalgoorlie.

## 2.

## EDUCATION

### Sports Grounds: South Kalgoorlie

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Further to the answer given by the Treasurer to question 15 of 23rd September, 1976, concerning the grassing of the playing area to service the Adeline (South Kalgoorlie) schools, what financial contribution will the Government make on behalf of South Kalgoorlie primary schools contribution and when?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

No specific allocation has been made for the purpose but the question of meeting a reasonable share of cost for the school is still being examined.

## 3.

## LAND AT ESPERANCE

### Release for Agriculture

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Could he advise if any decision has been made in relation to the release of land for agriculture in—

(a) Cascades area—80 km west-north-west of Esperance;

(b) East Grass Patch area—50 km north east of Esperance?

(2) If "No" could he report progress on studies into the economic viability of developing farms in these areas?

(3) When can a decision be expected?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) (a) and (b) No.

(2) The Cascades area has been visited this week by officers of the Departments of Agriculture and Lands and Surveys to examine the soil types and drainage of the area. Economic assessment of this area and reassessment of the East Grass Patch area will then proceed.

(3) A meeting of the Cabinet sub-committee on land release will make a recommendation on the release of both areas when these assessments are completed.

## 4. LAND IN ROE ELECTORATE

### Release for Agriculture

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Lands:

(1) What area of land has been released for agriculture during the term of this Government in the shires of—

(a) Esperance;

(b) Ravensthorpe;

- (c) Gnowangerup;
- (d) Kent and Lake Grace—
  - (i) for the first time;
  - (ii) as a result of forfeiture?
- (2) What area of land has been cleared in the abovenamed shires during—
  - (a) the same period;
  - (b) during the preceding 10 years?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The information requested is not readily available as land is released in Land Act districts and statistics kept accordingly.
- (2) Not known.

## 5. COAL DEPOSITS

### *Perth-Geraldton Area*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Will he advise if the Mines Department has received any reports of economical deposits of coal located between Perth and Geraldton?
- (2) Does Hancock and Wright hold any coal mining leases or have they applied for any exploration permits in the abovementioned area?
- (3) If so, would he indicate the area and exploration permits held or applied for?
- (4) Has any report been received from Hancock and Wright regarding discoveries of coal between Perth and Geraldton?
- (5) If so, has there been any assessment of the potential of the discoveries?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The previous reported deposit near Eneabba remains the only reported deposit which may be of economic interest in the future.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not applicable.

## 6. EDUCATION

### *Non-Government School Sites: Submission*

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the Minister for Education has received a submission from the Western Australian Parents and Friends Federation requesting that provision be made under the Town Planning and Development Act of sites for non-Government schools in developing areas?
- (2) Will he please state the policy of the Government on this matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Town Planning and Development Act only provides for the machinery for local authorities to prepare town planning schemes and for the Town Planning Board to determine applications for subdivisions.

The Act makes no provision for the allocation of sites for any purpose.

This is done by local authorities allocating areas for specific purposes in town planning schemes or zoning by-laws.

Non-Government school institutions should approach the local authority in whose area they wish to locate a school so that the local authority could consider such location in its town planning scheme.

## 7. KALGOORLIE REGIONAL HOSPITAL

### *Resident Doctors*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Further to his answer to question 3 of 16th September on the question of resident doctors for Geraldton Regional Hospital:

- (1) Have replies been received from all Geraldton doctors indicating their attitudes?
- (2) If "Yes" will the Minister please indicate the nature of the responses?
- (3) Have there been any further developments on the question of resident doctors for Geraldton?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), will the Minister please indicate the position?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) and (4) The subject is under continuing consideration.

## 8. IRRIGATION

### *Geraldton: Water Quotas*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Further to his answer to question 10 of 7th October, concerning quotas for Geraldton tomato growers, what factors are considered when the annual review of quotas is made?
- (2) What is the extent of variation in size of quotas allocated?
- (3) What factors affect the variations in size of quotas (specifically does the number of plants grown affect the quota)?

- (4) Is there a limit to the quantity of water made available for the industry in general, or are quotas allocated individually without reference to any "overall ceiling quantity"?
- (5) Has a request been received for increased quotas during the last two years, either from individual growers or from the Geraldton Tomato Growers Association?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), what were the results of such requests?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) A check is made of each grower's actual annual consumption in relation to his individual quota.  
No grower who exceeds his quota has ever been refused additional water, but the price of all water in excess of the quota is increased from 7 cents to 22 cents per kilolitre.
- (2) Individual quotas vary from 5 450 kilolitres to 910 kilolitres per year.
- (3) Answered by (1) above. No account is taken of the number of plants grown as this could vary from year to year.
- (4) The total quota was initially fixed to limit industry usage having regard to individual grower's requirements.  
In recent years total industry consumptions have been much less than the total industry quota.
- (5) and (6) No official requests have been received.

## 7. RURAL AFFAIRS INQUIRY

### *Meeting at Morawa*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Why did the rural affairs inquiry not hold a meeting in Morawa?
- (2) Was a meeting in Morawa requested by any person or organisation?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Because no meeting was requested.
- (2) No.

## 10. HOUSING

### *Duplex Units: Purchase*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it the policy of the State Housing Commission to allow purchase of duplex units by rental tenants thereof?
- (2) If "No" has such been the policy in the past?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), when did such policy change, and why?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The sale of duplex units is allowed subject to both adjoining tenants opting to purchase at the same time, and provided the commission also agrees the units can be released from the rental stock.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

## 11. DENTAL CLINICS *Geraldton*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Further to the Minister's answer to question 7 of 7th October, concerning dental clinics in Geraldton, how specifically will each clinic be staffed?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Two full time dental therapists.  
One full time dental chairside assistant.  
One dental officer, part time.

## 12. TECHNICAL SCHOOL AT GERALDTON *Courses*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Further to the Minister's answer to question 8 of 7th October, concerning courses at Geraldton Technical School, which of the courses listed will be available for—

- (a) day studies only;
- (b) night studies only;
- (c) both day and night courses?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The courses will be offered as follows and their operations will be subject to demand.

- (a) Day studies only;
  - Stage A
    - Hairdressing
    - Stage B
      - Painting and decorating
  - (b) Night studies only:
    - Stage A
      - Nil
      - Stage B
        - Nil
    - (c) Both day and night courses:
      - Stage A
        - Commercial courses
        - Language courses (Foreign, English and Remedial)
        - Catering—(adult education courses)
        - Dressmaking
        - Science

**Stage B**

Automotive trades  
 Electrical trades  
 Plumbing and sheetmetal trades  
 Carpentry and Joinery trades  
 Welding and metal construction trades  
 Art

13.

