

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 1 July 1986

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

THE LATE HON. F. J. S. WISE

Condolence Motion

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.32 p.m.]: I move—

That this House expresses its deep regret at the death of Hon. Frank Joseph Scott Wise, AO, a former Minister of the Crown, Premier and Member of the Legislative Assembly from 1933 to 1951 and Member of the Legislative Council from 1956 to 1971, places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious public service, and tenders its profound sympathy to his widow and the members of his family in their bereavement.

It is both with sadness and a great deal of honour that I speak to the condolence motion for Hon. Frank Joseph Scott Wise, who died on Sunday, 29 June.

Born in Queensland in 1897, Frank Wise studied at the Gatton Agricultural College, and it was his expertise in agriculture that saw him move to Western Australia in 1923. It is ironic that the appointment that originally brought Frank Wise to Western Australia was as an "adviser" on tropical agriculture to the then Liberal-National Party Government. However, some 12 months later Mr Wise returned to private farming in Queensland.

In 1929, at the request of Sir Hal Colebatch in his capacity as the then Premier of Western Australia, Frank Wise was requested to investigate the establishment of a banana and pineapple industry on the Gascoyne River. With the importation of 500 banana plants from Queensland, the first commercial crop of bananas was produced just 18 months later; and this industry has continued to play a very significant part in the success of primary production in the Gascoyne.

The year 1930 saw Frank Wise unsuccessful in his attempt to win the Legislative Council seat of North Province as the endorsed Labor Party candidate. However, Frank Wise did move into Parliament in 1933 when he won the Legislative Assembly seat of Gascoyne and did so with some very distinguished colleagues, for it was the Labor victory of 1933 that saw two

other subsequent Premiers of our Great State enter Parliament; namely, the late Bert Hawke and John Tonkin.

Within two years of entering Parliament, Frank Wise was appointed Minister for Agriculture and the North-West in the Collier Government. Frank Wise continued in the Ministry for the next 10 years in various portfolios.

As Minister for Lands and Agriculture, Frank Wise undertook what was to be later recognised as possibly his most significant contribution to Western Australia when he engineered the creation of the Rural and Industries Bank. This financial institution replaced the ailing Agricultural Bank, and it took Frank Wise almost two years to successfully achieve such a takeover. After opening on 1 October 1945, the Rural and Industries Bank accrued assets of approximately \$11 million in its first year of operation; and there is no need for me to elaborate to members the very successful role the Rural and Industries Bank has since played in the State's development.

Frank Wise became the sixteenth Premier of Western Australia on 31 July 1945 and as such was concerned with returning the State to a peacetime existence following World War II. As Frank Wise said, "almost everybody wanted to have business as usual overnight when the treaty was signed in Japan, but great problems were posed in restoring normal life."

Regrettably Frank Wise was only Premier for 20 months, for the Government was not returned in the State election of 1947.

Following a period as Leader of the Opposition, he was appointed as Administrator of the Northern Territory in 1951. He served in that position, and was also President of the Northern Territory Legislative Council, until ill health forced his resignation in June 1956. In the same year, Frank Wise won the Legislative Council seat of North Province which he successfully held until his retirement in 1971. During this period, he was again appointed to the Ministry, this time within the Hawke Government.

The Hawke Government's defeat in the 1959 election was Frank Wise's greatest disappointment; as he said on his retirement, he "had only been in Government when things were difficult—during the Depression, the war, and the postwar period."

Such periods were certainly in vast contrast to those which followed in the 1960s and 1970s.

Frank Wise did have a remarkable and distinguished career, and the State surely gained from his insight, diligence, and commitment during adverse times when the Government had to lead by example.

I join with all members in issuing our sincere sympathy to the Wise family on their very sad loss. The contribution and influence Frank Wise had on this State's development will always be acknowledged.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [3.38 p.m.]: I second the motion and in doing so of course support the condolence motion moved by Hon. Des Dans. Like most members of the Legislative Council and this Parliament, I certainly did not have the opportunity of knowing Hon. Frank Wise or being in Parliament with him. Therefore it is a loss to people such as myself in that we did not have that personal knowledge and the opportunity to have met him and seen him in action.

He held the parliamentary system of Western Australia in very high esteem and, from what I have heard, he was totally dedicated to the development and promotion of Western Australia. Many people who knew him said that his commitment to the development of the north was well ahead of time, and I take it that certainly was the case.

As far as my party is concerned, and those members who knew him and those who simply have read about or have heard about him, he was held in the very deepest respect and his integrity and his dedication were unsurpassed. His record is without parallel. Hon. Des Dans has already mentioned his record in Parliament. I suggest his record is not likely to be surpassed for a long time in the future, if ever. It is not likely, for example, that any other man could have the capacity to serve as the Premier of Western Australia, to then become Leader of the Opposition in Western Australia, to serve as Administrator of the Northern Territory, and then to return to the Western Australian Parliament and serve as a member of the Government and later as Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council. That was a tremendous effort and is a record that is not likely to be repeated for a long time.

It is also interesting, in reading about his background, to learn that he left school at the age of 12 years and four years later attended an agricultural college, so his achievements have been very great indeed.

All I can do on behalf of Opposition members of this House is to express our very sincere condolences to Frank Wise's family; that is, his wife, his two sons, his five daughters, and his 14 grandchildren. They have every right to be proud of a truly great man.

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [3.40 p.m.]: I was a member of this House during the last few years of the membership of Hon. Frank Wise and therefore would like to be associated with this motion. Hon. Frank Wise was an able and dedicated member of this House, and he was a vigorous and knowledgeable debater. He had no hesitation in drawing upon his long experience in the many responsible positions he held during his life and that responsibility showed through in his approach to everything he did, not only in this House, but I am sure in the other place as well and throughout his life in other positions.

Frank Wise was an ardent supporter of parliamentary practices as we know them and a strong practitioner of actively pursuing the traditional ways of the Westminster system. He was always ready to offer friendly advice to any member, whether old or new, or to any member of the public.

I wish to pass on my condolences to his second wife, Patricia. It is my privilege to know Patricia and her family. They resided in Narrogin many years ago. I had some pleasant associations with that family in my much younger days. I have had the pleasure of meeting Mrs Wise on a number of occasions since then. She is a very fine woman.

To Mrs Wise and her family and to others, I offer my condolences and publicly thank Frank Wise for his contribution to Western Australia.

HON. TOM STEPHENS (North) [3.44 p.m.]: I also want to be associated with this condolence motion. When Frank Wise retired in 1971, great changes were made to the seat that I now hold, North Province. An unusual phenomenon occurred at that time. It probably stood as testimony to Frank Wise that when he retired in 1971, the Labor vote was cut quite dramatically. Bill Withers, a Liberal, was elected at that time, and a member of the Labor Party was also elected. That was quite a kick in the pants for our party. Rather than that being seen as a tremendous loss for the Labor Party, it should also be seen as testimony to the high regard in which Frank Wise was held in the electorate of North Province. That high regard will be recorded for all time by this Government on 21 July. The old Kimberley research

station will be named after Frank Wise when the Cabinet meets in Kununurra on 21 July. That will ensure that my predecessor, the former member for North Province, will be remembered for all time for his contribution to the agricultural and horticultural industries of the north-west.

This State benefited from Frank Wise's long years of service. As his successor I have considerable regard for those long years of service to his electorate and for the very high offices he held.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [3.46 p.m.]: I also wish to be associated with this condolence motion. I arrived in this Chamber late this afternoon because I have been on the phone talking to someone who could point out some very interesting facts about the late Hon. Frank Wise. I spent Monday in Carnarvon where I also talked to many older people who knew him well.

He lived in Carnarvon for many years. As well as being regarded as the father of the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia, he was also regarded as the person who began the banana industry in Carnarvon. As well as growing the first bananas, he also packed them and was extremely proud of the day they were marketed in the city.

He is regarded in the Gascoyne region by people of all persuasions as a person who represented the area politically without fear or favour. He is spoken of very highly by all sides of the political spectrum. His name is synonymous with someone who is an absolute gentleman and who did not have any fear of admitting he was wrong or of taking advice from time to time.

In my early career as a member of Parliament, I had the privilege of meeting with him in this place. I sat down and discussed with him for an hour some of his memories and some of his old friends in Carnarvon. I know that the town of Carnarvon will also remember him as this Government will remember him in the Kimberley on 21 July.

On behalf of my constituents and with all members I convey to his loved ones our deepest sympathy. I am proud too that I follow a person of such high distinction in this place. He is held in as high esteem in this place as any member I have known since I was elected to this Parliament.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [3.48 p.m.]: I wish also to add my remarks to this motion. I was in the un-

usual position for a Liberal, I suppose, although I was not a member of the Liberal Party at the time, of knowing Hon. Frank Wise quite intimately as a journalist. I almost wrote his biography at the time he retired as a member of this House.

In 1971, the newspaper for which I worked and for which I reported politics accorded what I suppose for a daily newspaper was a signal honour to a practising politician. Not only did he have his story written upon his retirement but he had a three-part serialisation of his life and times as a public figure recorded. That was no accident because the newspaper recognised that the unique contribution he made should be so serialised.

It is perhaps not realised by some people that he effectively led Governments in two parts of Australia because he was the Premier of Western Australia and he was the President of the Legislative Council of the Northern Territory in the postwar years. He was the only person in Australia who led his party in both Houses. He led the Labor Party in the lower House here and then transferred to this House after his return home from the Northern Territory and became leader. Hon. Des Dans mentioned the fact that he entered Parliament at the same time as Messrs Hawke and Tonkin. It is another peculiarity—in fact it is unique—that the three who entered Parliament in 1933 not only each became Premier, but they also actually served under each of the other two while the others were Premiers and Leaders of the Labor Party. I understand that nowhere else in any Australian Parliament has that rather odd position been the case.

Some mention has been made of Mr Wise's knowledge of the State. I recall that he was described as being literally a walking encyclopaedia of the north-west of Western Australia. Press reports and Hon. Des Dans, in his speech today, made mention of something that I think bears correction. I hope it will be taken in the best spirit that is intended. On a number of occasions it has been said that in 1929, at the request of Sir Hal Colebatch, as the then Premier, Mr Wise was requested to investigate the banana and pineapple industry. In fact, I think the Labor Party is perhaps doing itself a disservice. I think people would find that it was another great Labor Premier of Western Australia, Hon. Phil Collier, who enticed Mr Wise into doing that pioneering work about 10 years after Sir Hal Colebatch was Premier. Since he was a conservative

Premier, the family might prefer to correct that point.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think we should correct it.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am glad that Mr Dans accepts that point in the spirit in which it was intended.

There can be no better example of a talented individual being frustrated by having to spend too many years on the Opposition benches than that of Hon. Frank Wise. I suppose that could be said about many Australian political figures, particularly in the States where politics tends to be stable. That means that anyone who is on one side of the House tends to stay there for many years. I hope that that will not be the case here.

Mr Wise was a classic example of a very talented, resourceful, creative individual who just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. Such was his sense of frustration that after the war he lost the 1947 election; that was really lost for the Labor Government by the Trades and Labor Council, and in 1950 when the Labor Party failed to win the election Mr Wise, a man only in his late forties, who had already had a term as Premier and looked like going into a third term in Opposition was enticed away to the Northern Territory in the belief that his knowledge of northern Australia would be an important factor in Australia's postwar recovery.

Quick mention needs to be made of the fact that he was one of the last direct links with people of the calibre of John Curtin. He was certainly a close and intimate friend of John Curtin and also experienced the sadness of becoming the Premier of Western Australia only two or three weeks after John Curtin died and was replaced by Chifley.

Finally, Mr President, you would be aware, as would older members, and as I am only aware because of that contact I had as a newspaperman, that apart from anything else Mr Wise was a great raconteur. He once told with great gusto a story of a place in his province that some of the northern members here may recognise. He claimed that it was a true story of a little town that had a local doctor and a local roads board president who bristled at the sight of each other. That was unfortunate in a small town because people had to learn to get on with one another. It turned out also that these two were the only justices of the peace in the town. Therefore, by law, they sat on the bench whenever minor cases came before the Police Court.

On one occasion on a Saturday night these two men got into an altercation in the local hotel. It was quite an unseemly brawl and the police were called. The doctor and the president, both JPs, were escorted to the town gaol and had to wait there until Monday morning when the policeman convened the court. However, the policeman had the difficulty of not being able to convene the court because the two JPs were on the inside. Thus the two JPs actually started out sitting on the bench together for this case while the policeman recited the facts of the case. Then one of them stepped down. The first to do so was the doctor. He stood down while the president of the roads board said that it was a disgusting bit of behaviour on the part of someone so well educated and so highly thought of in the town and that therefore there would be a five-pound fine. He then stood down and the doctor went up to the bench while the president came down to face the music. The doctor asked the police sergeant what were the facts in the case. The sergeant repeated the facts and was asked what the other fellow had been fined. The sergeant told him that the fine had been five pounds and the doctor said, "Well, there has been far too much of this kind of behaviour in this town in the past 24 hours. You are fined 20 pounds; stand down."

I told that story because I spent some time trying to convince people like Hon. Frank Wise that because they had been given much opportunity to serve the people of this State they had gained experiences commensurately, the like of which few people in Australian history were ever given the privilege to experience. Come what may, I could not convince him that these stories were worth writing down, in order perhaps to be published one day.

He was without question a great Australian and a great Western Australian. I join with my colleagues on both sides of the House in mourning his passing.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [3.58 p.m.]: I would like to be associated with this motion. My relationship with Hon. Frank Wise was through Esperance. Members might not realise—Hon. Des Dans did not raise it amongst the achievements of Mr Wise—that he was responsible for bringing the Americans to Esperance. At the time, they were opening up Humpty Doo in the Northern Territory. Obviously, the Western Australian Government had had much difficulty trying to get anyone interested in Esperance. The research station proved its abilities, but nobody in Western

Australia wanted to go as far away from the capital to invest money.

Mr Wise persuaded Art Linkletter and others to come to Esperance. They formed a company known as the "Hollywood Pioneers" which, regrettably, was rather a failure. Allan Chase was perhaps the person who put the group together. Later they sold out to the real Chase Bank and that became a great success. Esperance has never looked back since. It was probably those original people, the Hollywood Pioneers, who drew the attention of the rest of the world to Esperance. The people of that district are grateful to Mr Wise to that extent.

HON. T. G. BUTLER (North-East Metropolitan) [3.59 p.m.]: I, too, associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed and the condolences offered in respect of the late Frank Wise. I was only a very young member of the Australian Labor Party when Frank Wise returned to this Chamber. Nevertheless, in the various forums of the Australian Labor Party I came into contact with Frank Wise on numerous occasions. While I did not get to know him very intimately, I did get to know him well enough to respect him and hold him in high esteem.

As Hon. Phil Lockyer said, while he was a very loyal member of the Australian Labor Party—fiercely loyal—he served his constituents without fear or favour and was a man of very strong character. It is unfortunate that he did not enjoy the best of health, especially over the latter years of his life. I remember seeing him about five or six years ago and he looked then as if he did not have very long to live. Obviously, he was very resilient and was able to fight off the illnesses and live to a comparatively old age.

One of my fondest memories of Frank Wise was when I was first elected to the Western Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party. One of the first people to ring me and to congratulate me was Frank Wise. I felt very honoured that he had even remembered me, because I was only a young member of the party at the time.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made and with the condolences.

HON. E. J. CHARLTON (Central) [4.01 p.m.]: The members of the National Party in this place associate themselves with the remarks made and the thoughts expressed about the late Frank Wise. I join with all members present in the expressions of appreciation

for the achievements of such a great man. Anyone who reached the level that he did in representing not only his area of the State but also Western Australia as a whole, and possessed the qualities which he portrayed, will go down in history and be remembered long after these few days have passed.