**RAILWAYS****Geraldton Marshalling Yards**

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to his answer to question 2 of 7th October concerning land purchased from Mr G. K. Allen for marshalling yards in which he advised me that Westrail concedes:

- (a) it no longer needs the land for marshalling yards;
- (b) Mr Allen did not wish to sell the land to Westrail; and
- (c) Mr Allen wishes to repurchase the land—
  - (1) Why will the land not be returned to Mr Allen now at cost?
  - (2) Why does Westrail have no plans to dispose of the land in question until the need for new marshalling yards has been established, when in fact the land is no longer needed for that purpose anyway?
  - (3) Does Westrail propose to make a profit from resuming the land, holding it indefinitely while its value rises, and then selling it back to its original owner?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) Westrail has already outlaid capital money for land for a marshalling yard at the site originally planned.

To comply with the Geraldton Regional Planning Report Westrail will, at some time in the future, be faced with further capital expenditure for land in another location and will have to pay current valuation.

Westrail proposes to offset the cost of the new area against benefits gained from sale of the old area at current valuation. This is normal procedure with land transactions. There is no legal obligation to sell the land back to the

original owner but as indicated in my answer to your previous question Mr Allen will be given first option to re-purchase at current valuation at the appropriate time.

14.

**DRUG ABUSE****Ministerial Conference**

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Who represented this State at the conference of State and Australian Government Ministers recently held in Melbourne to discuss the question of drug abuse?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Hon. R. J. O'Connor, M.L.A. Minister for Transport, Police and Traffic and the Hon. R. J. L. Williams, M.L.C. representing the Hon. N. E. Baxter, M.L.C. Minister for Health and Community Welfare. They were supported by Dr J. F. Scott, Medical Director Alcohol and Drug Authority and Acting Inspector D. Ayres, CIB.

15.

**HEALTH****Family Planning Association**

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Referring to question 11 of 21st September, 1976, re funds for the Family Planning Association, can the Minister now advise please what success he has had with his representations to the Australian Government authorities?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Family Planning Association will continue to receive a health programme grant until the 30th June, 1977. It was initially indicated that a charge would have to be raised for scheduled services for privately insured persons, but this is now being re-considered by the Commonwealth Government.

16.

**RAPE SEED****Production and Sales**

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many tonnes of rape seed were delivered to the Grain Pool in the 1975-76 season?
- (2) How much of the delivered crop has been sold?
- (3) Who was the purchaser?
- (4) Are markets being negotiated for the balance of the crop?
- (5) Is Refinoll the major market?



- (6) Over the past two seasons, 1973-1974 and 1974-75, who purchased the Western Australian crop?
- (7) Why is Western Australian rape seed apparently not selling well?
- (8) What is the solution to this problem?
- (9) Is it possible for the Grain Pool to sell on forward contracts?
- (10) If not, why not?
- (11) Does this limit the opportunity of obtaining additional sales?
- (12) If it is not possible for the Grain Pool to sell forward, would a Government guarantee facilitate sales that RefinOil could be making?
- (13) What payments have been made to growers on the 1975-76 crop?
- (14) When can second and subsequent payments be expected?
- (15) What is the expected rate of payment?
- (16) Is he aware that this industry could be in danger of extinction, unless—
  - (a) more suitable varieties are made available and grown by producers;
  - (b) better marketing arrangements can be made?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) 1 747.38 tonnes.
- (2) 1 538 tonnes.
- (3) (a) RefinOil Pty. Ltd.—1 500 tonnes with a 10% margin in buyers option.
- (b) Symonds Seeds—23 tonnes.
- (c) Mt. Barker Co-op—15 tonnes.
- (4) and (5) Yes.
- (6) RefinOil Pty. Ltd.
- (7) Western Australian rapeseed is well accepted by buyers. Excessively high freight rates to export markets for small parcel quantities render offers uncompetitive if growers returns are not to be eroded. For example the freight rate to Japan ex Fremantle from WA for small parcel quantities is approximately A\$61 per tonne. The equivalent to the continent is approximately A\$93 per tonne and to the UK approximately A\$99.
- (8) Increased production to enable bulk charter freight to be used. For example current bulk charter freight rate for cargo quantities to Japan is estimated at around A\$15 per tonne and to Europe at around A\$25 per tonne.
- (9) No.
- (10) Production is unpredictable due to the very limited area sown.
- (11) Yes.
- (12) Unknown.

- (13) A\$100 per tonne, less growers' individual freight and Co-operative Bulk Handling tolls.
- (14) Second advance anticipated during October/November.  
Third advance when unsold balance cleared.  
Final advance when handling costs established.
- (15) Second advance estimated A\$15 per tonne.  
Third/final a total of A\$20 per tonne.
- (16) (a) and (b) New blackleg resistant and LEA varieties are expected to be available in commercial quantities within 5 years and this should be a base for a major expansion in the industry.

# 17. EVANSTON GOLDMINE

## *Retreatment of Residues*

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What company has been granted the right to re-treat the sands residue situated at the mine site known as the Evanston gold mine?
- (2) (a) When did the treatment commence; and  
(b) what is the estimated time for the treatment to be completed?
- (3) Is the process different from the normal re-treatment process for gold bearing sands, and if so, what type of process is involved?
- (4) In view of the fact that the area has a sign erected on it stating that poison chemicals are used in the area and that persons must take care—
  - (a) what type of chemical is being used in the treatment process;
  - (b) is it injurious to the health of humans or animals;
  - (c) is it injurious to the flora in the area?
- (5) Was it a part of the licence granted that re-treated sand slimes would not be permitted to spread over a wide area of ground?
- (6) Would he ensure that the area for the dumping of the re-treated slime is contained in a reasonable area and not allowed to spread out in an indiscriminate fashion?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Licence 2303H to treat tailings at Evanston was granted to Alan John Foxton in 1974 and is now held by Robert John Beavis.
- (2) (a) Early 1976.  
(b) Approximately 15 to 18 months time.

- (3) No, there is no difference.
- (4) (a) As far as is known a Sodium Cyanide compound is the principal chemical being used.
- (b) and (c) Yes.
- (5) No.
- (6) The need to recycle water ensures that all re-treated tailings are confined to a minimal area.

# 18. PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS

## *Graduates and Vacancies*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the anticipated number of newly graduated pre-school teachers at the end of the 1976 academic year?
- (2) What is the anticipated number of vacancies for pre-school teachers in Western Australia in 1977 in—
  - (a) pre-school board centres;
  - (b) pre-primary centres?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) 130 approximately.
- (2) (a) 41 not including part-time centres.
- (b) Between 40 and 50.

# 19. PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

## *Belmont Area: Enrolments*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to establish a pre-primary centre at Belmay Junior Primary School for 1977?
- (2) Has the Education Department assessed anticipated enrolments for 1977 school year at the Redcliffe, Belmay East, and Belmay Cloverdale Pre-School Centres?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" will the Minister provide details?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.

# 20. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES

## *Waiting List and Enrolments*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In respect of pre-school centres which have been transformed into pre-primary centres—

- (1) Is the established waiting list honoured; if not, what policy is employed?
- (2) Is it departmental policy to offer places to children on a priority basis who will be enrolling at the primary school associated with the pre-primary centre?

- (3) Are children who intend to enrol at nearby non-Government primary schools still eligible to attend Government pre-primary centres?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Where the Education Department establishes pre-primary centres within a school, all five-year-olds within the intake area of that school become eligible to enrol in the pre-primary centre.
- (3) Yes.

# 21. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRE

## *Tranby School*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) When the Government replaces the prefabricated buildings at Tranby Primary School, is it intended to build a pre-primary centre within the school grounds?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" does the Education Department propose to return the Happy Days Kindergarten site and building to the Belmont Shire;
- (b) if not, how does the Government intend to use these premises?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Replacement buildings for Tranby Primary School have not yet been planned.
- (2) Not applicable.

22.

# TEACHERS

## *Engagement of Graduates*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister able to guarantee that positions will be found in Western Australian schools for all newly graduated teachers in 1977?
- (2) If not, what is the Education Department's estimate of the anticipated surplus of all teachers in Western Australia next year?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) In terms of teachers available for appointment anywhere in the State, the surplus could be zero. In the metropolitan area and in some larger centres, the total number not employed at the opening of the school year may be as high as 400.

23.

**HIGH SCHOOLS*****Learning Materials: Inquiry into Costs***

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Who were the individuals appointed by the Government to the committee established for the purpose of inquiring into the escalating costs of learning materials in secondary schools?
- (2) When was the committee appointed?
- (3) On how many occasions has the committee met?
- (4) In light of the Minister's previous statements indicating that the committee's report was expected by the end of June, will he explain—
  - (a) why the report has not yet been made available to members;
  - (b) when he now anticipates the report will be completed and made available?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Dr A. N. Stewart, Assistant Director-General (Resources), Chairman  
 Mr H. W. Loudon, Assistant Director-General (Schools and Services)  
 Mr K. Lockhart, Director, WA Council of State School Organisations  
 Mr J. Casey, President, WA High School Principals' Association  
 Dr I. E. Fraser, Superintendent Education (Research)  
 Mr F. A. Giles, Planning Branch, Executive Officer.

- (2) February, 1976.
- (3) The Committee met on at least seven occasions.
- (4) The report has been completed and will be made available to members.

24.

**PERTH ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE*****Annual Running Cost, and Finance***

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the nett annual cost to the Treasury resulting from the Government's decision to take over the Entertainment Centre?
- (2) Who were the firms/companies/individuals involved in financing the construction and running of the Entertainment Centre, prior to the State Government takeover?
- (3) What equity did the entrepreneurs have in the venture?

- (4) In what manner were Government bodies involved in financing the project?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The annual outlay by the State on interest and loan repayments will vary from \$518 000 in 1976-77 rising to a peak of \$975 000 in 1985-86 and reducing thereafter as loans are repaid. These payments will be offset by the lease rental of \$250 000 per annum during the period of the lease to TVW Limited and by net earnings from the hire of the centre thereafter.
- (2) Academy Entertainment Pty. Ltd., the shareholders of which are—  
 TVW Limited  
 MCA Australia Pty. Ltd.  
 Paramount Pictures (Australia) Pty. Ltd.  
 Stadium Holdings Pty. Ltd.  
 Valmana Pty. Ltd.
- (3) \$1 004 000 plus a further sum of approximately \$500 000 by way of shareholders' loans.
- (4) Rural and Industries Bank loan of \$4 million secured in part by State Government guarantee of \$3 million;  
 State Superannuation Board loan of \$1.8 million secured by State Government guarantee;  
 Commonwealth Government loan of \$1 million;  
 State Government loan of \$500 000.  
 It is pertinent to remind the member that the original decision to give guarantees for the project was made by the State Labor Government in 1973—as was the decision to have the centre built where it is, rather than a more modest and more viable project at the Royal Agricultural Society Claremont Showgrounds.

25.

**JAPANESE TUNA VESSELS*****Port Facilities***

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

With regard to the Japanese-Australian agreement for the use of Australian ports by Japanese tuna boats and further to question 21 of 22nd September—

- (1) What are the reasons for the delay in finalisation of the agreement which was due for renewal by November, 1976?
- (2) When is it anticipated that negotiations will be finalised?
- (3) (a) Has there been any alteration to the Western Australian port which was recommended in May, 1976; and  
 (b) if so, why?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The Japan/Australia Fisheries Agreement expired on the 27th November, 1975. The entry concession for Japanese long line tuna fishing vessels to the ports of Fremantle, Hobart, Sydney and Brisbane was extended for twelve months to the 27th November, 1976, by an exchange of letters of understanding between the Australian and Japanese Governments in November, 1975.
- (2) It is unlikely that a new Fisheries Agreement will be finalised until the implications of the introduction of the 200 mile economic fishing zone are clarified. A further extension to the concession allowing use of ports is currently being considered.
- (3) (a) No.  
(b) Not applicable.

## 26. COALMINE WORKERS

### *Pensions*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Mines:

Adverting to his letter to me dated 4th October, 1976, in connection with his receiving a deputation from the Collie mining unions regarding an increase in the level of the coal mine workers pensions will he please advise—

- (1) Since the pension was first introduced has not the level of pension paid in the Eastern States been the yardstick used in this State?
- (2) Is it not a fact that the coal mine workers pension in the Eastern States was increased by \$4 per fortnight as from 22nd December, 1974 and no similar increase was applied in this State?
- (3) Is it not a fact that the pension payable in the Eastern States is to be increased by \$7.50 per week as from 1st August, 1976?
- (4) Is it not a fact that the actuarial examination on our fund was carried out in June 1973 and since that date approximately 240 non starters have commenced in the mines at Collie with an average age of 30 years?
- (5) If the answer to (4) is "Yes" is it not a fact the actuarial report is out of date and the viability of the fund improves with more contributors joining the fund?

- (6) In view of the foregoing will he arrange the deputation which is causing the Collie mining unions concern?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The pension rate payable under the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act, 1943, is negotiable and in negotiations from time to time rates payable in other States have been referred to.
- (2) On the 22nd December, 1974, the pension rate in New South Wales was increased by \$4.00 per fortnight. There was no similar increase in Western Australia and the position in other States is unknown.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) (a) The last actuarial examination of the West Australian Fund was as at the 30th June, 1973.  
(b) There has been an increase of 250 workers between 30th June, 1973 and 30th June, 1976.  
(c) The average age of new workers has not been assessed, but between 30th June, 1973 and 30th June, 1976 the average age of workers has fallen from 43.31 years to 38.15 years. (The words "non starters" are not understood).
- (5) (a) The actuarial examination as at the 30th June, 1973 is the last carried out.  
(b) The viability of the fund does not necessarily improve with an increase in the number of contributors, because the liability of the fund is also thereby increased.
- (6) In my letter of the 4th October, 1976 to the member for Collie I said a conference might well be advantageous when comments are received from all concerned on the actuarial examination report.

## 27.

### CABINET

#### *Study Groups and Committees*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Is there a record kept of the study—probe groups—investigation and other committees and sub-committees by whatever name called which he has so far established within the Cabinet?
- (2) If "Yes" will he list them?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) From time to time, appointment of committees or sub-committees of Cabinet is made—as is the custom with most Governments—for specific purposes.