On behalf of other members of the National Party, I join with other members of the House and with you, Mr President, in expressing our condolences.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): Before I put the question I would like to take the opportunity, as one of those members who had the privilege of serving for six years in this Parliament with the late Frank Wise, to say a few words. He had a great amount of ability, a great interest in maintaining all the traditional rules of the Parliament, and of this House in particular.

He was a true orator, a great debater, and he had a knowledge and understanding of the Standing Orders of this place equal to anyone in this Parliament, in my experience. He was never too busy to offer help or advice to any member, whether of his own party or not. He would always offer assistance and words of encouragement to members whenever they participated in the various activities of the House.

Those members fortunate enough to have served in the Parliament with him I am sure must, as I do, have considered it a great honour and privilege to have done so. He was a friend to everyone who knew him.

He had some skills which unfortunately do not seem to be prevalent in many members of the Parliament today. He was a leader when the numbers were 20 to 10 against him. But he had an incredible skill which he used to induce, entice, or cajole members. Somehow or other it allowed him sometimes to win the debates. This is a trend which unfortunately disappeared when he left this place in 1971.

His understanding of the Standing Orders was such that I was pleased I did not then hold the position I now hold, because I used to watch with terror the questioning that he raised with one of my predecessors on many occasions. If I have been able to display some small amount of ability in my position, I have no hesitation in saying that I owe that ability to a great extent to Hon. Frank Wise.

I therefore wish to be associated with all the other speakers in extending my condolences to Mrs Wise and to all the members of his family.

Honourable members, the way in which we honour this condolence motion is to rise in our places and stand in silence for one minute.

Question passed, members standing.

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members, for your information, I will on your behalf forward to Mrs Wise a copy of this motion, together with a copy of the sentiments expressed during the debate.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Afternoon Tea Suspension

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): As honourable members are aware, we normally adjourn the House at 3.45 p.m. for afternoon tea. I am not going to do that today, but I want to announce that while the arrangements were not spelt out in the amending sessional orders, the spirit of the arrangement was intended to mean that on Tuesdays when we sit at 3.30 p.m. I shall not leave the Chair for afternoon tea. However, the afternoon tea facilities will be available in the corridor as usual from 3.45 p.m. until about 4.15 p.m. Members will be at liberty to wander out, have a cup of tea, and come back again with a minimum of fuss.

BILLS (5): ASSENT

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

1. Mining (Validation and Amendment) Bill.
2. Transport Co-ordination Amendment Bill.
3. Financial Administration and Audit Amendment Bill.
4. Acts Amendment (Financial Administration and Audit) Bill.
5. Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill.

HEALTH: DRUGS

Schools: Urgency Motion

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): Honourable members, I have received the following letter—

Dear Mr President,

In accordance with Standing Order 63, I desire to move that the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11.00 a.m. on Friday, 26th December, 1986, for the purpose of:

1. Condemning the State Government, and particularly the Minister for Education, for consistently

refusing to acknowledge that a significant drug problem may exist within our schools, and for failing to take any meaningful action to ascertain the extent of the problem;

2. Calling on the Government to establish, as a matter of urgency, a top level enquiry into the incidence, extent and effect of drug use and abuse in Western Australian Schools.

Yours sincerely,

NORMAN MOORE, M.L.C.

To debate this matter it will be necessary in accordance with Standing Order 63 for it to be supported by at least four members rising in their places.

Four members having risen in their places.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [4.11 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11.00 a.m. on Friday, 26 December 1986.

The West Australian of 28 May 1986 had a headline which read, "Drugs are in every school". The first paragraph of that Press statement reads as follows—

Every WA high school has a drug problem and in most of them it has reached epidemic proportions, according to a policeman at a seminar on alcohol and drug abuse yesterday.

Const. Rick Veaney, of the Police Department's community education branch, said that drugs such as marihuana, lysergic acid (LSD), palfium and valium, as well as alcohol and tobacco, were in epidemic proportions and easy to obtain at high schools.

That to me was a statement of some significance and one indeed which caused me a great deal of concern. However, the response by the Minister for Education, Mr Pearce, caused me even more concern when he said in the same article that a drug epidemic in Western Australian schools was "bizarre". His statement ran as follows—

"I would discount it as a wild exaggeration," he said. "Drugs may be readily available in the community, but these vague allegations about drugs being grown around schools or about schools being used as a base for drug dealing almost always prove to be inaccurate."

In the same article there was a comment made by the Director of the Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority, Dr John Spencer, to the effect that—

... there was a degree of truth in Const. Veaney's statement, but as they were not based on legitimate research they held little credibility.

That Press article in which Constable Veaney made his allegations, which Mr Pearce discounted, and in which the WA Alcohol and Drug Authority suggested that there is a problem, indicates to me a degree of concern within the community generally. It was suggested by some people that Constable Veaney was not in fact presenting a legitimate argument and that he was only one person making comments from his own experience and that in fact he had it all wrong. I understand that Constable Veaney has been "requested" not to make any further statements about the matter.

However, I have looked back over the last year or so to see whether in fact there are other examples in the Press of people making similar allegations. I have done this in order to try to work out whether what Constable Veaney had said on that occasion was close to the truth, bearing in mind that he said there is an epidemic of drug use in Western Australian schools.

Looking back at some of the newspapers there is in *The Western Mail* of 2 March 1985 the headline, "Students risk death. Schools drug abuse shock". The article reads as follows—

The abuse of potentially-deadly analgesic drugs has reached alarming proportions in WA schools.

As a result, many students risk a slow, painful death.

In *The West Australian* of 1 July 1985, there is the headline, "Fuel-sniff rate up—Group". The article reads as follows—

Petrol-sniffing is a growing problem among Aboriginal children in the city, according to the Aboriginal-run Kulila anti-drug and alcohol-abuse association...

The article continues as follows—

Six Aboriginal children had been admitted to the PMH in the past two years suffering from the effects of petrol-sniffing.

I happen to know that within my own electorate there are many examples of young Aboriginal people—not necessarily all Aborigines in

this particular instance—who are petrol sniffing.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: What was the date of that article?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It was dated 1 July 1985.

That information fits in with information I have about the extent of petrol sniffing in the Eastern Goldfields. On 14 July 1985 the *Sunday Independent* ran a heading, "New programme for youth epidemic". I quote as follows—

Drinking and drug abuse among teenagers has reached "epidemic" proportions in WA, according to the director of the WA Institute of Alcohol and Addictions, Mr John Keating.

The word "epidemic" is used again on 10 August 1985 in *The Western Mail*. The heading of the article is "Kids of nine in Broome binge". The article reads as follows—

Children as young as nine are smoking marijuana and drinking in the streets of Broome.

The article continues as follows—

Broome's Father Michael McMahon said the main trouble was with kids between 12 and 17 but many younger children were also involved in the street scene.

The *Sunday Times* of 27 October 1985 ran the headline, "Drug expert sounds warning". The article reads as follows—

A drugs epidemic is set to sweep Perth's secondary schools, according to an American narcotics expert.

And Mr Bob Burklow, director of a drug crisis centre in the city run by the Jesus People, coupled his warning with an attack on doctors for over-prescribing drugs.

The article continues—

And police confirmed that high school students as young as 13 were among those using cannabis which sells for about \$35 for 10 grams.

Those comments from these newspapers contain the word "epidemic" three times and this indicates to me that we should be taking Constable Veaney's comments seriously.

At the time of Constable Veaney's allegations the Opposition called for a Royal Commission into the subject. I called for a Royal Commission because I believe that an inquiry of some significance is necessary in Western Australia to find out whether in fact Constable

Veaney's allegations are correct and, if so, what can be done about it.

It could be found that his allegations are exaggerated and bear no relationship to the truth. There are many people who, on reading Constable Veaney's comments in the newspaper, would be very alarmed at the prospects for their children when they attend schools in this State.

Hon. Tom Stephens: They would be further alarmed by your motion.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: What an incredible interjection! Hon. Tom Stephens is suggesting that if one has a problem, one should not talk about it but should keep one's mouth shut and do nothing in case someone overhears one and that exacerbates the problem. I suggest quite clearly that this Government, of which Hon. Tom Stephens is a member, ought to get off its tail and discover just what the problem is.

I did not raise the issue but I have mentioned four or five people, people who are involved in this matter, who have made those statements, three of which used the word "epidemic". They made the statements first of all so I now call for an inquiry to find out whether in fact they are correct or not.

I did not say there are drugs in schools. I said, "Let's find out if there are".

Hon. Tom Stephens: Why focus on schools?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Because that is what this matter is about and what Constable Veaney is about.

Hon. Tom Stephens: That's not the case. You have quoted cases which have nothing to do with schools. Don't misrepresent the stuff you are putting to the Parliament.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Constable Veaney has said there is an epidemic in schools.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You referred to something from Broome which has nothing whatever to do with schools.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is the member suggesting this does not happen in Broome?

Hon. Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will ignore the continuing interjections from the member because we might run out of time for this motion.

In response to my call for a Royal Commission, the Minister for Education was quoted in *The West Australian* of 29 May as follows—

The Minister for Education, Mr Pearce, said he would not support an inquiry unless he had hard evidence that a major problem existed.

How does one get hard evidence unless one has an inquiry? Mr Pearce then accused the Opposition of seeking to exploit grossly irresponsible comments by one police officer. I have endeavoured to point out they were not irresponsible comments by a police officer. Members should understand that considerable anecdotal evidence exists from people able to advise what is going on around the place. Mr Pearce rejected the first call from the Opposition for an inquiry into the subject.

The *Sunday Times* of 1 June, just a couple of days after Mr Pearce had rejected the call, decided to get involved in the argument and printed a story under the heading "Drugs in school: It's over to police". I quote as follows—

The police cannot walk away from this week's sensational allegations about drugs in our high schools.

And then—

The startling statements made by Constable Veaney, who has been shamefully muzzled in typical fashion, must be subjected to cross-examination before any parent can feel confident it's safe to allow children to go to a WA high school.

Further on—

It does no-one, especially parents and their children, any good to hear the State Police and Education Minister at loggerheads over what is potentially a destructive problem affecting our youth.

Nothing happened. A couple of weeks went by and then *The West Australian* of 18 June printed a report of a survey into the drug problem in Victoria, the survey having been commissioned by the Victorian Labor Government. I quote as follows—

More than one in four senior-school students has smoked marihuana, 92 per cent have drunk alcohol and 78 per cent have smoked tobacco, according to a Victorian Government survey.

On it went. This was a very detailed report done at the behest of the Victorian Labor Government.

As a result of that survey I once again suggested to the Minister for Education, via the media, that he ought to take the matter more seriously. So, instead of being negative as Hon. Tom Stephens would suggest, I made what I believe were positive suggestions. My comments were reported in the *Sunday Times* of 22 June. I quote as follows—

An Operation Noah-style phone-in should be conducted in a bid to combat the drug problem in WA schools, the Opposition Youth and Education spokesman, Mr Moore, said yesterday.

I suggested that a phone-in should be conducted by the Police Force—it has been suggested that we should have done it ourselves. I made the suggestion because the police had undertaken Operation Noah and they are the ones responsible for problems associated with drugs—or finding out who is involved in drug trafficking.

This is the problem we face, Mr President. When I said the police have a responsibility in respect of drugs, Hon. Kay Hallahan and Hon. Tom Stephens laughed.

Hon. Tom Stephens: We did because you said they were responsible for the problem.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: They are responsible for removing the problem. The member's mirth might indicate his attitude to this matter. He might suggest that, because it is a criminal offence, that exacerbates the problem and therefore we should make drugs more available.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We are going to have this debate without any interjections. You can have your say one after the other, but not altogether.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I suggested that the Police Department be requested to conduct a phone-in so that people could indicate to the police what they consider the problem to be.

I also asked that a factual study be undertaken in the same way as before. On the next day, 23 June, *The West Australian* ran an article under the heading "School drug probe out, says Pearce". I quote as follows—

The Minister for Education, Mr Pearce, is considering an anti-drug campaign levelled at schoolchildren along the lines of the "Only dags need fags" advertisements.

Mr Pearce said that the drug problem was not in WA schools, but those of school age were under peer pressure to try drugs.

He dismissed a call by the State Opposition for a study to identify the extent of the drug problem in schools.

Further on it reads—

Mr Pearce said that drug-taking or alcohol-taking in schools was easily identifiable, but rare.

Still further we find—

Mr Pearce said that the Education Department was aware of the drug problem and was trying to reverse the peer pressure for schoolchildren to take drugs.

What a most extraordinary statement! First of all he says there will be an anti-drug campaign, then he says there is no problem and that it does not happen in schools, and then he says the Education Department knows all about it but we do not need an inquiry. That is the most extraordinary statement I have read.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Perhaps not from Mr Pearce.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister says he is considering an anti-drugs campaign, then he says there is no problem in WA schools, then he says he is aware of the problem and is trying to take the pressure off schoolchildren.

Hon. B. L. Jones: There are drugs, but not inside schools.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will get to that in a minute.

On 20 June the *Daily News* ran an article headed "Juvenile drug arrests leap". I quote as follows—

Arrests for school-age drug abuse have more than trebled in WA in two years, police figures show.

Further on—

This week the WA drug squad showed the *Daily News* figures of juvenile drug arrests skyrocketing from 50 in 1981-82 to 140 in 1982-83, 269 in 1983-84 and 431 in 1984-85.

Hon. B. L. Jones: Were they arrested in school?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: These were arrests of school-age drug users; they were not arrested in school.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: No, because they don't do it in school.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That's not true.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will get to that in a moment; just hang on. I know the Minister is chafing at the bit.

The *Daily News* decided it would take an interest in this subject and on 25 June ran a "news focus" article about the WA school-age drug scene. I admit it is about the "school-age" drug scene. The report is by Philip Bodeker, and I quote as follows—

The word "party", for many WA school-agers, has become synonymous with the use of illegal drugs.

Further on—

The school-age "drug scene" is like a secret society, entered only through drug participation and tightly shut to all those who are "straight".

Further on—

Genesis Christian Life Centre director, Mr Ray Jenner, is determined that Constable Rick Veane's remarks about a WA high school drug epidemic should not be covered over and forgotten.

As a counsellor with wide experience in treating drug and alcohol abuse, and a regular speaker at schools, he has been approached by parents who want the issue kept alive.

He says: "There is an abundance of drug abuse at high schools, both soft and hard drugs, but mainly marihuana.

Further on—

The drug pushers are specially selected students in high schools—that I know for a fact from the drug squad.

Further on—

Drug Squad police say that at the moment there is plenty of marihuana in Perth.

Further on—

Studies by leading U.S. drugs researchers describe U.S. children as being caught in a "drug epidemic".

Australia is said to be 10 years behind the U.S. in drug and alcohol abuse, and following fast.

The *Daily News* took what I consider to be a very responsible approach and ran one of its "Access" programmes on youth and drugs in schools, "Are drugs a problem in our schools?" It appeared in yesterday's edition, and prompted me to move this urgency motion today.

Hon. Tom Stephens: So you can grab part of the headlines?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Not at all. What it does is to emphasise that there may be a serious problem.

[Resolved: That business be continued.]

Hon. N. F. MOORE: My understanding of the "Access" series of articles in the *Daily News* is that the newspaper prints a series of letters it receives and endeavours to weigh up the subject matter so that it gives an indication of the views of the people who write in. Of the 17 letters sent to "Access", all except two said there was a drug problem in schools. One who said there was not a drug problem said he thought marijuana should be legalised anyway. That series of letters is worth looking at because it answers the suggestion raised earlier that there is no problem in schools, and that children do the right thing at school and do not become involved in drugs until they have left the premises and gone somewhere else. I commend this page to members. There is a series of letters which indicate that people are saying there are drugs in schools and that people are peddling drugs on school premises.

I will not go through all the letters, but I suggest that members do so. They talk about and emphasise the point I am trying to make—that there are problems in schools. We can be pedantic and ask whether we are talking about drug problems in school or drug problems in relation to school age children. Whatever it is, it is a problem that needs to be confronted.