Naturally, the appointment of such committees or sub-committees is recorded at the time.

- (2) No—and for good reason, which the member, as a former Minister, should appreciate.

### QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

#### 1. EVANSTON GOLDMINE

##### *Retreatment of Residues*

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Mines:

My question arises out of my question on notice today. Last Sunday I visited the mine area concerned, which is some 120 miles north of Southern Cross, and found the tailings are being allowed to percolate throughout the entire area without any restriction being placed upon them.

Mr O'Connor: Is that a question?

Mr SKIDMORE: Because of that would the Minister undertake to have an inspector go to the area immediately to ensure this practice ceases forthwith?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

To the best of my knowledge, inspectors of mines are visiting mines regularly. I have no objection to asking the Mines Department when the last visit took place, and to ensuring through the inspector that the rules and regulations are complied with. That is as far as I can go.

#### 2. JAPANESE TUNA VESSELS

##### *Port Facilities*

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

Part (3) (a) of my question 25 on today's notice paper should have read "recommended in May, 1975". In view of that, is the answer the Minister has given me still the same?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Yes, it is still the same. The extension which is being considered by the Commonwealth at the present time does not propose any change in the agreement. It simply relates to an extension of time because of the introduction of the 200-mile economic zone.

Mr Stephens: I referred to part (3) (a).

Mr P. V. JONES: No.

3.

### ROADS

#### *National Highway: Sealing*

Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

This is a matter of concern to a large number of people throughout the State and particularly to people in my electorate.

Based on previous Federal financial allocations for national roads throughout the State, and in view of the current estimate of \$35 million to seal the section of the national highway between the Goldsworthy turn-off and the Broome-Derby junction, what effect would the sealing of the aforementioned section within the next three-year period—as promised recently by the State Opposition—have on the State's road programme as a whole, and in particular on the Pilbara?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The sealing of this road in the next three years would eat up all the annual Commonwealth funds currently available for national roads in Western Australia and leave other areas of the State with no funds for this purpose. Therefore, as far as the Pilbara is concerned, the view expressed by the Opposition would involve curtailment of works in the Pilbara and other areas of the State, including the Meekatharra-Newman road.

I might add that considerable funds have been provided in this financial year for the Port Hedland-Broome road and the Government is hopeful of allocating further funds in the near future.

### WATERWAYS CONSERVATION BILL

#### *Second Reading*

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Conservation and the Environment) [5.09 p.m.]: 1 move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This legislation is a further example of the Government's commitment to responsible environmental management, particularly where it includes local government participation. In the field of waterway and estuary management this Bill does precisely that.

In broad terms, the Bill will vest in local management authorities the day-to-day management of particular estuarine systems, and will provide for finance to be made available from Government sources for this task.

This Bill also provides for the repeal of the Swan River Conservation Act. In the interests of uniformity of waterways'

management in this State this move was found to be desirable, but in doing so it has also provided us with the opportunity to update the provisions in the original Act.

The Government wishes to record its appreciation for the work of the Swan River Conservation Board, and the two nonstatutory committees assisting in the management of the Peel Inlet and the Leschenault Estuary.

Firstly, I wish to pay special tribute to, and express the Government's appreciation for, the many years of work and effort that have been given by both present and past members of the statutory and advisory bodies. Successive Governments have received the benefits of sound advice and unselfish application to the task of maintaining people's aquatic playgrounds in the first-class condition we have long enjoyed, and which we have now come to expect as being the norm. The Swan River Conservation Board and the Peel Inlet and Leschenault Estuary Conservation Advisory Committees have excellent records in practical river and estuarine management, and I foresee this experience being of the greatest assistance in the formative period of the new authorities.

It is probably appropriate that the members should be made aware of the tremendous contribution made by the Swan River Conservation Board. The board itself, which is some 20 years old, had its origins in the early committees relating to the Swan River, and I refer to the Swan River Reference Committee and the Swan River Pollution Committee.

Originally, during the period of the Second World War, it was found necessary to have some reference committee for work on the river as industry expansion occurred; also, the waterways were used for wartime pursuits such as a flying boat base, and a committee was formed to advise the Government regarding the waterway.

You would be well aware, Mr Speaker, of the contributions made by the late Mr Reg Bond, Mr Kenworthy—of what is now the Metropolitan Water Board—and Dr Davidson of the Public Health Department. These gentlemen provided a set of management criteria which was subsequently adopted by the Swan River Pollution Committee. Then, in 1956, the Government of the day established the Swan River Conservation Board and Mr Bond became its first chairman, a position which he held for the subsequent 10 years.

Following that, the board, composed not only of representatives of aquatic and conservation interests but also of representatives of Government departments, has provided the capital city of this State with a waterway of which we can be justly proud.

The board goes out of existence with the passing of this legislation but the condition of our waterways will remain a tribute to the unselfish contribution of many people.

The Bill itself is the result of fruitful discussion with these three bodies, and with local government representatives.

In addition to the management authorities, there will be set up a waterways commission for the purpose of co-ordinating the activities of the management bodies in the interests of uniformity and economy. Strong local flavour is again evident on this body for only the commissioner will not be drawn directly from the membership of the management authorities.

Finance provided will be channelled through the commission for use directly by the local bodies who will submit yearly budget estimates in the normal manner for such accounting procedures.

The commission also has the general duty of advising the Environmental Protection Authority. The EPA already has overall statutory responsibility for conservation and environmental management in the State and it is appropriate that the EPA should, in turn, provide policy advice to the commission. In addition, the commission will also have direct access to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment as well as to the EPA should the need arise.

Management authorities are to be provided in this Bill for the Swan and Canning Rivers, the Peel Inlet system, and for Leschenault Estuary. Provision is also included for other estuarine and waterway systems to be declared from time to time as is deemed appropriate.

These locally-based authorities will comprise, in the main, local people who have a direct interest in their own particular area. Secretariat and advisory services will be provided by the waterways commission, at least in the short term until the management programmes are well established.

These authorities will be responsible generally for the conservation and management of the water and land placed under their control, to advise the Minister, the EPA, and the commission on matters of local interest related thereto and to carry out any duties delegated by the commission. In this regard may I stress that it is the intention of the Government that as many functions as possible should be performed by the local bodies.

Contained in the Bill are a number of provisions to facilitate interaction and consultation between the Minister, the various management authorities, the waterways commission, and relevant local authorities. It is not the intention of this legislation that local government should be excluded from the areas under the control of management authorities.

Without adequate co-operation by all parties concerned, and legislative support, the ultimate preservation of our estuarine and waterway systems will be much too difficult a task. Local authority representation on the management bodies is only a first step—active liaison and co-operation are the spirit of this legislation.