It is my view, following the evidence in recent times and some presented by various people last year, that we need a survey. A survey was done in New South Wales in 1983, and I refer members to the final comments on page 23 of the report of that survey which state—

The value of the current survey would be increased if it were carried out on a national basis rather than in N.S.W. only.

Clearly they are saying that if we want to come to grips with the problem we should not tackle it in just one State. In 1985 the Commonwealth Department of Health put out a booklet entitled "Statistics on Drug Abuse in Australia". Under the heading "Drug use by the young", it states—

The only information available on drug use by the young is from surveys of school children. A series of surveys of drug use by Year 10 students (aged between 15-17 years) in New South Wales was undertaken, covering the years 1971-83.

The only information available was in the New South Wales survey, and that was quoted in the Commonwealth publication in 1985, a little over a year ago. As I mentioned earlier, a survey has just been completed in Victoria. It found that more than one in four senior school students have smoked marijuana, 92 per cent have drunk alcohol, and 78 per cent have smoked tobacco, etc. The report is available, and it is a survey of drug use among Victorian post primary students. It is in the Parliamentary Library, and I suggest the Minister get hold of a copy and find out the scope of the problem in Victoria.

So there are two major surveys—in New South Wales and Victoria—and a Commonwealth suggestion that we need more research and information in order to be able to do something about the problem. We now have the \$100 million drug offensive campaign, designed mainly to promote the Prime Minister and various State Premiers.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Oh, come on!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It says in the pamphlet put out in the drug offensive campaign that phase one of the offensive was due to finish yesterday and that phase two would start in mid-1986. In referring to phase one it refers to concern about drugs and says—

To meet these concerns, Phase One has these objectives: to provide the facts to the public.

Only two surveys have been done in respect of young people and drugs—one in Victoria, and one in New South Wales. I would have thought that the drug offensive campaign might have done a survey to provide the facts to the public. One cannot talk about facts unless one has done an in-depth inquiry into what is going on.

The saga continues as of today when I received an answer to a question I asked on 24 June, 1986. In question 202 I asked—

Is the Minister aware of the recent Victorian Government survey of 9 000 students which revealed a major drug problem in schools in that State?

The answer was as follows—

Yes—the survey did not indicate the prevalence of drug use in schools. It was a survey of school children and their use of drugs.

That is being very pedantic in my view. The second question I asked was—

In view of the findings of the Victorian school drug survey and the recent statement in Western Australia by a policeman at a seminar on drugs, that every high school has a drug problem will the Minister institute a factual study to identify the extent of the drug problem in Western Australian schools?

The answer was as follows—

No—in terms of the use of drugs by school aged children, there is sufficient evidence around Australia and within this State to indicate the direction our prevention programmes should take.

Again I am told there is no need for an inquiry, and we are not to have one. I wonder why. It is necessary to go back into history to find out why the Government is adopting a head-in-the-sand approach to the whole problem. On 7 February 1979 the headline in *The Australian* was, "State Labor backs use of marijuana".

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Here we go; knock the Minister again!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The article goes on as follows—

The West Australian executive of the Labor Party has come out in favor of legalising marijuana.

Then it talks about the executive approving a State conference resolution to that effect. Two days later in the *Daily News* of 9 February 1979 there appeared the heading "Yes voters on pot stand confirmed". The article stated—

Two key supporters of the ALP's pro-marihuana policy today reaffirmed their stand.

The secretary of the Kalgoorlie-Boulder branch, Mr Graeme Campbell, accused conservative elements of blowing the issue out of perspective.

Mr Campbell is the current Federal member for Kalgoorlie. The article goes on to say—

Gosnells MLA, Mr Bob Pearce, said pushers of drugs benefited most from the fact that marijuana was illegal.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. Robert Hetherington): Order! I will be pleased if the honourable member is allowed to make his speech without this cross-Chamber conversation.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The article goes on as follows—

Those who spoke in favour of the motion at this and a previous meeting last November included Senator John Wheeldon, who today was touring country areas; Mr Pearce, and Mr Campbell.

Mr Pearce supported a motion as part of the ALP policy in support of legalisation—I use that word carefully—of marijuana. At that time some of the wiser heads in the Parliamentary Labor Party realised there was an election due in 12 months time and took the view that Mr Pearce's comments were not on. There were some newspaper surveys which indicated that legalisation of marijuana would not be acceptable to many people in Western Australia. Then on 14 February, five days after Mr Pearce confirmed his stance, a headline appeared in *The West Australian*, "Change of mind on 'pot' by MLA". The article stated—

A Labor back-bencher who initially supported the ALP's controversial decision favouring legalisation of marijuana has now reversed his stand.

The MLA for Gosnells, Mr R. J. Pearce, said yesterday that at the next ALP State executive meeting on Monday he would vote to reverse the policy.

Mr Pearce's decision was influenced by a strong reaction in his electorate against the marijuana decision.

Further on it states—

... he accepted that this view had failed to win community acceptance and that it would be wrong for him to proceed with it.

It is a classic case of somebody in the Labor Party arguing a principle of policy, and supporting what he knows is an exceptionally unpopular view, stating that the platform of that party should contain the view that marijuana should be legalised, not decriminalised. Five days later, Mr Pearce made a statement that he had changed his mind. He did not say that he believed the principle was wrong, but he said that he had telephoned around his electorate and had been told that he was on the wrong track. Therefore, he did the right thing by his electorate and changed his stand. My view is that Mr Pearce still holds the same view.

In 1981 during the debate on the Misuse of Drugs Bill, Mr Pearce supported the view that marijuana should be decriminalised. Mr Pearce is learning; as a young man in 1979 he said that marijuana should be legalised, and in 1981

when he was only two years older, he realised that legalisation of marijuana was unacceptable but he sought to have it decriminalised.

Mr Pearce was not the only one who held that view. Mr D. C. Parker, the Labor member for Fremantle, said—

... there should be more emphasis on education, rehabilitation, counselling and treatment.

That is fine, but he continued—

There was no discrimination between the more serious drugs of addiction and lesser drugs such as marijuana.

He was referring to the Misuse of Drugs Bill which was passed in 1981. When one reads the debate on the Misuse of Drugs Bill it is clear that the attitude of members of the Labor Party to drugs is very soft.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What absolute nonsense.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Every time some members of the Labor Party argue about drugs they give the distinct impression that they do not think there is any problem with marijuana and that, in fact, it should be freely available. I would go so far as to say that many members of the Labor Party would argue that it should be legalised. Maybe members opposite can tell me whether they support that view.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do you think it is the same as narcotics?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: If Hon. Garry Kelly had listened to the "Nightline" programme on the radio last week he would have heard Dr John Sherman from St Kilda in Victoria, who works with drug-affected people, make the suggestion that a type of marijuana that is being used in Victoria contains additives. Users of marijuana are now suffering brain damage. There is significant evidence available which shows that marijuana does cause brain damage.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Do you ever use marijuana, Mr Moore?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: No, I do not.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You seem to have a slight case of brain damage.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: That is what we expect from a man like you—a high level of repartee.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: A member of Parliament stands on his feet in this House and asks for an inquiry into drug abuse in Western Australian schools when the evidence is almost overwhelming that there is a major problem, and Mr Piantadosi has the gall to suggest that

my calling for such an inquiry relates in some way to my having brain damage. He is absurd! I ask the member whether he has children attending school.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. Robert Hetherington): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: If Hon. Sam Piantadosi had children at school, as some of us do, and they were in a position where they were confronted by people peddling drugs, he might have a concern about the problem and would not make inane comments about it. It is a serious problem. I have children who have just started school and I am concerned about the problem. As a result, I am doing what I am paid to do. The interjections indicate the attitude that members opposite have and that is why there has been no inquiry. Both Mr Pearce and Mr Parker are soft on drugs and the member opposite is soft, full stop!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The House will come to order.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! When I call the House to order I expect it to come to order and to not continue.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is interesting that in 1981 when the Misuse of Drugs Bill was before this Parliament, the Opposition spokesman, Mr Tom Jones, said there should be a top-level inquiry into drugs; that sounds like a good argument and I am arguing that we should do it. At that time it was being argued that an inquiry be held into drugs in general and there was no mention of schools.

Hon. Tom Stephens: The Liberal Party has members like you.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Those are the sorts of comments that are made when one cannot win an argument.

In 1984 when this Labor Government was elected an article was published in the *Daily News* on 12 May and was headed, "Report earns praise for politicians" and read as follows—

It's not often politicians earn the congratulations of the public they serve.

But this week's Parliamentary report on alcohol and drugs deserves the highest accolade.

It has shed new light on one of WA's most crucial and damaging social ills, and it made a series of laudable suggestions to help cure it.

The inquiry, headed by Labor's Gordon Hill confirmed the gravest fears about the burgeoning hard drug trade in this State.

One of the young members of the Labor Party was involved in that inquiry, the results of which were applauded by a newspaper, and yet when we are confronted with what I consider to be evidence of such significance which proves there should be an inquiry into what is going on in schools the Minister for Education, Mr Pearce, consistently says that there is no need for such an inquiry. Mr Pearce has stated that if there is a problem in schools he would know about it. I am suggesting that he does not know about it.

To conclude my arguments I will refer to the Victorian figures in an endeavour to explain what the situation would be in Western Australia if the drug problem in this State was the same as that in Victoria. I remind members that surveys in Victoria have shown that 25 per cent of secondary school students in that State use marijuana. If 25 per cent of the secondary students in Western Australia used marijuana it would mean that 26 019 Western Australian school students would be involved.

Hon. B. L. Jones: It is used outside the school, not inside.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is the member saying that because the drugs are used outside the school there should be no inquiry?

Hon. D. K. Dans: There has not been one case of drugs being used in schools.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Therefore, we ignore the problem. The Federal Government is spending \$1 million in promoting the Prime Minister's face around Australia. It is also promoting the faces of State Premiers and I understand it sent a booklet about drugs to all residents in the community. I did not receive a booklet in my letterbox.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I will not tolerate cross-Chamber conversation during this debate. Interjections are bad enough, but when it comes to arguing between each other across the Chamber I will not put up with it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: If, in fact, 25 per cent of Western Australian students are using marijuana it means that 26 000 children are

involved and that illustrates the significance and the extent of the problem. I am not saying that I know what the problem is. If I knew, I would not be calling for an inquiry. As a general rule I do not call for inquiries, but I suggest there needs to be an inquiry, in the nature of a Royal Commission, which would have the power to find out the truth. Royal Commissions have the power to find out what is true and what is not.

Every parent of every school child in this State has reason to be concerned when a policeman and people involved in the drug business make statements month after month that there is an epidemic of drug use among school-aged children; when a *Daily News* survey indicates significant use of drugs and trafficking of drugs in our schools; and when the Minister for Education in one Press statement admits that the Education Department knows about the problem. I suggest that this House agree to the motion and that the Minister take notice of what has been said. He should get his Government to do something about the problem. That action needs to be quick and urgent because people are entitled to know what the problem is.

If the inquiry found that there was no problem, I would be the first to say that that was fantastic. I have three young children starting school and I do not want them to go into that situation and to be confronted with this problem. When one has young children one becomes more aware of the potential problems they face.

I urge the Government to take notice of this call for an inquiry and to set it up as a matter of urgency.

HON. JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.51 p.m.]: I will be brief in seconding the motion. I believe the mover of the motion has produced specific facts and statistics which should cause all of us some concern—concern perhaps that a problem exists.

I hate to say this but it seems that the wheel has turned yet another circle in a short period of 15 years. Fifteen years ago I argued in this Chamber that there was an alcohol problem in Western Australia. I was told, of course, that there was no problem, that was well known, and that it should not be worried about. My motion for the setting up of a Select Committee of this House to investigate the problem was defeated on a bipartisan basis. It was not until I added the magic word "drug" to the next mo-

tion I introduced that the House agreed that there should be an inquiry.

The inquiry was duly constituted. Hon. Lyla Elliott, Hon. Tom Perry, and I spent many hours listening to evidence. The report presented to this House was not our opinion of what was going on in Perth but rather the evidence people had given us. One of those pieces of evidence—which is available for members to read if they wish—was that Perth could not escape the epidemic overtaking the rest of the world. Many people told us that it would never happen. One person said, "It will never happen in pretty Perth; we are not well known for that sort of thing".

When dealing with drugs one finds that one of the main concerned groups is parents worrying for their children. Unlike several members, I do not differentiate between hard drugs and soft drugs because there is no such differentiation. A person has to study the subject, be with it night and day—as we were—to find out that in 99 per cent of cases those people who had started on the so-called soft drugs had beaten the track to the hard drugs without any problems whatsoever.

Nobody in this House will tell me that he or she can stabilise the toxicity of the marijuana plant. Two seeds of the same variety from the same stock can be planted, treated with the same watering and cultivation procedures, and at the end one of those plants will perhaps be more toxic than the other. Marijuana is now produced by the tonne with no sort of guarantee of the level of toxicity, such as when producing opium from poppies, where the toxicity can be controlled. That does not exist with marijuana.

I am no expert in the field, but according to the latest report on marijuana by the United States Surgeon General, there is now irrefutable evidence that it is brain damaging. If it is not irrefutable then the reports the Surgeon General receives are not to be believed. Everybody tells me that I should believe what the Surgeon General says about smoking and tobacco.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Do you?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Yes, certainly. I promise I will give up smoking when the "Quit" campaign is finished.

The concern that people have should be our concern. It is no use trying to draw a fine line between people who have tried marijuana, LSD, heroin, Mogadon, or any of those other so-called drugs.

Alcohol, of course, is the greatest drug of them all and we are forgetting that when we talk about drugs in schools. It is quite ridiculous to say that the children do not actually take it into schools. I can tell members that within five minutes of the children getting out of school they are at the alcohol. There are no two ways about it. As an ex-teacher I can tell members that from time to time some children presented themselves under the influence of some drug or other. Do not let us kid ourselves that it has never happened before and that it is a present-day phenomenon.

I would like to see some group outside the Education Department—perhaps social workers trained in the facts about drugs as a totality—conducting, as Hon. N. F. Moore suggests, a very swift and effective inquiry into the matter. I think we owe it to the citizens of Western Australia, because this is a great worry to them.

Many parents still ring me—I now refer them to others dealing with this problem—about their fears of what is happening. If Hon. Mick Gayfer were in the Chamber he could tell members of those fears which he has asked me to dispel in the country areas. Those fears are very apparent among country parents and I have tried to help him in this regard. Honourable members should not forget that many country children go to Perth for their education and, unlike the metropolitan students, they do not have the benefits of going to their homes each evening where parents can detect any abnormal behaviour in their children from time to time. It is a definite worry to country people that their children attending schools in Perth could be inveigled into experimenting with drugs and the parents are worried that the children are without parental guidance.

The inquiry would seek to identify two things: Firstly, is there a problem? Secondly, if there is a problem, what is the best way to mobilise the State's forces to combat it? That is not asking for a great deal but it will alleviate a great deal of worry from a large section of the population, both parents—or even grandparents—and those who have a responsibility towards children.

[Questions taken.]

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: I now propose to conclude my remarks, but before I do I want to know—and I am sure members opposite and on this side would like to know—is there really a problem, or are we going to say it is just media chatter again? I suggest that one of the

solutions is to hold such an inquiry. In the Health Department's magazine which arrived on my desk today, and following a question I posed to the Attorney General, I notice that in point of fact the new Alcohol and Drug Authority's inquiry centre is dealing with about 35 inquiries a week. These inquiries relate in the main to marijuana use by children of concerned parents, and it is the parents who are ringing.

Until we get our thinking right and put behind us the thinking we had before about marijuana, and update it with last year's medical evidence presented by the United States Surgeon General, we will think there is no problem and that the children will soon be weaned off it. That is not the case now.

The case now is that, as far as I am concerned and as far as I have always been concerned, marijuana is a harder drug than heroin. It takes longer; that is the only difference. Even when one has sworn off marijuana, even years ago we knew that the residual contents of that drug were left in the fatty tissues of the body, and those tissues include the brain. One of the tragedies that may occur, although it seldom occurs and when it does it usually results in death, is the consumption of alcohol after one has been clean of marijuana for some months. One might get what is described as a "flashover". A flashover was attributed as the cause of death of a young fellow in your constituency, Mr President, some years ago. He had been experimenting with marijuana but had given it away. He then went on to alcohol and proceeded to commit suicide by throwing himself into the polar bear pit. There was no other way out then.

It is a serious subject. It is a subject that, devoid of emotion, should be treated in such a way that the people in this State can be satisfied that either there is or there is not a problem; and if there is a problem, we must ascertain how it can be most effectively dealt with in the quickest possible way for the safety of our children.

I support the motion.

HON. KAY HALLAHAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [5.10 p.m.]: In responding to the motion, I point out initially that I regard this as a political stunt, to attack a Minister of the Government, the Government, and the teachers in schools in our State.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Not at all.

Hon. N. F. Moore: The first half is right.

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: Neither the Government nor the Minister has ever denied that drug abuse is not a problem in our community. Quite frankly, if Hon. Norman Moore was really worried about the whole question of drug use and abuse by young people he would be calling for a survey which took in all young people.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Would you agree if I modified my motion?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: What happens to children in schools? This motion is an absolute denigration of our teachers; it is a very poor attack on the teaching fraternity of this State.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Try an amendment.

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: The teachers of this State would be very angered to think that the Leader of the Opposition is attacking the schools and naming them as centrepieces of drug activity for young people of Western Australia. There is no evidence whatever to support the proposition that schools are the centrepieces of drug activity in this State. In fact, schools are the places where we are attempting to equip children and young adolescents with the wherewithal to combat the self-destructive elements in any sort of substance abuse, including drugs.

We all know that alcohol and tobacco consumption is much more widespread than drug use, in spite of what members opposite say, and that fact has been well and truly documented. The notion of hitting at this problem perhaps indicates the member's concern for his own young children and he is bringing his personal concern into the House, or else he is attempting to denigrate a very able Minister for Education.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Are you saying cigarettes and tobacco are prevalent in schools?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: I am saying that cigarettes, tobacco and alcohol are very serious problems in the community.

Hon. G. E. Masters: In schools?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: They are very serious problems in the community.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Not in schools?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: The Leader of the Opposition is so stupid. I am constantly unimpressed by the inability of members opposite to understand the complexity of modern social problems, and I again refer to the motion which is before the House. If we have a social problem in our wider community there is no doubt but that it will be reflected in our schools to some degree.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Right. So drugs are in schools as well, aren't they?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: It is reasonable to expect that it is the adults' modelling of behaviour which the young people take up. Nobody is saying that there is not a problem. There is no question of the Government saying that these types of problems are not serious in our community. Any institution within our society—

Hon. G. E. Masters: They are serious in schools as well, aren't they?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: Within the schools there is a very big push towards prevention. Could I just point out to the interjecting member—

Hon. G. E. Masters: Because it is in the schools.

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: —that prevention is the way to go. The Education Department has a health syllabus and programme. I did not hear one constructive point mentioned by Hon. Norman Moore. I hope that he will give support to the health syllabus which does provide a comprehensive range of knowledge to young people in regard to dealing with drug education problems in our community. I hope Hon. Norman Moore does support it.

We all know that drug addiction is only a problem in cases where people do not have sufficient self-esteem, where they do not feel good enough about themselves to protect themselves from destructive behaviour. We ought to be taking that line of attack and not the narrow line suggested by Opposition members.

The reason the member was stimulated as to introduce this debate and why he condemns the State Government and a Minister of the Crown is that he has read six articles in the Press over a year, and two or three of those articles used the word "epidemic". That was enough to make him behave in this way; I really think it is poor reasoning to take up such a serious social issue and try to marginalise and politicise it in this way.

The member did not refer to two newspaper articles. I draw those headlines to members' attention. One headline of 29 May is entitled, "Anger at drug allegations". On the afternoon of 28 May appeared the headline, "Drugs claim knocked". The article of 28 May indicates a number of principals of schools were telephoned and they said there was not a drug problem within their schools. That is not very difficult to understand when our teachers try to protect and guide our young people by educat-

ing them. We know when our young people are at school they are in the care of the teachers. While some principals indicated that outside school hours students may indeed be exposed to that risk, there was no evidence of a problem within the schools; they had not heard of it. The State School Teachers Union said that if its teachers were confronted with that problem and were worried about it, it would bubble out at the principals and deputy principals conferences. Indeed, that did not happen at the conference of the State School Teachers Union. That was not the case at all; so I do not know from where Hon. Norman Moore gets his concerns. But I do know he is setting up the teachers of this State in a most appalling way to receive criticism and is aiming at them the accusation that they are not responsible members of their profession. That is a most serious allegation to be made in this House and I think Hon. Norman Moore should reconsider his position in that regard.

The Victorian survey to which Hon. Norman Moore made reference is again referred to in a question on today's Notice Paper. While referring to the question of drug abuse by school-aged children he does not refer to the whole question of drug abuse being a problem in the community. The items are integrated and it is no good the member criticising our schools in that way. It does everyone a disservice. The preventative programmes the Education Department has in place are known by all international standards to be the best way to go; indeed, prevention is the only way to go.

The member who seconded the motion really surprised me because I thought he was a member with some knowledge in this area. He put forward the theme "...if there is a problem..."; the Australian Government would not be spending enormous sums of money on national drug offensive programmes if we did not all believe a problem exists. The problem exists and for that reason preventative programmes are run in schools. I feel very strongly about the honourable member's introducing this very sensational motion. He has an inability to come to terms with the fact that the Government is doing a lot in this area. It is very easy for the honourable member to stand and tell us that this Government is doing nothing. No Government has done more than this one towards offsetting serious social disadvantages and serious social problems of the whole community, especially in regard to the younger members of the community.

In conclusion, the Government is aware that drug abuse is a problem in our community. We accept that if problems exist in our community, in some instances that will be reflected in schools. The figures in the schools do not show a widespread incidence of abuse or addiction by students. If students are involved, it has been shown that it is more likely to happen in shopping centres and other places frequented by young people, but the one place where our children do get some protection from that sort of risk and some education in how to deal with the problem is in fact in the schools of this State.

I reject the motion of Hon. Norman Moore.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [5.20 p.m.]: I thank Hon. John Williams and Hon. Kay Hallahan for their contributions to this urgency debate. I would also support an inquiry into the extent of the use of drugs by school-aged children.

I raise this question of the use of drugs in schools as a direct response to a very serious allegation made by a police constable who said there was an epidemic of drug use in schools. I therefore directed my attention to this problem. If the Minister were prepared to set up an inquiry into the use of drugs by school-aged children within the community, I would be the first to support her. I am as concerned about whether a child is taking drugs in the playground as I am about whether that child is taking them after school down by the school oval. The problem still exists. To be pedantic about whether they are being used inside or outside schools is to denigrate anyone who suggests that there is a problem among young people.

The Minister said that I was seeking to attack schoolteachers. That is absurd. Schoolteachers have a very onerous job. I know because I used to be one. One of the problems they have is knowing exactly what is going on with the use of drugs.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Are you suggesting they don't know what is going on?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am saying that some do not. I am trying to make the point that principals, as a general rule, say that there is no problem in their schools. That would be the normal first reaction to any report. That is how they would respond.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Are you suggesting they are telling lies?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am saying that that is the response they would make when telephoned about whether there is a problem. Not one principal would say that his or her school is completely riddled with people smoking marijuana. A principal would be careful not to bring disrepute upon his school. He may be seeking to do something about the problem without a lot of publicity. I hope the Government gives him support in those efforts.

It is nonsense for the Minister to suggest that the Opposition does not understand modern social problems. I do not understand how she can make that statement with respect to this motion. If one reads the motion one will see that all it does is to seek to condemn the State Government, and particularly the Minister, for refusing to acknowledge that a significant drug problem exists within our schools and for failing to take action to find out. All we suggest is that the Minister should be condemned for not attempting to find out the extent of the problem, bearing in mind the evidence. I am not making any judgment about how the problem should be dealt with. We should find out the problem first and then deal with it.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You wanted to have a cheap political stunt first and then get the Minister to do something about it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister made some comments about there being no drug problem in schools and that it was a figment of my imagination. She suggested that everybody who talked about this problem was really talking drivell. I want to read to her parts of letters published in yesterday's *Daily News*. No names or addresses have been published for obvious reasons. An aware parent wrote—

Make no mistake—marijuana dealing occurs in every school. It even extends to some primary schools. Alcohol abuse likewise.

Another one signed by a concerned parent stated—

My own son has been threatened with a knife for a sum of money owing for purchase of marihuana in a high school.

A concerned mum wrote—

Two years ago when my daughter was attending a private school, I confronted the principal about a boy who was selling drugs from his locker on the school premises.

A student from Warwick wrote—

Like everyone else, you know where you can buy marihuana and, like Mr Jenner said . . . marihuana is readily available in high schools.

An anxious mother wrote—

I have two teenage children. One went to a private school and one is attending a State school, and they have both told me that all sorts of drugs are freely available at both schools.

A year 9 student wrote—

At my school there is easy access—anyone can get drugs if they want to.

Obviously he or she does not know what they are talking about! A registered builder wrote—

I've asked them questions about drugs and they tell me it's in all the schools but that none of the kids will tell on each other, . . .

A country resident wrote—

People were hanging around the schools in those days selling drugs and are still doing so and the young people are terrified of them.

Finally, a student wrote—

Hard drugs are not available. I wouldn't know where to get them in schools.

But the soft drugs are readily available.

How can one say that there is no problem, that they are making it up, and that the problem does not exist? Is the Minister suggesting that?

Hon. Kay Hallahan: The Government is not doing that; that is the point I am making.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I suggest that we should find out how many people in the community feel this way, and how much of this problem exists in schools. If the Minister wishes to set up a broader inquiry, I am happy to support her. To talk about my sensationalising this problem is nonsense. The classic case of sensationalising this problem and attempting to gain every bit of political kudos out of it, was the "Drug Offensive". An amount of \$100 million of taxpayers' money was spent by the Federal Government with the approval of the State Premiers to promote their Governments' concern about the drug problem. The Prime Minister, in his usual smarmy way, and the State Premiers indicated that they would fix the problem. The Prime Minister's usual beaming face appeared on brochures which were put in people's letter boxes. That is about all that has happened. Everybody was to be told about

drugs in that brochure. However, the problem still exists and there is evidence that it does still exist.

People wrote to a newspaper yesterday expressing their concern and saying that drugs are available in schools. I am not sensationalising this issue at all. I have introduced it to this Parliament after asking a number of questions of the Minister for Education. I have asked the Minister to do something about the problem. I suggest that the Minister's refusal to do anything is evidence of his lack of concern. There is no way that the Minister would do anything about an inquiry that would find out that the problem is more serious than was previously thought.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Did you have to contact him through the media?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I asked him questions in the Parliament and did not receive answers.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: You got a good answer today.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is the Minister talking about her answer?

Hon. Kay Hallahan: I am talking about my answer to him.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: When the Minister reads it she might understand that it is nonsense.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think the Opposition should be briefed by the Federal Police.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Two other inquiries into drug abuse by schoolchildren have been carried out. One was carried out by the New South Wales Labor Government and one by the Victorian Labor Government. The inquiries were extended from drug abuse by schoolchildren to cover drug abuse by young people. I suggest that the same sort of inquiry should be carried out in this State in an attempt to find out whether the same sorts of problems exist here. When we receive that information we can do something about what is a most serious problem. If it is not addressed this country will be worse off.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TENTH DAY

Motion, as Amended

Debate resumed from 26 June.

HON. J. M. BROWN (South-East) [5.30 p.m.]: I join with other members in welcoming new members to this Chamber. In particular, I welcome Hon. John Halden, Hon. Beryl Jones, and Hon. Doug Wenn. Their election was par-

ticularly significant inasmuch as it increased our numbers from 13 to 16 and no longer does the 18:13 rule apply. I also acknowledge new members on the opposite side, Hon. Max Evans and Hon. John Caldwell. I certainly wish them well in the Chamber.

I thought it was shameful of the Opposition, in responding to the Address-in-Reply, to want to introduce an amendment to the motion that was moved to His Excellency the Governor (Professor Gordon Stanley Reid). This had not been done since 1973 when the late Arthur Griffiths moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. The motion to the Address-in-Reply to the Governor, from this Chamber in particular, should be one of support for what His Excellency is doing and the way in which he carries out the functions of State. The commendations that he has received from members of all political persuasions are very commendable. Therefore, to use the Address-in-Reply to move an amendment to be conveyed to His Excellency is a disgraceful and shameful act on the part of the Opposition.

Hon. G. E. Masters: But when you were in Opposition Hon. Robert Hetherington and Hon. Lyla Elliott tried it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I can't recollect that.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I assure you they did.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: The only time an amendment to the Address-in-Reply was carried was in 1973 when we were in Government. The Opposition has used this occasion to do the same thing again. I wonder what standard the Opposition has reached. I thought it would have learnt a lot more after three years in Opposition, but it is evident that not only will the 16:13 rule apply, it will also expand.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You have not done your homework; look at 1979.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I have done my homework. I think the Opposition's action in having this Chamber pass an amendment to be conveyed to His Excellency was disgraceful.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It compromises the Governor too.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Don't be ridiculous! We have a very high regard for him; he is a very fine man.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: It shows the level to which the Opposition has stooped. It is disgraceful that the Opposition should want to do such a thing for cheap political gain at the expense of an Address-in-Reply debate. It does no credit to the Opposition that this Chamber

and this Government, under the direction of the President, must convey such a motion, although it was disagreed to by the Government.

Having made those points, I now make reference to some matters that are of major concern to me. I want to talk about the rural industry and the wrong perceptions people have in this respect. It is fair to say that there is a crisis within the rural industry, but we must ask ourselves why that crisis arose and who are the culprits with respect to it. Why is the rural situation so grim? Hon. John Caldwell, in his maiden speech, adequately explained how the crisis occurred in the first place. He made the comment that we should divert from the philosophy of, "Get big and get out" and adopt the philosophy of, "If you don't want to fall, stay small". The "get big and get out" syndrome is one of the first causes of the problems within the farming community. Everybody is now running for cover, denying the fact that they ever supported that philosophy.

The people who embarked on a course of getting big did so without any knowledge of what they were leading themselves into. They borrowed hundreds of thousands of dollars at nominal interest rates in the first instance, but those rates rose to in excess of 20 per cent for rollover bills. Those interest rates led to the demise of many in the farming community.

Hon. W. N. Stretch: Forced up by Government, of course—bad Government.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I will catch up with what the member said in a minute.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Mr Hawke admits it.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I will catch up with what the member said about rates being forced up. The purchasers made a commitment with the full understanding of what they were doing. They relied on the escalation of land prices which reached their peak in 1982. They relied on the escalation of land prices to overcome the difficulties they were facing, but the prices did not escalate. In fact, land prices have depreciated by at least 50 per cent in the last 12 months. In certain areas, they have depreciated much more than that.

The problem arose because they were encouraged by land salesmen, financiers, and companies not associated with the banking industry, to borrow sums under a three-monthly rollover bill arrangement with terms to be decided at the expiration of that three-monthly period. Hon. David Wordsworth talked about

the Hawke Government. The first thing it did for primary industry this year was reduce the price of fuel by in excess of 50 per cent. Farmers were paying in excess of 45c a litre for distillate; in rural communities 250 to 300 kilometres from the coast they are now paying less than 25c a litre. Indeed, one farmer in my area said, "If you are paying more than 20c a litre for distillate, you are paying too much." He made that comment in the Primary Industry Association's newspaper, *The Farmers Weekly*.