I do not intend at this time to continue to detail the many duties and responsibilities devolving upon the management and policy bodies to be set up by this legislation. Suffice it to say that the time is fast approaching, in fact it has arrived on some of our waterways, when conflicting pressures of public usage for recreation, transportation, and industry will place considerable stresses on efforts to conserve and manage our valuable water areas.

The Government is meeting these challenges, and in this legislation aims to provide the machinery for competent management of yet another of our valuable recreational and environmental resources.

I commend the Bill to the House.

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

**MR A. R. TONKIN** (Morley) [5.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned for four sitting days.

**Sir Charles Court**: Could we have the motion clarified?

The **SPEAKER**: I will put the question again so there is no doubt. The question is that the debate be adjourned for four sitting days.

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier) [5.18 p.m.]: To the best of my knowledge the honourable member did not confer with the Minister about this. I hope the motion is not passed in its present form because of the confusion it could generate. Also, I believe this motion is in a different form from normal adjournment motions. I can assure the honourable member that there is no intention to bring forward the debate on the Bill again before the adjournment of the House for the Constitutional Convention.

**Mr A. R. Tonkin**: That is all this will do.

**Sir Charles Court**: Well, put your motion that way.

The **SPEAKER**: I will have to put the question again.

**Sir Charles Court**: We will have to oppose it. Even if we defeat the motion, the Bill will not be brought forward again before the adjournment of the House for the Constitutional Convention. If members want the debate adjourned until a special date, this can be achieved.

The **SPEAKER**: Before putting the question again, it might be appropriate for me to say that if the motion is defeated, the debate will have to continue. As it stands at the moment I must put the question that the debate be adjourned for four days.

#### *Point of Order*

**Sir Charles Court**: Could I seek clarification from you, Sir, about the form of the motion? My understanding is that the motion is normally that the debate be adjourned, and if a member wants an adjournment to a special date, he fixes that date. However, as I understand it, the wording of the motion is to the effect that the debate be postponed.

**Mr A. R. Tonkin**: No.

The **SPEAKER**: The point of order raised by the Premier is not an illogical one. In my experience in this House, when situations of this kind arise, usually some sort of understanding is reached between the two opposing points of view. A compromise is reached so that what might appear to be something unacceptable to the Government is not voted on *per se*. That is my experience as a member, a Minister, and Speaker in this Chamber. Perhaps traditionally this sort of motion has not been moved. However, I cannot see any reason that it should not be moved if the member for Morley wishes to pursue his course. I will resume my seat to see if anyone else has anything to say. As no-one else wishes to speak, I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

*Sitting suspended from 5.21 to 5.26 p.m.*

*Debate (on adjournment) Resumed*

*Amendment to Adjournment Motion*

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.26 p.m.]: I move an amendment—

Delete the words "for four sitting days".

Members will appreciate that the adjournment motion was not moved in the usual form, but certainly we can adjudge the intention of the member for Morley.

I desire to indicate that if the House agrees to this amendment the Government undertakes that the Bill will not be brought on for debate until after the recess during which the Constitutional Convention will be held in Hobart. I think that will satisfy the intention of the member for Morley, because along with many of us he is a delegate to the convention, and this is an important Bill which requires a considerable amount of study.

**MR A. R. TONKIN** (Morley) [5.28 p.m.]: I would like to comment that as the Government has given this undertaking and has moved to amend the motion,

it has achieved what I set out to achieve with my motion. Why my motion could not have been agreed to is a matter of amusement to me, because although it is true my motion is not in the usual form, it does not seem to me to be a terribly revolutionary one.

Sir Charles Court: It makes a specific date instead of leaving it flexible. You defeated yourself.

Amendment put and passed.

Motion (adjournment of debate) as amended, put and passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR McIVER (Avon)** [5.29 p.m.]: The Budget presented by the Treasurer can only be described as pitiful. As is usual, because it has happened in the past under this Government, the Budget sets out to do two things: to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The Budget has given no consideration whatever to the working people of Western Australia and their families, the pensioners, and others; all these people will be ignored by the Budget.

In fact, it was not a Budget at all, because in the past three years since this Government came to power we have seen numerous increases imposed on the people of Western Australia at various times so that they would not have to come in one bite. I refer of course to the increase in SEC charges, water rates, and motor vehicle registration fees; in addition to the increase in the last item, a recording fee was imposed on licence renewals, and no concessions have been allowed for pensioners, despite the appeals which have been made by members on this side of the House.

In addition, we have seen increases imposed by the State Housing Commission, with its levy of \$60 on those people purchasing SHC homes. I believe such an impost most certainly could be challenged successfully in the High Court. In fact, many people in Western Australia have refused to pay the \$60, and do not intend to pay it in the future, yet no action has been taken by this Government to make them pay. In other words, those who are paying the \$60 are doing so of their own volition. Why should a charge be imposed on some people, and not on others? If the Government is to impose these increased charges, let them be collected from everybody, not just a few; if it condones the present situation where some people have refused to pay the \$60 while others are paying it, the Government should withdraw the charge.

Of course, with the change of Government next year, as was made quite clear some time ago by the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr J. T. Tonkin) the amounts already paid would be credited against the capital cost of the homes being purchased. Therefore, all this hogwash we have heard from Government spokesman this afternoon about this "wonderful" Budget does not even hold water. Once again, we see the Liberal Government coming out in its true colours, and adopting its main theme, which is one of hypocrisy.

In discussing the next subject, I speak in my capacity as shadow Minister for Transport; I refer, of course, to the non-allocation of finance to the very important transport industry. In fact, transport is the most important industry in Australia today. It employs directly and indirectly more people than any other industry. Altogether, transport has a greater capital investment—Government and private—than any other industry. It is the most important part of the plan of any town.

The transport industry costs the people and local, State, and Federal Governments approximately 30 per cent of our total domestic expenditure. In addition, no other industry costs the people more in terms of loss of life, limb and property. At present, the cost of road accidents exceeds \$1.5 million a week. No other industry serves the people so badly and at the same time disturbs, distresses and pollutes so much of the environment and invokes so much hostile reaction from the public as the transport industry.

We always hear from Government members about how important is private enterprise, how it should be promoted, and how this Government is the saviour of private enterprise. However, private enterprise has failed completely—more so than in any other industry—to give the people a good transport service at a reasonable cost. What is the policy of the present Government in relation to transport? It has no policy; the Budget provides for no allocation of funds to this area. We find only proposals which we know from past experience will never eventuate. With the present rate of growth of Western Australia, the present chaos will continue to grow.

Mr Coyne: As long as Cowles is there it will.

Mr McIVER: The honourable member's Premier not so long ago said Cowles was the finest man in the trade union movement in this State.

Mr O'Connor: That is a laugh!

Mr McIVER: Does the Minister deny that?

Mr O'Connor: I would be astounded if the Premier said that.

Mr McIVER: The Premier is recorded in the Press as saying that. The member for Murchison-Eyre should be the last person



to make such an interjection, with the deterioration of the transport system in his electorate, where trains are running at approximately 15 kilometres per hour due to the deterioration of the track because insufficient funds have been allocated to maintain the track in suitable condition. The member should do his homework.