It is now cheaper to leave one's land fallow than to use all the noxious sprays that are so prevalent and so costly. They are costly in that they destroy much of the land. They certainly destroy the countryside and any of the green feed that may follow. They are costly inasmuch as there are no restrictions on the prices that may be charged for them.

The problem has arisen within that framework. Farmers have not taken advantage of the concessions that are available to them. Fuel, their greatest expense, has been reduced by 50 per cent in price. I have taken members of the farming community to the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation, about which there has been much criticism. In many instances, that criticism has been made unfairly. Those farmers I have taken to the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation have been able to reduce their budgets considerably. I took a farmer to that body just last week. He had an estimated budget of \$42 000 for fuel. His revised budget for his 1986 harvest is now \$20 000 and he thinks that will more than cover his requirements. Indeed his cost for sprays has been reduced from \$10 000 to \$3 000. In all we were able to reduce his budgeted expenditure by \$45 000. Members will know what that can mean to a farmer.

If that prevails throughout the farming community, one can see an endeavour to get farmers back onto the road again. The comment, "If you do not want to fall, stay small", is very apt in the rural community today.

We are losing far too many of our farmers, and we are not replacing them. We must look to replacing them with young farmers. We want young men and women back on the farm.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: They are going.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Let me relate the case of Mr Mark Butterworth. He is a young man of 34 with five children living at Bencubbin, who rang me the other day. He is well-known to everybody. Westpac Banking Corporation is taking out a writ against him; it has been issued

to him by the police already. He did not receive the same support as Barry Jones of Corrigin. He did not have the same support as Kingsley James.

Several members interjected.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: He did not receive the same support as Kingsley James of Katanning who was issued with a writ. These are people of eminence in their communities; I do not deny it.

Mr Mark Butterworth rang me up to tell me about his situation. I rang the bank on his behalf to see what I could do, and the reply was that it was bank policy. I told the lady on the phone that I would make some observations concerning the position in the Parliament, and she said, "Be that as it may, it is bank policy."

The transportable home for which Mr Butterworth borrowed funds from the Rural Housing Authority—we are not denying the right of the banking corporation—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I am finding it extremely difficult to hear the member. I am sure *Hansard* is suffering the same difficulty from the noise emanating from behind the Chair.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. Members are missing an excellent speech on the trials and tribulations of the rural community, and in particular of Mr Mark Butterworth of Bencubbin.

No-one denies the right of the bank to evict him. He asked if he could remain until the place had been sold and he could move elsewhere. The bank did not agree to that but told him he had to go.

A member: Disgraceful!

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I do not follow the bank's reasoning, because I was able to discover from the Bencubbin community that he was a very industrious person. He over-committed himself with funds from the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation, the banking institution, and the Rural Housing Authority. He got himself into difficulties which he could in no way avoid or escape. I wonder what considerations were given to this man, his wife and five children in the bush? What sort of realisation is there in the metropolitan area that it is bank policy that they must be evicted?

There is another aspect of Mr Butterworth's situation. He was also involved in the fracas at the Merlin Hotel when the Pastoralists and Graziers Association had a demonstration. As members know, the member for O'Connor, Mr

Wilson Tuckey, and the former member for Mt Marshall, Mr McNee, were there.

Mr Butterworth was charged with failing to leave licensed premises and resisting arrest. In his words, all he did was hold a placard; he did not say anything. He was invited there by the organisation. The Federal member for O'Connor was doing all the talking; he was abusive. The police asked Mr Butterworth to remove his placard. He refused, and the Federal member for O'Connor came in very heavily against the force, and in Mr Butterworth's opinion was abusive. Notwithstanding that, Mr Butterworth now finds himself fined \$214, which he has not paid and for which he is liable to be arrested at any time.

Mr Butterworth thought the people responsible should pay the fine. He said it was nothing more than political point-scoring at his expense when that demonstration was held at the Merlin Hotel on Australia Day.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: I agree.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: The Pastoralists and Graziers Association, to its credit, has paid his legal expenses, amounting to some \$2 000 to date, in an endeavour to ensure that he was not convicted of what he considered a cheap political point-scoring exercise.

I do not have to say any more in relation to the behaviour of the former member for Mt Marshall and the Federal member for O'Connor. Members know what happened there.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have reference to the National Party there.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Not all of them.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: They are saying you are the only one who does deals.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Is that right?

Hon. J. M. BROWN: The reason for the additional crisis in the country is the cheap political point-scoring which takes place. It does not help anybody, either in the city or in the country. It is a condemnation of those members; I believe Mr Tuckey will suffer the same fate as Mr McNee if he goes on with such nonsense.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: I think he will.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I want to say something about the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation. It has indeed had a very difficult task. It has been criticised in the media and in the Parliament. While I am not trying to justify the position of RAFCOR, I believe that the circumstances which prevailed this year need

some clarification. The corporation has had to increase its staff and has had to be attuned to the legalities of lending large sums of money. While delays have been experienced in certain areas, the fault does not lie with RAFCOR. Other people are to be blamed for the lack of an early favourable response to farmers.

As I have just illustrated, one farmer overestimated his expenses for this season by \$45 000. One can understand that RAFCOR might consider that person not to be viable in those circumstances. But in the overall situation of the rural community, I consider that RAFCOR has carried out its duties to the best of its ability, and the rural community will appreciate its efforts as the year goes on.

This year is an excellent one in the rural industry, particularly for wheat and wool farmers. It has never looked better.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: It is the rain.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: If one says the prices are not too good, one must know what one is talking about. For argument's sake, the reserve price for wool has never been better. The stock has never been in better condition; therefore a better return can be expected.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: What about the wheat price?

Hon. J. M. BROWN: That is a one-off situation. We have had forward selling.

We produce less than five per cent of the total world wheat production. In Western Australia we already have forward selling and we have lost only two markets—only 50 000 tonnes to Yemen and 50 000 tonnes to Sri Lanka. That is all that has been lost in the overall context of sales.

We have greater sales and deliveries for the first quarter of this year than we have had in the history of wheat production, and we have produced less than five per cent of the world's wheat production. We have a guaranteed reserve price, and while people are saying that wheat is down to \$100 a tonne because of discounting by the Americans and the European Economic Community, I have confidence in the Australian Wheat Board's ability to ensure that wheat producers in this country will continue to receive a fair price. Of course it will be ably assisted by the guaranteed prices wheat producers receive from the Government. However, I have no doubt that the wheat production and the returns involved will continue to give the producers of this State their livelihood.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are the only one who has no doubt.

Hon. E. J. Charlton interjected.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: In 1951, the powers-that-be advised farmers not to grow wheat but to plant oats instead. What happened?

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It sold for only 30c a bag.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: As Hon. A. A. Lewis said, it sold for only 30c a bag. There is a strong demand for wheat and Mr Clinton Condon, the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board, made those pronouncements of gloom and doom. I remember that on 19 December 1983 the Christmas harvest present for producers was, after being told by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that wheat could drop \$20 a tonne, that it went the other way. Producers were getting in excess of \$200 a tonne.

I think that the question should be asked: What is the interest bill in relation to the wheat that is sold? What are the overall costs to the producers when this year they received \$150 a tonne, in round figures, as against \$145 as a first advance previously? The \$150 which producers will receive this year is the highest they have ever been paid, so I do not think we should take a gloomy attitude in this respect, nor do I think that producers are going to be in a crisis situation when at the very moment they are not. I am sure we will come to grips with a selling problem if it does arise, but it is very hard for anyone to understand why there could be a selling problem for any of our products when there are so many people around the world who are hungry. Perhaps the answer lies in all Australians tightening their belts and selling wheat at a lesser price. In that way we could contribute more and that would be a far wiser thing to do than to say we will not do anything because things do not look too bright.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: You could not put on a subsidy like the EEC and the Americans have done.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: If producers were subsidised, as are the EEC and the Americans.

As I have already explained the Australian Wheat Board, under Sir Leslie Price, has already achieved forward selling at prices in American dollars. What does Hon. E. J. Charlton think this will be worth to the Australian economy when it is related to US dollars? It is marvellous how we relate things to US dollars when we are talking of selling prices, when we should relate them to Australian dollars because it is considerably more.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Is he very concerned?

Hon. J. M. BROWN: He is no longer. Sir Leslie Price has gone to Elders now, but he made pronouncements of doom and gloom. I do not think his successor will be any different and I do not think anyone would be any different in relation to the Australian Wheat Board because they are all playing the same tune.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: They have a great tune.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Without a shadow of doubt. The Australian Wheat Board is the greatest thing this country has ever had, but it is a continual whinger. I do not know where it learned to whinge like that. It deals with farmers, and farmers farm while cockies scratch; that is where the grizzling cocky syndrome comes from.

The agricultural industries of this country mean a great deal to the economy of the State, as does the mining industry. We depend upon the products of those two great industries, and the resources they provide, for the well-being of our State and for the workers who carry out those duties. It is very significant that this year is the one hundredth anniversary of the Australian Workers Union, a union I am proud to be a member of. I have been a union man for more than 15 years.

The Australian Workers Union is celebrating its centenary from 1886 to 1986, and its centenary paper is really worth laying on the Table for members to view because it contains some excellent commentary and background of the workforce of this country, and the trials and tribulations of the union itself. The Australian Workers Union was responsible for incorporating the membership of the non-craft workers, who were working in a closed shop situation. The Australian Workers Union started off with unskilled labourers and with the Australian Shearers Union.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: That's why you and I were members.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: That is why we were members, because we were unskilled labourers, as Hon. Sandy Lewis has pointed out.

Three members of the Australian Workers Union became Prime Ministers of this country. In 1904 John Watson was Prime Minister; from 1929 to 1932 John Henry Scullen was Prime Minister; and, as all of us know, between 1941 and 1945 John Curtin was Prime Minister. They were all members of the Australian Workers Union and they were valued Australian citizens who did a great deal for this

country. They made a strong contribution to the activities of Australians and I would like to place on record my admiration for the Western Australian branch of the Australian Workers Union. Gil Barr is now the national secretary but he was formerly the Western Australian secretary of the union. He was followed in his position by Joe Keenan. Of course in the mining industry there are people like Alf Barwick, who was the secretary of the mining division from Kalgoorlie, followed by Vic Nicoletto who is the present incumbent in the Australian Workers Union.

The union, under the guidance of those members, has, I believe, led the nation's progress. I refer to those other trade unionists whom I mentioned as members of Parliament. The future president of the Australian Labor Party, Mr Mick Young, was a member of the Australian Workers Union. I am not so narrow-minded as to devote my entire energies towards discussing the Australian Workers Union. I have a very strong affiliation with the Municipal Employees Union.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Before the tea suspension I was referring to the Municipal Employees Union and to the Australian Workers Union. I have a very close association with the Municipal Employees Union. As a result of my 19-year association as a member of a local authority, a shire president, and a member of the executive of the Country Shire Councils Association and because of my deep concern for members of unions, particularly the country people who are employed under the Municipal Employees Union, naturally enough I have been inclined to give the union every assistance I have been able to give it. I feel I have had some measure of success in that direction. Adrian Bennett, the Secretary of the Municipal Employees Union and Doug White, the President, and his executive officers saw fit to give me a certificate of appreciation for my services to them. They also acknowledged my services as their returning officer, a position I have held for many years. Naturally enough, I would be concerned to see any loss to them. As for any benefits they may receive from working in local government, all members would know that local government employees, particularly those who live in the country, are not highly paid. They certainly are necessary for the community's progress.

I will continue my efforts on behalf of that section of the community. The other trade union movement with which I have a strong

association, probably caused through my long-association with Hon. Fred McKenzie, is the Australian Railways Union, which union's activities mean so much to country people and their decentralisation. I have always had a very close association with the organisation. For the benefit of new members, particularly country members, I will reflect on the great losses we have suffered through the deregulation programme which was instituted by the previous Government and which we have been forced to follow.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Is that why you are doing it?

Hon. J. M. BROWN: The point of no return was probably reached. I think Hon. D. J. Wordsworth would agree that the deregulation programme which was implemented by his successor was probably set up without due consideration for the consequences.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It certainly was not.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Be that as it may, the loss of railway employees and the decline in population in the country is something we cannot afford. We do not receive any better services from the new transport system.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is all serviced from Perth now.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: When the transport of freezer cargoes was forced away from the railways to private carriers it spelt the death knell for services to country people. They get a poorer service at two or three times the trade cost, and no-one can deny that. That has been the subject of previous debates.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members will cease their audible conversations. Members are to be heard in silence during the course of the Address-in-Reply.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: My good friend Hon. Sam Piantadosi gave me a note to remind me of—but I need no reminding of it—the great services the Water Authority supplies.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: This is probably one of the few areas in which we have effective decentralisation. I now turn to the Agaton water supply. When we were in Opposition I said when we were the Government we would support it, and I have not changed my opinion whatsoever. It is a natural underground aquifer which could certainly supplement the water supply on the goldfields line and which would open up one million hectares of land to be

supplied with a service. This project is expected to cost some \$60 million. I have always told the Government we need to implement the Agaton water scheme and I will continue to be as forceful as I possibly can in that direction to ensure its implementation, because in real terms the expenditure of the Western Australian Water Authority is now less than it was 10 years ago. I am not saying we should implement the Agaton scheme for the sake of employing more workers or because it will boost the community; it is something country people cannot afford to do without, and a turnaround in our country communities will be almost an impossibility without water. I can speak personally; if my family had not been fortunate enough to find water on our property we would not be on our farm today.

I have fought for the Agaton water scheme and for the requirement of the Westonia-Mt Hampton scheme for nearly 20 years, but I have not had any success since John Tonkin was Minister for Works and Water Supplies. This is a condemnation of all Governments and it is a condemnation of us for letting people suffer in that way. Therefore I have no hesitation in supporting Clive Holding's consideration of Aboriginal communities and his \$80 million contribution over five years towards their needs. It is a necessity and if we are to show those human values to the people of our State we must implement such things.

Much has been said about a gold tax. Believe it or not, a lot of my constituents, both within the agricultural regions and the goldfields, are not so sure a tax should not be applied. I am strongly opposed to the implementation of a gold tax, for very good reason. As members understand, tariffs are imposed. Western Australia is an agricultural and mineral producing State and the tariffs are impositions against us; but, more importantly, we are a great importer of products from our Eastern States counterparts. Western Australia produces 85 per cent of Australian gold, in excess of 30 tonnes per annum. The compensation that we receive by not paying a gold tax has enabled the expansion of the goldfields and the communities in the eastern goldfields. Organisations which put submissions to the Gutman inquiry and other bodies included the Australian Gold Producers Association and the Prospectors Association. They are well balanced submissions. Because we are the greatest producer of gold in Australia and because of the imports we receive from the Eastern States which are more expensive to the con-

sumer, there should be a balancing effect. I do not know whether anyone has given the matter any consideration, but this matter could not be balanced by imposing a gold tax, and for that reason I am strongly opposed to the introduction of a gold tax.

One matter that has not been mentioned is that the Federal Government has allowed for investments by the farming community. It was considering introducing a quarantine provision. One associates "quarantine" with animals but this quarantine provision allowed for a farmer to earn so much off his farm, which money he could put into the farm. There was a threshold on how much he could earn. The limit originally was \$20 000, which was then increased to \$30 000. The Federal Government has now removed the provision, and that move has been of tremendous assistance to the farming community. It also allows farmers with off-farm investments to continue to support the enterprise with which they are associated. It has been a great incentive. I suppose people could refer to those people as St George's Terrace farmers, but that is not so much in evidence today as it was 10 years ago. It allows people with off-farm incomes who have a vested interest in a farm to continue to put their resources into the farm and receive the appropriate deductions. I do not think we have appropriately recognised that type of assistance given to the rural community.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Your party introduced a tax and now you think it should be praised for taking it off.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Many members on the other side of this House, as well on this side, would have been reluctant to contribute. However, they would not have been beneficiaries of what the Government was endeavouring to do. They should not now try to hide behind interjections which they are not prepared to substantiate. Hon. David Wordsworth would have been a beneficiary.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Of course I was.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: He was scared when it was threatened that it would be introduced. It was because of the Federal Government's consideration for the rural community that it did not proceed with it. That is what Hon. David Wordsworth is not prepared to accept.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are joking.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: Hon. David Wordsworth said that I was joking. The provision was withdrawn because there were many off-farm investments that were not available.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Who put it on in the first place?