I repeat: Because it suited him, the Premier made that statement. Although I am open to correction, I believe it was in relation to the Medibank strike. The Premier said that because the Transport Workers' Union did not support the other unions, Cowles was a wonderful man.

Mr Nanovich: Did you know that the Labor Party's policy on transport is, "I'll walk beside you"?

Mr McIVER: Nobody will be walking beside the Labor Party's policy because the transport system will be streamlined and upgraded. However, I do not think the honourable member will be here to comment on the improvements.

Mr Nanovich: I will be here a lot longer than you.

Mr McIVER: I doubt that: It is very different from what I hear in his electorate. As a matter of fact, people said to me the other day, "Is the member for Toodyay still alive? We have not seen him for months."

Let me return to the essence of this debate: Transport has been sadly neglected by this Government. Surely with the present rate of growth in Western Australia, transport should receive the prime allocation in any Budget. Prior to the Royal Show this year I asked questions in this House seeking information as to whether Westrail could carry the number of patrons expected to attend the show, and I was given an undertaking by the Minister that this year, patrons would not be carted in guards' vans but would travel in comfort on our suburban rail services. But what did we see happening? The people could not even get on the trains, and when they asked for a refund for the tickets they had purchased for a service they never received, they were refused. What a shocking situation for the transport system of Western Australia to be in!

Mr O'Connor: You are beating it around the corner a little, but I will tell you about that later.

Mr McIVER: I do not know about beating it around the corner; I would like to see something going straight forward for a change. At present the Government is in reverse gear.

Mr O'Connor: We still could not catch up with you, going backwards.

Mr McIVER: I do not know about that; I have never been one who has gone backwards; I have always endeavoured to progress forwards.

Mr O'Connor: I now know what they mean when they refer to the "Northam crab".

Mr McIVER: I can assure the Minister there are not too many crabs left in the Avon River. Once again, the fault for this can be laid at the feet of this Government which, because of its lack of environment policy has permitted the Avon River to become so badly silted that one of Western Australia's greatest assets has been almost destroyed.

The Minister can be facetious if he wishes, but I do not consider transport to be a facetious subject. I thought the Minister would pay a little attention and not belittle the situation.

If we were to order new rolling stock now it would be 12 to 15 months before it could be delivered.

Mr O'Connor: What sort of rolling stock would you order?

Mr Davies: We need some carriages.

Mr McIVER: As I was referring specifically to suburban rail services, I will answer the Minister in this way: I would order at present diesel electric locomotives and I would have them constructed at the Midland workshops in such a way that they could be converted for use with direct electricity. Of course, this Government would never utilise the Midland workshops. It would give the work to Tomlinsons or some other private enterprise and increase the expenditure by thousands of dollars, rather than allow the people of the Midland workshops to handle the situation, which they are quite capable of doing. In fact, if it were not for the brilliance and ingenuity of those people the railcars would grind themselves into the ground.

We must expand our transport system and induce the public to utilise it to the fullest extent. This has been done in New South Wales under a Labor Government. That Government is not only inducing the further use of all modes of public transport but also has reduced fares by 30 per cent—not increased fares as has happened in this State.

Mr O'Connor: By how much did that upgrade their deficit?

Mr McIVER: I do not have those figures before me, but I shall be going to New South Wales in November and when I return I will be very pleased to inform the Minister.

Let us consider the situation of the Metropolitan Transport Trust. Every week we hear of proposed curtailments to regular services for the public of Western Australia. Where are we heading? Where is the policy? When questions are asked in this House we usually hear that the situation is under review, that the Government will have a look at it, or that we are going to have a committee.

The Director-General of Transport has just returned from the United Kingdom. All I have seen in the Press—no doubt the Minister has received a confidential report and knows more—is that it is proposed to purchase a helicopter for an ambulance service. I can remember making a speech in this place in 1970 when I said that helicopter pads should be provided in the Avon Valley. I am sure the Minister must have taken some notice of what I said because that very weekend he went to the Avon Valley and on his return said that he fully agreed with my statement. He said that parts of the valley were inaccessible and that if there was a train derailment or a serious accident in any of those parts of the valley, only helicopters would be able to serve the situation. I gave that advice free of charge and yet the Director-General went to the United Kingdom at the cost of thousands of dollars to the Government. I shall be very disappointed if something more constructive does not result from his report.

Mr O'Connor: I think you are very unfair to him—

Mr McIVER, I am not being unfair.

Mr O'Connor: —without having seen the report he has prepared.

Mr McIVER: He has been back for weeks. Why has he not tabled a report?

Mr O'Connor: He has been back for a couple of days, not weeks.

Mr McIVER: That is enough.

Mr O'Connor: Fair go!

Mr McIVER: I am not being unfair because this is not the only report the Government has had. Why not send the Commissioner for Railways or Mr Shea of the MTT to have a look at the situation, because they are the men who must administer the various facets of transport?

Mr O'Connor: If you had only understood, you would know that they have been.

Mr McIVER: Have any of their policies or recommendations been implemented by this Government?

Mr O'Connor: First of all you ask for them to go and when you find out they have been, you complain.

Mr McIVER: However the Minister tries to giggle out of this, we revert to the situation that nothing has been done.

Mr Jamieson: Isn't it called a crawfish in other States?

Mr McIVER: The Minister raised the matter, I did not.

Mr Laurance: I get the feeling nothing can please you.

Mr McIVER: You would be surprised!

Mr Clarke: Something would!

Mr McIVER: Let us consider the situation in regard to the pensioners of Western Australia. What a miserable and mean Government we have. It took away the concessions from pensioners. Even Government members have supported the contention that the concessions be reinstated.

Mr Jamieson: Not the member for Bunbury. He does not believe in them.

Mr McIVER: I think the least we say about that the better. We are not going to be unkind to the member for Bunbury. What a miserable decision it was to take away from the pensioners of this State a concession that was given to them by the Labor Government—something they deserved. What has been put in its place? If they go from point A to point B within two hours they pay a fare of only 20c. Where can one go in two hours? Let us take the example of a pensioner who has to visit a specialist. One can sit in the waiting room for that time. Irrespective of the excuses it puts up, the Government has failed dismally. Transport is one facet in which the Government has failed particularly dismally.

I turn now to consider the railways. For 10 or 15 years the administrative staff has consisted of leading figures including the Commissioner of Railways, the Chief Traffic Manager, the Chief Controller of Audits and the Chief Mechanical Engineer. At that time there were three times as many services as there are now. In the old steam days one had to shift a load with three trains but now with dieselisation one train does the job.

Let us look at the salaries of this hierarchy of the transport system, with particular reference to the railways. I feel this matter is one of the main reasons there is no money for transport.

Mr Laurance: I thought you were talking about pensioners?

Mr McIVER: I made a reference to pensioners.

Mr Jamieson: You can't keep up, but that's nothing unusual.