Hon. J. M. BROWN: It was withdrawn because of the crisis within the rural community.

Finally, I join with all members in paying tribute to the late Hon. Clive Hughes, the former member for Cockburn, who recently passed away so tragically. I had a high admiration for Clive and was pleased to notice so many members of Parliament paying tribute to Clive by their attendance at the Fremantle Cemetery. He will certainly be sadly missed. I, like other members, extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs Hughes and her family.

While I support the motion, I believe the amendment was unnecessary.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Mr President, in accordance with Standing Order No. 151, I request the newspaper quoted by Hon. Jim Brown be tabled.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will table the paper.

(See paper No. 213.)

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [7.45 p.m.]: I too wish to pay tribute to Hon. Frank Wise, as other members have done today. I knew him a little. I also wish to pay tribute to Hon. Bert Hawke, whom I knew a little more. It is a very interesting fact that one of my uncles beat Bert Hawke in his first election in South Australia. Whenever I saw Bert in the corridors of this place, we used to have a yarn about how they campaigned. He was extremely kind to me when I first came to this place.

I pay tribute also to Clive Hughes of whom, like most members of the Opposition, I did not see much. I did see a little of him through committee work and I understand why the Labor Party feels his loss so greatly. He had great charm and, knowing what we do now, great courage. I express my condolences to his family.

I wish to congratulate the Leader of the House, Hon. Des Dans, for his reappointment to that position. Sometimes we do not see eye to eye, but most times we do. I congratulate Hon. Joe Berinson and Hon. Kay Hallahan. I look forward to hearing her in full flight again as we did this afternoon. Maybe we will give her a bit of work to do at various times and hope that she does not lose her pieces of paper. I congratulate also Hon. Gordon Masters and the three Whips. I am having a little difficulty with three Whips now to chase me around.

I congratulate also the members who were elected or re-elected. I congratulate those new members who have made their maiden speeches. If the standard of those speeches is anything to go by, I look forward to their rising again to speak on other matters. I hope they are not overcome by old persons' disease and try to make speeches without the preparation that they put into their maiden speeches.

I particularly welcome my minder who sits beside me. I have had some charming people sitting next to me, but none so charming as Hon. Tom Helm.

I congratulate Hon. Mick Gayfer. Despite reading in the newspaper that the National Party would not have a leader in this place, I now see that Mr Gayfer has that position. I find that interesting particularly as I have heard him say so many times that he was nothing but a Country Party member, but now he is the leader of the National Party in this place. I congratulate him for his flexibility and his ability to combine both offices.

The Government probably does not want to hear any more about that shameful proroguing of Parliament, but it will continue to hear about it. It was unnecessary and probably showed a hint of panic. It will not stop us from paying tribute to people in this House who were retiring.

When I had been in the other place for about six months, we had one of those well-regulated tours to the north-west. Hon. Lyla Elliott was in the group that I was with. The trip had some peculiarities, I seem to recall—fists flying and badly cut eyes and things like that—but at least it allowed members of all parties to get to know one another. I found Lyla Elliott to be as charming then as she was throughout her time in Parliament. I believe she will be missed in this place.

Many people have talked about Hon. Ian Medcalf and his ability as a lawyer and as Attorney General. His ability is allowing the present Attorney to have a fairly easy ride because Hon. Ian Medcalf did the background work for the majority of the Bills that were brought in in the last session. The debates between Hon. Joe Berinson and Hon. Ian Medcalf were interesting because of Mr Medcalf's background knowledge and his ability to question the Attorney on the legislation.

We lost two other members who took probably a little higher profile. I refer first to Mr Dowding, who has gone to another place.

His behaviour, as I hear it, does not seem to have improved there. I am glad we have Hon. Tom Helm, with his quietness and politeness, instead of Mr Dowding. I refer secondly to Hon. Graham MacKinnon. Let us consider Hon. Graham MacKinnon's parliamentary history and the jobs he did.

He introduced fluoride to the water supply, which was not the easiest thing in the world to do. He had certain brushes with scientologists.

Hon. Garry Kelly: He didn't introduce it in the south-west.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Garry Kelly is not quite correct. The Labor Party tends to think of Busselton and Bunbury as the south-west. It is true that flouride was not introduced to the water supplies in Bunbury and Busselton. As a result, the teeth of residents there are not as good as they might have been had fluoride been introduced.

Hon. Graham MacKinnon had a few skirmishes with scientologists which probably got him ready for the cockies and the clearing restrictions that came in under the Country Areas Water Supply Act. Graham MacKinnon confided in me that some of those meetings were worse than interrogations at Changi. At one meeting he had two spotlights shining in his eyes. He could not see the public at all and about 350 people were present. That is probably where Hon. Bill Stretch got to know Graham McKinnon better than he did previously.

Mr MacKinnon carried the burden not only for the State or the State Government, but also for the future of the State. The decision had to be made. I still feel a deal of shame that some of his colleagues deserted him in his bid for leadership after he did that. I thought that was very unfair. He was only backing a Cabinet decision and he did it to the best of his ability, as he did everything.

The Labor Party talks a lot about pre-school children and their education. Graham MacKinnon was the Minister for Education who brought in pre-primary schools and moved that along with such effect that we were the leaders in Australia in that area. We remember his efforts with respect to the State's 150th anniversary. The Labor Party in the main wiped off the sesquicentenary. With the exception of the few people whom I will talk about in a minute, the Labor Party gave no cooperation with respect to it. Graham MacKinnon carried that ball and did it extremely well. He made our 150th anniversary the success it was. In my

opinion, he was the best Minister for Education we have ever had. He had foresight and administrative ability. He certainly got on with the job and would listen and put into practice things which very few Ministers in my time have done.

Hon. Fred McKenzie reminded me the other day of a person who retired from the other place who, I believe, was the best Labor Party Minister I have ever met. That was Colin Jamieson. Perhaps he was too good because the ALP obviously abandoned him without giving him a Ministry in the last Government. Now he has retired he seems to be one of the few blokes who has not been given a job for the boys. Perhaps he was too honest, too straight, for the present Government. I remember him, in particular, as a Minister for Works. As a Minister he was excellent.

Hon. Mick Gayfer would remember that we always used to refer to the two best-read men in Parliament. They were Des O'Neil and Colin Jamieson. His going is our loss. I did the odd trip with Colin Jamieson and did a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association tour with him. His knowledge and his wisdom were certainly above average.

Finally, I guess most members got a copy of the letter to the President written by Hon. Graham MacKinnon. It was a pity that because of petty party politics—snide politics I guess I would call them—Mr MacKinnon could not make a speech after 30 years in this House. It is a disgrace, and I hope that the Labor Party and some of the younger members who serve a time in this place do not have the same treatment dealt out to them. As I understand it, it is the first time that has happened. Let us hope that the Labor Party has learnt its lesson and does not do it again.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I thought you were saying it was the petty politics of the other side of the Chamber.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. It was an utter disgrace. You will never live it down.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: You were frightened about what we were going to find.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) Order! Hon. P.G. Pandal will come to order. The Leader of the Opposition will also come to order.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Somebody might want to know why the House was prorogued. That was pretty simple. A couple of Select Committees were due to report, and before the election the

Government was not likely to like the tone of those reports.

Of course, we had what we are now to reintroduce, the reports of the committee on committees.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Not if you have any sense.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is typical of that sort of remark we expect from Hon. Tom Stephens. I know he is under a deal of family pressure at the moment.

A member: Pregnant with possibilities!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Pregnant with possibilities, but not for a month or so. Mr Deputy President, those committees were set up by the House. The tendency has been too much towards the Government trying to take over the workings of the place. I will defend the workings of this place against any Government. At least I held the record, Sir, and you will remember, of having crossed the floor to vote against my own Government at times when I thought it was trying to make use of this place.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Would you defend the Government against an unscrupulous Opposition?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will defend each member against every other member. Who is the most unscrupulous I would not be prepared to say at the present moment.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You are like Solomon.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am like Solomon because I have that type of wisdom.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Mr Nevill, it is no use buttering me up now. He can butter me up later on.

We had an uncertain address by the old doyen of the accountancy world, Hon. Fred McKenzie, on fringe benefits.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Thank you very much.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: You must admit it got him off the trains.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He is a very good person, but unfortunately he quoted from *The Sydney Morning Herald*. I do not know whether the ALP has bought it or something like that, but that editorial contained the greatest heap of claptrap about what the farmers were getting and were not getting out of fringe benefits. I felt I should read Mr McKenzie's speech for the benefit of the House and comment on it.

Mr McKenzie is always very fair. He will come to me after this speech and say, "Sandy, you have convinced me. I did not realise there was so much in it." That is the fairness of Hon. Fred McKenzie.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: It is all arguments and personalities.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is why he will come to me—

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, it is not personalities. No way.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Currently on speeches—

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will just deal with a few small comments on the fringe benefits tax. I was rung up the other day by a constituent who happens to work for a tyre company. He is the local controller of the State Emergency Services, so he asked his boss, "Can I have a State Emergency wireless in the ute so that if an emergency starts up I can race straight off to it, using your vehicle?" The boss said, "Yes, that sounds very sensible, you can."

That worked all right until the boss found out that he would be paying fringe benefits tax when the employee went off to help the district as head of communications for the State Emergency Service. Even Mr McKenzie would not think that that was right, would he?

Take someone in the volunteer bushfire brigade, or the volunteer fire brigade in the town. These people take their cars to where the fire is, and they are charged fringe benefits tax. Mr McKenzie is a very fair man. Say one of these persons works for the railways; perhaps he is a guard who is also in the volunteer fire brigade. He has a railway ute in which he is allowed to go home. There will be a few of them under this Government.

Say this man goes off to fight a fire. The Government has to pay fringe benefits tax on that. Nobody can say that is fair. I am sure Hon. Fred McKenzie will agree with me that something should be done about it, and I am sure he will come to me after I have finished my speech tonight and see what we can do about it.

I do not know that I should really bring this subject up, but you know me well, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D.J. Wordsworth); you know perfectly well I will. This concerns a stud tax, a servicing tax if members like it better.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It has nothing to do with sexual assault, so members should not get onto that. I shall read a letter I have from another constituent of mine who, incidentally, rears goats. She has stud goats. She says—

Dear Sandy,

Herewith our reasons for strongly opposing the proposed 'stud tax' to be implemented on July 1st, 1986. (Source: National President of Angora Mohair Breeders Association, Phillip Johnston of Gnowangerup, after a discussion between Angora Breeders with Texan imports on Torrens Island and Mr. Kerin.)

Mr. Hawke has asked Australians to be innovative, to export, to take risks, to advance 'high tech' industries and to invest in Australia.

We took a risk... We bought a farm. Result... high interest.

We were innovative and exported Angoras to New Zealand. With the aim of improving the quality of our animals, we kept the best and invested the returns of the export sales in an Embryo Transfer Program, (is that 'high tech' enough?) and the result... a stud tax on animals produced by Artificial Insemination or Embryo Transfer!

One can go a little further, because service fees for stallions, bulls and even rams I suppose come under this tax. To continue—

The application of this tax is in effect 'retrospective'. Our calculations were made on a basis which had been long established. We cannot now, 2 months later, suggest to our pregnant does that the economic climate is not suitable for their offspring. It should be noted at this point, that anyone with any grasp of the rural economy would understand the implications of a change in figures after the deed has been done! We can only assume that neither Kerin nor Keating have ever had to plan an irrevocable budget for their own use 12 months in advance!

The application of the stud tax to animals produced by A.I. and E.T. is also discriminatory in the extreme.

Not only does it penalise those breeders who take the risk to improve the breed at as fast a rate as possible, it will have devastating effects on the Agricultural Vets who have been innovative enough to try a little 'high tech'!

If the tax is implemented and applied to animals at birth, as we have been led to believe, . . .

They were led to believe that correctly, because that is what will happen. To continue—

. . . will the unfortunate stud breeder who decides to stick to high standards of selection, be able to claim a deduction for the animals downgraded to the commercial flock at 18 months of age, or later?

The alternative will be castration. We do not yet have the answer about castration, so we do not know the position. To continue—

We are concerned that an opportunity to advance Australia's rural industries by using the latest techniques will be strangled while overseas countries bound ahead and once again leave us floundering. The imported animals, sheep, goats and cattle at the various quarantine stations are, by Government decree, bred by artificial means to prevent damage to the Australian rural industries. If breeding by artificial means within Australia is hampered by short-sighted, ham-fisted economists it won't be too long before we have nothing much worth protecting.

It is said that farmers are complaining about nothing. It is fascinating. Further to that, this poor person who wrote to me had extra problems, because she had embryo transfers. The sutures used by the vet were a poor variety and it looks as though she will have a heap of mis-carriages on her hands, because the sutures sealed on the outside and not on the inside. So she has another problem. I suppose the Treasurer will say, "You outlaid \$30 000 or \$40 000. That is bad luck. You will be able to claim that because you did not get any progeny". However, when she went into embryo transfers her idea was to get some progeny.

Mr McKenzie also said, "Farmers are getting it easy again". The cost of the fringe benefits tax on the average worker's house on a property will be \$2 000 in round figures. If one has five or six workers, one will just give away one worker. One worker will be put out of a job to pay the fringe benefits tax, because it must be paid up-front.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You said the same things about the entertainment tax. You said everybody in the hospitality industry would be out of work and that did not come to pass.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is estimated that 11 000 people around Australia are out of work because of the entertainment tax. Now it does not matter to Mr McKenzie that 11 000 workers are out of jobs. Having 1 200 out of work in the railways did not matter to him.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: There is none out of work as a result of the tax.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Is Mr McKenzie referring to the restaurant industry?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Yes.

Hon. Mark Nevill: He should know. He has researched it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Obviously his research on that matter was as good as it was in respect of farmers. A total of 11 000 people in Australia are out of jobs as a result of that tax.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: My figure is as accurate as your 11 000.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: What is Mr McKenzie's figure?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Zero.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There must be variations on one side or the other. Is Mr McKenzie saying that the position has remained static over the last 12 months? He has only to ask the people in the library and they will get the information for him.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You give me the hard evidence, otherwise it is zero.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am so fond of Mr McKenzie that I will get the answers for him tomorrow, because the position is set out.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is all airy-fairy too.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The whole fringe benefits tax is a bit airy-fairy. Would a union know anything about the fringe benefits tax? Of course a union would. Hon. Sam Piantadosi indicates that a union would know something about it. The following article has this to say—

SUMMARY

The Vehicle Builders Employees' Federation oppose the proposed tax on employer supplied motor cars on the ground that:

1. The proposed tax changes the basic assumptions on which the unions agreed to support the new motor industry plan announced in May 1984 in spite of the fact that the Minister responsible for the motor industry plan gave both the unions and the industry an absolute undertaking that there would be no changes to these

underlying assumptions without full proper and prior consultations.

2. The proposed tax will destroy the local content plan by directly penalising the highest local content, highest production volume, most cost efficient vehicles in the local content plan.
3. The proposed tax is a direct breach of the Government commitments to the unions in ALP ACTU Accord, namely to ensure that "there is adequate co-ordination of ministries covering economic planning industry and trade", and if there has to be a rise in taxation "to discuss the matter with the unions before giving effect to it."

That is what the union said. Would Mr McKenzie like to know what that union says about people in that line of business who are unemployed, or would he not believe the union? Would Mr McKenzie like to hear what the union says about the number of people who will be unemployed? I am referring to one union.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Which union is it?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is the Vehicle Builders Employees' Federation. It is pretty big stuff, or it was until the fringe benefits tax was introduced. It goes on to say—

The union is opposed to the new tax because it will lead to an immediate loss of jobs.

Mr McKenzie should be listening to this. Westrail was doing enough damage getting rid of jobs and workers without this as well. To continue—

Initially there will be a reduction of around 20 000 to 30 000 in total annual industry sales which will mean an immediate loss of some 3 000 to 5 000 direct labour jobs, plus another 5 000 to 10 000 jobs lost in the vehicle distribution industry.

Hon. Mark Nevill: It was predicted but it did not happen in Canada when they brought it in.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Nevill should go and talk to the secretary of this union. I am sure he would be glad to have Mr Nevill's support. Good Lord, it did not happen in Canada!

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It would be reassuring to know that it did not happen in Canada.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There is a bloke called Bob Ansett who is not very popular with Mr Keating and Mr Hawke. He says—

Then there's the fringe benefit tax which will add over \$1 000 a year to the on charges for each employee fortunate to have a company car as part of a package.

A bit later I shall quote some of the things the Government has had to say about the rural industry. John Elliott of Elders probably has 5 000 cars on the road at \$1 000 apiece. What will that cost the farmer?

Mr Ansett goes on to talk about the Government in rather uncomplimentary terms. I shall read another of his comments, because we hear so much about what this Government is doing for employment. He says—

Australia's job producing record is not something that we can be proud of even though the present Government has succeeded in creating 500 000 jobs in the past four years. According to recent statistics, Australia has produced 3 200 jobs for each one million people a year over the past decade. America did much better with 5 600 jobs per million people but even more illuminating is the fact that during the 1950's and 60's Australia was producing 11 000 new jobs per one million people each year. So we're not going all that well, particularly when you take into account that well over half of the 500 000 jobs created during the past four years were in the Public Sector.

The accord! The trilogy! The consensus! This Government has been on a con trip for so long that it does not matter. It has been trying to con the Australian people year after year.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You don't believe that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I really do believe that. I believe the Hawke-Keating Government and the Burke Government have been trying to con the people of this State for far too long. We should have a look at what has occurred.

I received a letter dated 29 January 1986. It was a bit lousy. It was addressed to Alexander Ashley Lewis and Patricia Elizabeth Lewis. It says—

Dear A. A. & P. E. Lewis,—

I looked at this letter and saw it was from Hon. Brian Burke. The postage was paid in Australia by the taxpayer, I guess. I am not sure whether the first page was paid for by the taxpayers because there is a special mention of "Private

correspondence, not produced at public expense". I am sure the other pages were at the taxpayers' expense. He was probably using up his stationery account. I did not ask him and I am not interested because I do not think—if it was anything like other questions I have asked in this place—I would have received an answer. It is difficult to get answers in this place. Listen to this! I am sorry my friend the Minister for Budget Management is not here because I would like him to hear this quote, which is as follows—

The challenge to put the lid on government taxes and charges and to begin implementing the Beazley Report into our education system.

Is that not great! The challenge we have is to put the lid on Government charges—that after last week's fiasco and the school teachers' going on about the Beazley report! Is it not great stuff? How we can change from 29 January to 1 July! Great stuff. Next time I get a letter I will believe him implicitly because I have seen this 15 to 18 per cent increase when he has promised to put the lid on rises! It must be a funny lid. It must be a lid without sides so the froth and bubble can come out, because that is what this Government is: Froth and bubble. It is fascinating.

The letter goes on to say that he wants to improve school facilities and he speaks about tourism. The first thing he did about tourism was to issue a report that said they wanted to close down all the country tourist bureaux. We had a few words to say about that, and Mrs Beggs might come to a truce on that matter. The report talks about fishing in Boyup Brook. Those who know the Blackwood River know it is too salty for people to do any fishing.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That was before the member's cocky mates got into that country and cleared it. The letter talks about no land rights whatever. Truthful Brian! Lovely stuff. I am sure the CSA would like this, and I quote—

The achievement of which I am personally proudest is the new sense of fairness in our community, the tolerance that comes from people trusting each other.

One would think he was writing a play. He then goes on to say—

A vote for *Dave Evans* and *John Bird* will give you effective representation in both Houses of Parliament.

Imagine if John Bird got in. The taxes would have gone through the roof. There is a PS which says—

I'm particularly keen to see *Dave Evans* re-elected as the member for Warren. Dave and Betty Evans are close personal friends of mine—they make a terrific team.

So he sacks him! Great stuff. A great truthful Government. I will get back to telling some truthful stories before I get much older. That was a prize example of a letter.

What is very serious is that the ALP in its campaign got confidential union files and numbers which under the Secrecy Act are not allowed to be let out. This very confidential number was written on letters to certain Telecom people. I have been a union member for a great deal of my life and a parliamentarian for some of my life. I think this is the greatest abuse of trust I have ever seen. These people come under the Secrecy Act, yet the Premier, in a letter written to them, puts their special code number on it. I do not hear Government members saying to much about that.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Many unions complained about it too.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Especially those blokes covered by the secrecy provisions.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I listen to unions probably more than the member does.

I refer to the Kukerin Primary School. The Government is getting more rent after this new rise is GEHA rents. It was built in 1935 for the school principal and it has been upgraded once. Now, in 1986-87, we might get a new principal's house. I do not believe it. The Government is trying to con the principal. In 1935 the house cost £1488 to build. The Government has not done badly out of it. It has received a better return from it than it has from Westrail! It has been painted twice and it has received one rough R&R programme.

Another topic I want to discuss relates to the Soil Conservation Act. I do believe that the people in the bush have been told clearly enough that if they wish to clear over a hectare of land they must submit a notice of intention to the department. This needs to be brought to the attention of country people.

I refer now to Herdsman Lake. It has come in for a lot of criticism since I first entered this Parliament. I found in one of those funny Government magazines which waste a lot of money because someone has sent me five cop-

ies of it at great expense that it is to become a world-class, Class "A" reserve. I have had a bit to do with conservation and management, and Hon. Fred McKenzie is an expert on the matter. However, I will bet my bottom dollar that he has never heard of a "world-class, Class 'A' reserve".

Hon. Mark Nevill: He knows a lot about accountancy.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We know that, but he is not doing my tax return this year!

I read this magazine because I am interested in conservation. Do members know who has decided that this will be a world-class, Class "A" reserve? It is not the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority, but the Minister for Planning who has made the decision. From my inquiries I believe the conservation authority has not been asked about it.

Hon. C. J. Bell: He always had flights of fancy, didn't he?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Many people do, and I would hate to be unkind.

It appears to me that this Government is lost. It has given away all the traditional values that existed in the Public Service and in the management of land and departments. I am fairly reliably informed that when the destructive mechanism went through the then Public Works Department, many people at the top level took a golden handshake and shot through. For political reasons the Government wanted to move aside a few people at a lower level so they were put into the Office of Redeployment when the Building Management Authority was set up. I am also reliably informed that because the Government now cannot find top managers it has had to hire those top people back for the BMA as private consultants at a huge rate. I am told that 63 out of 67 officers from the then PWD who were shunted into the Office of Redeployment are now working for the BMA and are being paid for by the Office of Redeployment. I hope when the Minister answers this speech he can tell me whether that is so; the number may be 64 or 65 out of 67 by then. It seems a funny way to organise anything; one has a bloke working for one at a base rate, and then he is given a golden handshake and subsequently hired back as a private consultant.

I have been advised that the Northcliffe school will be looked at by the BMA and that it will also look at the Pemberton school which has to be rebuilt. The old Nyamup school was moved to the Manjimup Primary School but

work under one of the grants went 240 per cent over budget at the beginning of last year. At 30 May the old Nyamup school was still not ready for habitation by children. That is fascinating management!

I visited the Bridgetown High School last year with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place. I think the Deputy Premier used to be down there somewhere too. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said the resources centre at the school was the same as it was when he was there. To the best of my knowledge we have been trying to get a resources centre for 15 years. Ministers come and Ministers go; maybe my predecessor tried as well. Bridgetown seems to have a mark on it with all educationalists. I do not know why, but nothing has happened.

It would be remiss of me if I did not mention some retirements from the Department of Conservation and Land Management, and in particular Steve Quain and Joe Havel. They are two magnificent officers. Joe Havel is known throughout Australia and has done a magnificent job. Steve Quain is a first-class forester and has been a great help to members of Parliament of all political colours. It is a little disappointing that these gentlemen are getting out at 55 rather than continuing for a few more years, but they are leaving because of the uncertainty of Government and management.

Speaking of conservation and land management brings me to the topic of draft management plans. The department has gone mad and thrown out plan after plan, but has not dealt with the total management of an area. That must be cured. In the d'Entrecasteaux and Shannon Parks the department has left out the whole of the Broke Inlet just because it is water. That is ridiculous. The whole area must have a total plan. Users of the park must know what its uses are. What are national parks and conservation areas for if not for the public and future generations? If we are going to lock them up and put buffers around them we will burn them out because lightning will hit them and that will be the end of them.

The thing that worries me about the management plan, and this may seem humorous especially to you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), is that it talks about huts. You will remember having something to do with a few huts in your days as a Minister. Clause 1 of the section says that all the huts must be removed and then a later clause says some will be kept for safety reasons. I usually go from A to B when I read a document, but what does one do

in this case when he reads A and then gets to clause D? Instead of saying in the plan that people can have a lifetime tenancy of the huts and then a decision will be made in the next four or five years which huts should be kept for safety reasons, it says in clause A that all the huts are to be removed.

Hon. Eric Charlton, Hon. Mick Gayfer, Hon. Bill Stretch, and others have talked about finance in the bush, but I thought I might tackle it in another way and talk about people in country areas.

From the farmers' point of view, businessmen are being forced out of country towns and the farmer will have to travel great distances to pick up spare parts, food, and other requirements. The machine in the paddock will have a greater down time. Instead of financing the airy-fairy housing schemes in this State or spending \$1.5 billion on job creation schemes over the last three years—half a billion dollars is spent each year on creation schemes for temporary jobs—the Government should subsidise the interest rates being paid by people in the country. By country, I mean those areas which are 70, 80 kilometres, and more from the city. The farmer, the farm businessman, the school bus contractors and people living in country towns should have the benefit of an interest subsidy. It makes far more sense to me to subsidise the people in the farming community rather than subsidising people in the city who have available to them all kinds of amenities.

The people in the country are the ones who will produce something which this country needs to survive. We run under the twin yokes of Burke and Hawke and their promises of what will be done for this country. Something should be done.

Hon. T. G. Butler interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Butler is only a young member of the Labor Party.

Hon. T. G. Butler: That is the nicest thing anyone has said about me.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Tom Butler may be like Hon. Fred McKenzie who comes under the trustworthy label.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Have I blotted my copybook?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, not tonight, but Hon. Fred McKenzie did blot his copybook the other night. Members of the Government should leave Hon. Fred McKenzie alone because he is a dutiful Whip.

Hon. D. K. Dans: He is an honest man like me.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, he is an honest man!

The cost of job creation schemes in 1983-84 was \$596 million and in 1984-85 it was \$565 million. The people in the country need help.

I will quote from a very good Press release which I issued in Melbourne two or three weeks ago.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: He is on a great ego trip.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Absolutely.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: For a fee—my party needs money!

Sales of new equipment in the year ending June 1985 were down \$212 000 for the average dealership. In the same period, sales of used equipment was down \$167 000 and margins were down. Spare parts usually have the greatest margin and this was down to 21.20 per cent.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): I draw the member's attention to the fact that he has two minutes only in which to wind up his speech.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I may ask for an extension of time. I thought the time limit on the Address-in-Reply debate was 60 minutes and I commenced my speech at 7.58 p.m. However, I will ask for an extension and if I hear one dissenting voice not many Ministers will have the opportunity to speak in this place.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I will move for an extension of time.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thank Hon. D. K. Dans for his offer—there are some honourable members in this House.

As I mentioned, the margin on spare parts sales was down to 21.20 per cent. If we take into account the cost of freight and interest on a part it comes down to a ridiculous figure of somewhere under six or seven per cent. The real margin for spare parts should be over 30 per cent. Interest on floor plant increased in some cases to 27.6 per cent. We must bear in mind that the rural industry is seasonal and that plant is carried over from year to year. In some cases plant is carried for nine months at a rate of 27 per cent. The rural industry is in real trouble.

Extension of Time

By leave, the member's time was extended.

Debate Resumed

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thank the House for granting me an extension of time and I will do my best to entertain members for the next 15 minutes.

When one considers that the average machinery dealer throughout Australia has liabilities of \$1.008 million including floor plant to the value of \$411 000, it is easy to see that that part of the rural industry is in real trouble. I believe the only way out is for the Government to subsidise interest incurred by the farming community.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not sell anything. I do spend a large part of my time selling myself and I am successful.

I quote an article from *The Australian* dated 25 March which was written by Des Keegan and which gives a snippet of what I believe applies in many rural areas. It states—

A sincere farmer, whose family I have known since my boyhood in Narrabri, told me yesterday he owed \$70 000 a few years ago and was easily able to service the debt at 16 per cent and to amortise the capital.

Since then, with the world's greatest economics team at the helm, this farmer's debt has gone to \$620 000 and his carrying charge on a 21.07 per cent overdraft is now \$130 000 a year.

That is the sort of problem with which the farming community is faced. I did intend to refer to numerous statements from Mr Kerin, the Premier, and Mr Grill. I will give members the benefit of those when I am speaking in the Budget debate. I am one of those funny people who collects and keeps papers.

I refer now to a matter concerning tourism and I am sure that Mr Dans will pass it on to the Minister concerned. Some years ago a signpost was promised to indicate Donnelly River and it has not yet been erected.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I never promised it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I did discuss it with Hon. D. K. Dans and I am of the opinion that it should have been erected.

An interesting letter was written by Dr Manca. Some of the new members may not know who he is.

Hon. T. G. Butler: He is the trotting fellow.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He is the director of the South West Development Authority; he does not move out of the Bunbury and Busselton

areas. Is it not interesting to read his comments in the *Albany Advertiser* prior to the last elections? I thought public servants were not allowed to become political.

Hon. D. K. Dans: He is not a public servant.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He has his snout in the Public Service as do Hon. D. K. Dans and I. He is a public servant. He receives \$45 000 out of the public purse and he is a public servant. Are members opposite telling me that the Government advisers are not public servants?

I believe I have my snout in the public trough and, therefore, I am a public servant. So too is Dr Manca. Let us not make any fuss about it and let us not have public servants making Press statements during election campaigns—certainly not if we want to play the game fairly.

One of the things he stated in this very long letter to the *Albany Advertiser* on Thursday, 30 January, was that the South West Development Authority had given a commitment to build the \$30 million Harris River dam. I think members have heard of the Harris River dam in this place before; they have seen the previous Minister shuffle from foot to foot when the subject was mentioned. He made no less than five Press statements in Collie saying that it would be built, but unfortunately he has left this place and we have lost the dam. I hope the present Minister will make the same commitment but it will be interesting to see how far it goes.

I refer now to an article in Monday's edition of *The West Australian*. It fascinated me and I think it goes very close to being a breach of parliamentary privilege. I refer to the article headed "Control him, Cowan warns". I do not like to read of anyone instructing anybody to start controlling a member of Parliament, except when that instruction is a direction from the Chair. For this upstart Cowan to tell my ex-leader that he has to control a member because that member said what he thought in the House is, in my opinion, very close to breaching parliamentary privilege. I shall not take the matter any further but it horrifies me that a minority party—nearly as small as my own and without as much intelligence—should try to put a muzzle on a member of Parliament. I certainly will not accept it during my time in this place. It is a disgrace and the Leader of the National Party should have drawn to his attention that some of us are not very happy about this attitude. I think the young man is getting too much publicity for his own good.