Mr McIVER: I have here a list supplied by the Australian Transport Officers' Federation, Western Australian Division. I should like members to take particular note of the salaries these men receive, keeping in mind that I have already said the system is presently run with a handful of administrative officers. I have full regard for the expansion and the magnitude of our railway system and I also keep in mind that many lines have been closed and that where there were once train services there are now buses.

I shall not touch on the top bracket because they are important people, they have important jobs and they deserve every cent they receive.

Mr Coyne: They will feel they have been discriminated against if you do not mention them.

Mr McIVER: Let us start with the Director of Management of Services Pool. I do not even know what that means. If one were to ask 100 railway personnel they would not know either.

That officer receives a salary of \$23 928 per annum. The next is the manager of the planning division who receives \$20 784 per annum. The manager of the services division also receives \$20 784, as does the manager of the systems division.

There we have the planning services and the systems division. If we ask the majority of the railway personnel who these officers are and what they do, I am sure they will not be able to tell us. I certainly do not know, but as shadow Minister for Transport I will find out.

Mr Laurance: What are you paid?

Mr McIVER: One would think that was the finish of the planning group, but there is a little way to go yet. Next we come to the leader of the planning group; he is a little unfortunate and receives only \$17 933 per annum. Then follows the leader of the systems section who also receives \$17 933 per annum, as does the planning officer in that area. What a top-heavy situation that is!

Mr O'Connor: Will you sack these officers if you are returned as the Government?

Mr McIVER: We will have a close look at the situation and integrate those positions in some way, so as to get the best out of them for the money they receive.

Mr Laurance: That is railway bashing!

Mr McIVER: Meekatharra might benefit from some of the money that could be diverted, so as to help the people in that area. Next we come to the administrative officer who receives \$17 076 per annum; followed by the chief statistical officer who receives \$15 940. The next is the EDP systems co-ordinator; with a title like that one would expect him to receive \$2 million, but he receives only \$15 940 per annum! Then follows the leader of the electronic data processing section who also receives \$15 940 per annum. There is the special officer over them all, and he also receives \$15 940 per annum.

That is a ridiculous situation. It is time the Government looked at those sections in the Railways Department. No wonder there is no money left for the purchase of rolling stock for the suburban services, or for the painting of railway stations, when salaries of that order are paid to those high-ranking officers.

As against that, so far as the interests of the public are concerned, Saturday work at local goods sheds is not permitted. The porter who receives a small margin

above the basic wage is affected, and he cannot work on Saturdays to provide a service for the delivery of parcels.

This special group of high-ranking officers I have mentioned make sure they retain their positions. They say to their juniors, "You can put him on for a couple of hours' overtime, and you can cut that person out for overtime. It does not matter whether the people in the metropolitan area want parcels urgently. We have fobbed those people off." This is the system of the Liberal Party.

Mr O'Connor: Were those persons holding office when you were in Government?

Mr McIVER: No.

Mr O'Connor: Are you sure?

Mr McIVER: When we were in Government various sections of the department, such as the Northam parcels office, were open to the public from 8.00 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturdays.

Mr O'Connor: I am talking about the officers you claimed were receiving high salaries.

Mr McIVER: I must be honest: I do not think it has anything to do with what I am saying. I am talking about the present, because as the Minister knows when we were in Government we were taking positive steps to upgrade the railways. Had we been returned there would be electrification of the suburban railway system. The Treasurer might scoff at my remark.

Sir Charles Court: What would you do for money?

Mr McIVER: In some way electrification of the suburban railway system would be introduced by the Labor Government; possibly the Perth-Midland section or the Perth-Armadale section. At this stage I cannot say what would be the priority. However, we would make every effort to introduce electrification and upgrade the transport system; we would not allow it to deteriorate.

The Minister knows he cannot carry on the present system; and he finds himself in the situation that our Government was in—without finance forthcoming from the Commonwealth. It is impossible to operate a transport system efficiently and effectively without funds coming continually from the Commonwealth Government. We can debate this question all night, but that is the position.

Mr Jamieson: The Government has no policy on metropolitan transport.

Mr McIVER: It has not. In the time that is left to me I would be remiss if I, as a trade unionist for some 20 years, did not answer some of the unjust and stupid statements that have been made by members opposite. Members of Parliament who make unjust and damaging statements about trade unions have no idea of the

predicament the State is facing. In Western Australia we are confronted with industrial unrest.

Mr Laurance: What is the answer?

Mr McIVER: If the honourable member will be patient I will unfold the picture to him. He should not walk in where angels fear to tread.

Mr Sibson: Who will unfold the picture?

Mr McIVER: I am sure the member for Bunbury was sincere in his contribution to the debate, and felt he was bringing forward something constructive. Unfortunately he has not been able to comprehend the present situation. Almost every day we see in the opinions column of the newspapers letters saying how terrible the trade unionists are. The Treasurer has added fuel to the fire by writing to the Press himself and by making statements about Russian control of trade unions, infiltration by communists, and fifth columnists.

Mr O'Connor: That has been so in some cases.

Mr Jamieson: The Minister should name one.

Mr McIVER: In the last State election so-called trade unionists in the Pilbara electorate were working actively for the Liberal Party. I felt disgusted that I was associated with them. They handed out cards for the Liberal Party, and these were so-called trade unionists.

Mr O'Connor: Are they not permitted to exercise their proper rights?

Mr McIVER: Of course they are. When the Minister uses the word "unionists" he should realise that they are among the people who support his party. They must help to make up the majority, because there is only one section of the people of this State and Australia as a whole who in effect elect Governments; they are the working people. I say the unionists elect Governments, whether they be employed as airline pilots, nurses, etc.

Unfortunately many members of the trade unions do not realise the importance of the trade union movement and the benefits which the unions have obtained for them over the years to keep them in employment.

The member for Bunbury mentioned a young lad of 18 years. Instead of squealing to the member for Bunbury, he would have been better off taking an active part in his union. Perhaps he could have got on the executive or become an officer and expressed his views to the executive rather than to the member for Bunbury. In that way he would have been serving the organisation far better. The member for Bunbury is merely submitting political rubbish as a gimmick for the coming election because he has run out of excuses. Members opposite cannot now use the

Whitlam Government as an excuse. The present Federal Government will be turfed out as quickly as it was elected.

Mr Clarke: No fear of that!

Mr McIVER: That is the opinion of the honourable member. I am expressing mine, and I believe the New South Wales election results prove I am right. There was a 17 per cent swing in New South Wales within a matter of a couple of weeks. What would it be now? It would probably be 67 per cent.

Several members interjected.

Mr McIVER: I am trying to be serious, despite the snide remarks of members opposite who know no better. They do not consider the matter seriously. Let us consider the present position with regard to our beef. America has once again placed stringent conditions on the import of our beef yet here we have the Treasurer and his cobbler, the Queensland Premier, as well as the Prime Minister, talking about the USSR build-up in the Indian Ocean. They keep saying we will be attacked by Russia. Must we not rely on that country to buy our products, particularly if America closes its doors to us? Can we say what we like about the USSR and then expect it to buy our produce? Let us be dinkum. We are closing the door on our markets, and this is the reason for the deterioration in many sections of our rural industries—wool, beef, apples, and so on.

In the 1800s forts were built in Sydney and even then the capitalists of this country were referring to the communist threat. Now we have many migrants from areas under communist rule. I suppose it is all right as a political gimmick to say that if a person votes for the ALP that person is a communist and loves Russia. All the time some people are trying to say that we will have no defence against these people and in the meantime such talk is affecting our beef, wool, and wheat markets. It is not good enough. We must work with these people instead of shutting our doors to them. We must extend the hand of friendship to them and open our doors to trade with them. It is only as a result of overseas trade that a country can become economically stable.

America, Britain, and other large countries of the world do not talk about being invaded by the countries with which they wish to trade. We hear all this hog-wash about fear and the Press loves it and highlights it by referring to the great build-up in the Indian Ocean. Since the present marvellous Government has been in office in Canberra we are told we are safe because of its policies and the Orion aircraft which were ordered by the Whitlam Administration. However, when that aircraft is fully loaded it cannot take off from Pearce because the runway is not long enough for it to do so with safety. Learmonth, the only other possible site for the aircraft, does not have the fuelling

facilities. However, such information is never revealed in the Press. All that we read in the Press is that we must spend millions of dollars on defence. In my opinion all the publicity is an exaggeration of the true situation. There is no fear of an invasion from the USSR. Admittedly we must have our armed services the same as any other country has them but, for heavens sake, do not let us make people afraid that they will be invaded by the Russians. I know that many people in Western Australia are gullible, but I do hope they will not fall for such propaganda.

Having regard for the hour, I now wish to say just a few words about the housing situation. Despite the denials by the Minister for Housing who states that people will still be able to purchase their own homes, we have got right away from the original concept of State housing. When the SHC was first established the idea was the low income families would be able to obtain a home in a wonderful environment, and thus be in a position to bring up their children in a happy atmosphere.

Mr O'Neil: Who signed the agreement which limited the sale of SHC homes to 30 per cent of those constructed?

Mr McIVER: I am talking about the present concept with finance from building societies. Members opposite were responsible for sending back millions of dollars which were allocated to help in the Aboriginal situation.

Mr O'Neil: It was the Whitlam Government which insisted that people earning in excess of 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings could not get a State house, and your Minister signed that agreement.

Mr McIVER: I have no quarrel about that. I am not against it because the whole concept of the SHC is to provide homes for low income families.

Mr O'Neil: Where is the change there? Half of the work force are not eligible for State Housing Commission housing.

Mr McIVER: In order to be able to purchase a home, finance has to be obtained from the permanent building societies, and if one earns over 95 per cent of the average wage, one is ineligible.

Mr O'Neil: Your Government signed that agreement with the Whitlam Government.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is exactly what happened.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: Cannot the Government change the agreement?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Avon has five minutes.

Mr McIVER: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr O'Neil: Perhaps he will talk about something other than the housing agreement.

Mr McIVER: Members of the Government cannot comprehend what I am saying. I can recall that between 1968 and 1971 the then Government carried on in the same manner, but after the poll in 1971 the present Government members found themselves sitting on this side of the Chamber and the same thing will happen in 1977.

Mr Grayden: You will be badly mistaken.

Mr O'Neil: We have to wait until then to get rid of the agreement which the previous Government signed.

Mr McIVER: A smokescreen has been placed over the education system in Western Australia, but I feel I must highlight the plight of country schools with regard to maintenance and the reduction in the expenditure on those schools. The school at Northam and the school at York have not been painted for many years, and despite the many promises and personal visits by the present Minister for Education, nothing has been done.

Mr Davies: And despite the Minister's "Tut-tutting".

Mr McIVER: I am sure that many members opposite would like to see a few dollars spent on the schools in their electorates. I do not believe that my area is the only one which is suffering. It seems the Liberal Government is neglecting entirely country schools. I know that gymnasium-halls have been constructed in areas which comprise safe liberal-seats. Surely we who live in the country should also have a bite of the cherry.

I trust that when the Treasurer goes to the hustings, and makes his election promises, there will be a promise of the allocation of funds for maintenance on schools in country areas.

In conclusion, I would say that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was speaking today, certainly highlighted the faults of the present Government, despite the endeavours of members opposite to belittle him. When a copy of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are distributed to the people of Western Australia they will have no hesitation in electing him as Premier in 1977.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Dr Dadour.

## BILLS (3): MESSAGES

### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Fish Farming (Lake Argyle) Development Agreement Bill.
2. Waterways Conservation Bill.
3. Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill.

*House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.*

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 19th October, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## BILLS (8): ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill.
2. Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
3. Western Australian Meat Industry Authority Bill.
4. Criminal Injuries (Compensation) Act Amendment Bill.
5. Betting Control Act Amendment Bill.
6. Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill.
7. Transport Commission Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
8. Irrigation (Dunham River) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.

## QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE.

### 1. PORT OF ESPERANCE

#### *Water Depth*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice, representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it a fact that a ship loading grain at Esperance grounded at the berth and loading operations were suspended?
- (2) If so, will the Minister advise why the vessel was permitted to take on cargo when there is an insufficient depth of water to accommodate it?
- (3) Has the water depth at the berth been reduced by silting?
- (4) If so—
  - (a) for how long has this been occurring; and
  - (b) what action has been taken to overcome the problem?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) A ship did touch bottom during loading operations.
- (2) The depth of water normally available at the berth was sufficient for the vessel. In this case the vessel was flat-bottomed and the stevedores loaded 500 tonnes of grain into one side of the ship, causing it to list.

(3) No. However, an inspection by a diver after the incident had occurred revealed that recent spillages of bulk cargoes have caused a shoal area to develop adjacent to the berth.

(4) (a) Answered by (3) above.

(b) The area has been sounded with a view to restoring the original depth of the affected area by grab dredging.

2.

## WASTE DISPOSAL

### *Statutory Authority*

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Minister advise if any further consideration has been given to the establishment of a Statutory Refuse Disposal Authority?
- (2) If so, will he give an assurance to keep fully advised the Shires of Wanneroo, Kalamunda and Mundaring, bearing in mind their strong opposition to the draft legislation in April, 1976, and my representation on their behalf?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Further negotiations have taken place and it is proposed to set up a Committee with an advisory body.
- (2) Yes, they have been party to negotiations although they opposed draft proposals previously.

### 3. SCARBOROUGH BEACH ROAD

#### *Overway*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Transport.

- (1) Has a request been made for a pedestrian overpass across Scarborough Beach Road in the vicinity of Westview Street or Gildercliffe Street?
- (2) Would the Government give urgent consideration to such a proposal?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The provision of pedestrian overpasses on this road is the responsibility of the City of Stirling. However, where significant numbers of school age children are required to cross busy arterial roads, the Main Roads Department does provide some financial assistance to the local authority towards provision of grade separated structures.