I would love to go on to the subject of railways and ask what is happening to the Boyup Brook-Katanning railway line. Now that the Government is getting rid of 1 200 workers in the next couple of years, perhaps it will have money to spend and will put back the 35 000 sleepers, the bridges, and the sets of lines it has removed. It should either do that or be honest and say that it has closed the line.

Hon. J. M. Brown has talked about deregulation. His Government has had four years to put this matter right and what has it done? It followed exactly the line of the former Deputy Premier because it was the only sensible thing to do. The member should not come into this House and cloud the issue by trying to sell another story. It is not good enough; some of us are built like elephants and have memories like elephants.

I felt sorry for my old friend, Fred McKenzie, and members will recall that he said the line will never be closed. I am sorry; I should have said "Hon. Fred McKenzie", and he certainly is an honourable man.

It seems a pity that the Government is attacking so many people. I realise that the Minister for Budget Management has his knife out and must try to save the State somehow, because so far the Government has made an awful mess of everything. It is a pity the Government will not state that it is closing the line, having removed 35 000 sleepers, a few bridges, and a few sets of lines.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: For the benefit of Hon. Mark Nevill, the Government spent \$300 000 to rebuild the bridge that was washed away and then it closed the line down.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You said that we have not closed it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Government has closed it and it has not closed it. It has pulled up the sleepers, removed the bridges and the lines, but it is not prepared to say it has closed it because that is not politically acceptable.

I support the motion, as amended.

HON. C. J. BELL (Lower West) [8.55 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion and in doing so I congratulate and welcome the new members to this Chamber. I hope they enjoy their stay in this House, however long that is. No doubt they will find the environment in the Chamber different from any other they are likely to experience, and they will need a period of adjustment.

I particularly welcome Hon. Beryl Jones, the new member in my electorate. At the same time I must say that I miss the presence of Hon. Ian Pratt, my former colleague. Ian was a very real friend to me for the past three years when I shared an office with him in Parliament House. I miss his friendship and companionship a great deal. It was a disappointment to me that he would no longer be a member.

It was interesting to read the comments of Hon. Beryl Jones in her maiden speech. In many ways the maiden speech of a member tells us a great deal about that person. I thought her speech was a very sound and reasoned comment and I support many of the things she said. Her concerns for the education facilities in Lower West Province have been my concerns also for the last three years. She drew the attention of the House to the state of some of those educational facilities.

During the campaign before the last election the Government promised to extend education to children in the four-year-old bracket. I think that is an ideal we should all support in the long-run. However, just as Hon. Beryl Jones has drawn attention to the deficiencies of some of the educational facilities in Lower West Province, I also draw attention to them and make the statement that I will support educational facilities for four-year-old children the day the Government has adequately provided for those children already in the system.

The Waroona school is a disgrace; I have made that point twice a year for the last three years and I now make it for the seventh time. Anyone looking at that school can see what that community has put up with in terms of a primary school, despite constant promises of remedial action from successive Governments, and can understand why I am making this statement.

The school is quite frankly going rotten; if a teacher wishes to interview a parent the interview has to take place in an open shed in the yard because there are no other facilities.

If a child is sick, it is sick in the principal's office which also backs up as a duplicating office; yet we talk about getting to and providing facilities for a great number more young Western Australians. Let us fix up what we have.

The Waroona school is not the only one short of facilities in my electorate. The provision of a high school at Australind has been promised, and we hope it will make the Budget this year. It may not.

The existing pre-primary facilities at Harvey are totally inadequate. The situation is that there are no staff toilets, which also applies at Waroona, and there are only adult toilets for five-year-old children, who have to try to cope when they cannot even reach the button to flush the cistern. It would be funny if it were not so serious.

The Pinjarra Senior High School is totally inadequate and obsolete. There are schools in Mandurah which are overcrowded and new facilities must be provided. These things must be addressed. Let us get on and fix them before we get too far down the track.

I support Hon. Beryl Jones' comments about her concern for our youth. If we do not care for our youth our country has no future whatsoever. It is heartening to see somebody come here and make the comment that he or she wants to do something constructive. It saddens me to hear a number of members make their maiden speeches in this place along controversial lines which are really outside the norm, so to speak. When they leave this place and look back on their maiden speeches, how sad it is that they will be irrelevant.

I will not make comment tonight on one of the issues that I did intend to take up and that has been touched on by Hon. Jim Brown and others, because I believe we will get another opportunity to make those comments in other debates. To that extent I intend to truncate my comments and stick to an issue on which members have heard me speak before. It is an issue which I believe needs to be recorded in public and in our Parliament so that people are made aware of some of the things that have happened over recent months.

I intend to go through a historical compilation of the events that have occurred in the dairy industry—both State and Federal—in the last year. There are 600 dairy farmers, and their families total some 1 000 adults; and about some 2 500 others are involved in the dairy industry as well. Things have happened in the last 12 months which in many ways have put at risk those people's livelihoods, and the livelihoods of small rural communities.

I refer to a media statement issued by the former Minister for Agriculture, Mr Dave Evans, on 15 October 1985. It reads in part—

Agriculture Minister Dave Evans today said new marketing arrangements now being proposed for the nation's dairy industry were untenable to Western Australia . . .

"The Federal Government has said it will go along with the ADIC proposal on the condition that all State dairy farmer organisations agree and all State Governments agree," Mr Evans said.

"Well, there is one State Government that doesn't agree and there is one dairy farmer organisation in this State that doesn't agree with the proposals in their current form."

That is quite clear and unequivocal, I think everybody would agree. I will refer to some more media statements, and members will see that the line is the same. On 6 November 1985 the same Minister said—

The WA Government would not agree to measures which transferred income from our dairymen to farmers in other States. It supported the PIA policy strongly.

There is no shift there. On 4 February 1986, Mr Evans issued a media statement which said—

Western Australia would not agree to national dairy marketing arrangements that put this State's dairymen at a disadvantage, Agriculture Minister Dave Evans said today . . .

"But Western Australia will not be party to any agreement that sees a massive transfer of funds from our dairymen into the hip pockets of their counterparts in other States."

Further on, that media statement states—

Essentially the proposals involve a two-tiered pricing system and a mechanism for redistributing industry revenue from market milk sales.

"The scheme has three basic flaws," Mr Evans said.

"First it assumes a world traded price is a reasonable base for Australian farmers when in reality it is a price set politically by the European Community.

"Second, it ignores economic common-sense in that it supports prices but does not control production.

"And third, it could end up costing Western Australian dairyfarmers \$5 million a year in direct subsidies to Victorian and Tasmanian farmers."

That is quite true. I have no argument with that. Mr Grill became Minister for Agriculture and on 26 February 1986 this media statement was issued—

Agriculture Minister Julian Grill today re-affirmed the State Government's opposition to national dairy marketing arrangements that would see this State's dairymen subsidising producers in other States.

"The Government finds it completely untenable that Western Australian dairymen should have to pay out as much as \$5 million because the dairying industries in Eastern Australia cannot get their act together," he said.

"It is particularly disturbing that our dairymen will have to cut into their returns from market milk to help prop up interstate dairy farmers returns from manufacturing milk.

That media statement concluded—

"Western Australia will not accept the proposed scheme unless the other states are willing to accept the need for controls on milk output. And even then, our acceptance will be one of reluctance."

That is pretty straightforward—there is no equivocation there. On 20 May 1986 he issued a further media statement in the following terms—

Western Australian dairyfarmers would face an average payout of \$4 500 a year under proposed national dairy marketing arrangements being introduced into Federal Parliament this week . . .

In a telex to Federal Primary Industry Minister John Kerin, Mr Grill reiterated his stand that there were no sound economic reasons for Western Australia to be part of the scheme . . .

"The actual costs to WA dairymen will vary depending on milk output. But the Dairy Industry Authority has estimated it will range \$2 750 for small quota holders to around \$7 500 for big quota holders."

Another piece of paper, which I understand was from a departmental source, came into my possession. It is headed "National Dairy Marketing Arrangements", and on page 4 it estimates that the net cost per farm will be \$4 493. That, of course, contradicts Mr Kerin's Department of Primary Industry assessment that it would only cost \$171 per farm. That all seems quite clear, but after all the huffing and puffing, what have we got? On 12 June 1986 the *West-*

ern Farmer and Grazier contained an article headed "Milk law a bitter blow" which stated—

Western Australia has condemned the Senate's action last Friday in passing the dairy marketing legislation without amendment.

Agriculture Minister Julian Grill described the move as a "bitter blow for WA dairyfarmers" and Primary Industry Association dairy section president David Partridge said farmers had reacted with disgust.

I must say that only one Western Australian voted against that legislation. That was Senator Noel Crichton-Brown, and I do not think any others can take any credit whatsoever for their endeavours to look after the interests of Western Australia.

The articles I have quoted contain assessments that the average farmer will be up for \$4 500.

Unfortunately that is not necessarily true because when we look at the chart provided by one of our dairy companies to the producers in regard to their likely return for the forthcoming year, month by month, it starts at \$2.80 gross price for July and August; falls to \$2.65 for September and October; rises again to \$2.80 during November, December, and January; to \$4.15 for February, March, and April; back to \$3.30 for May; and \$2.80 for June. The reality is that during the months of February, March, and April production of manufacturing milk in Western Australia is practically nil, so to that extent the real price is \$2.80 gross. However, from that one must deduct the levy which is estimated at around 34c per kilogram, so one is looking at a base price of \$2.46 or \$2.31 per peak production month. When one considers that during 1982-83 the price received by dairy farmers was \$3.30, one can see that the situation has deteriorated markedly over the last three years—of course, under the control of the Australian Labor Party, State and Federal.

The new arrangements endeavour to seek that the returns for dairy products in Australia relate to the international market to the extent of 130 per cent of the assessed average export price. When one looks at what has happened in New Zealand one starts to see what that new price is likely to be. I now read from the

Australian Dairy Farmers Federation newsletter of April-May 1986 as follows—

New Zealand farmers were paid NZ\$4 per kg butter fat this season. A large proportion of this was funded from an Industry reserve fund. This fund is now exhausted. The price to farmers next year will probably fall some 25%.

Dairying is an important industry to the New Zealand economy. The New Zealand Government is therefore likely to be looking to novel solutions to the Industry's difficulties.

When we look at international grain marketing, novel solutions must be introduced by the primary producers of Australia. It continues—

One option is to sell large quantities of dairy products to the USSR. It has been reported in the New Zealand press that the Soviets are keen to buy more dairy products from New Zealand in exchange for extended fishing rights in New Zealand waters. A four year dairy agreement ended recently and New Zealand will be keen to enter into another, however the overall trade balance is reported to be 12:1 in New Zealand's favour.

Quite clearly from that statement, one cannot expect the international dairy market to be tremendously favourable. I will not go into the other aspects of it except to say that a very serious position is beginning to emerge in the dairy industry. Bird Cameron, accountants, recently issued inter-farm comparisons. They communicated with the PIA President, Mr Partridge. The communication discussed the dairy industry and we will go into that in detail later. The comment at the bottom of the communication is so real we must take heed of it. It reads as follows—

We as a firm are most concerned at the trend of profitability, and of course with the added costs of the Kerin plan and the unknown burden of the Fringe Benefits Tax, it is all the more reason that management tools have to be accurate and of course right up to date.

The first line, "We . . . are most concerned at the trend of profitability . . .", clearly illustrates the problems that the industry is falling into. In last week's *Western Farmer and Grazier* a number of farmers estimated their potential costs. Mr Geoff Cox from south of Busselton suggested it would cost his farming enterprise \$18 000 per annum. Another producer, Mr Lionel Bell of Cowaramup, who happens to be

my brother, indicates that his costs will be between \$10 000 and \$16 000 because of the Kerin plan. The minister said on a number of occasions that he would not support the Kerin plan and it would not have got through without Government acceptance, unless some special arrangements were made for Western Australia. The realities are, of course, that no special arrangements were made; the Kerin plan is in operation; and the costs will be borne by the Western Australian dairy farmers. The Western Australian consumers will have two options, either to pay more for dairy products or to see the industry wither in Western Australia—to see the fresh products of their daily needs placed in jeopardy and see a very vital industry in Western Australia gradually disappear.

It is not the on-farm production costs which are unreasonable. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics quite clearly identified that dairy farming in Western Australia, at farm level, is very viable, but there are other problems. One such problem has been sitting with us for a number of years. I have raised it before and I intend to raise it again because it is within the power of this Government to do something about it. I refer to the continuing operation of monopolistic practices condoned by the Dairy Industry Authority by collusive pricing for manufacturing milk with the direction that manufacturers cannot compete for supply.

If one is historically a supplier for company A, there is no way that the Dairy Industry Authority will allow one to supply company B—end of story; yet the authority will not accept that if it is to adopt that line, at least it should have some input into the prices paid to producers. It just means that the companies can do as they please, and they have. When one looks at the comparative prices paid by Western Australian dairy companies and those paid in the Eastern States one sees—I quoted these prices earlier—\$2.31 for WA; and the opening price at Nestles in Victoria is \$3.20 gross. The on-farm cost is \$2.85. They add 34c to reach the levy; they do not take it off. United Milk Products pays, \$2.90 gross, \$2.55 net of levy, with the expectation that \$3 will be after the levy and it will be \$3.35 finally at the farm gate.

Mr Clayton Manners, the Executive Director of the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation said—

Western Australian dairy farmers are being robbed by the dairy companies.

That is his view of the current arrangements which operate within WA. We must do something about it and it is up to the Government to instruct the Dairy Industry Authority to put its house in order.

The Dairy Industry Authority of Western Australia has failed to live up to its charter. It has failed to take hold of the industry as it has been charged to do under its Act. Perhaps the Minister will have a close look at the authority and say that what I have spoken about until now has been related to the manufacturing of milk, and to that extent the matter is not under the control of this State; however, the price paid to dairy farmers for milk sold to households is. It is interesting to note what has happened over the three years of the Burke Government and to see how well dairy farmers in Western Australia have been treated. Their milk returns have been based very much on the same basis as the returns of an average worker. They have been based on a prices justification and indexation system. However, there always seems to be a reason why they do not keep up.

Hon. T. G. Butler: Are you suggesting that dairy farmers are suffering more under this Government than under the previous Government?

Hon. C. J. BELL: Yes, they are. In the time of the previous Government dairy farmers fell on the index but not to the same extent that they are falling now. I will put the statistics in front of the member so that he can make his own judgment. I do not intend to put my point of view on hearsay; I have evidence for the truth of what I am saying. I have a statement here from Miss Felicity Malone, the executive officer of the dairy industry section of the Primary Industry Association. The subject is "Changes in dairy farmers' terms of trade from December 1982 to December 1985". I think that is a pretty fair period for us to consider the figures. An index was set up when I was president of the Dairy Farmers Association in the early 1970's. The document states that Western Australian dairy farmers have incurred a 24.5 per cent increase in prices paid for the inputs from December 1982 to December 1985. In the same period WA dairy farmers received an increase in the price of their products of seven per cent. From a base of 100 in December, dairy farmers' terms of trade are now at 86. That is a 14 per cent decline over the three years.

My knowledge of the industry indicates that is so. My dairy farm is run by my son. I have access to the books and I know how it is going.

It is now getting close to the point where the viability of the operation has to be examined very closely. I do not wish to put my case forward. However, it is generally accepted that I have one of the best farms in the south-west. That is the position of my operation and it is evidenced by the figures put out by the Primary Industry Association. Perhaps prices have gone up in Western Australia and Western Australian dairy farmers are doing extremely well compared with the national average.

I have figures for the milk margins on a State-by-State basis. The table shows the prices for milk in various States. Producers in Victoria, which is always quoted as the benchmark, receive 32.5c a litre. In Tasmania they receive 31.98c a litre, in New South Wales 33.1c, in South Australia 33.29c, in Queensland 37.24c, in Western Australia 31.69c, and in the ACT 24.465c. There is a reason for the ACT figure which I will not go into. Those figures show that Western Australian producers receive the lowest price for milk. The farmers in this State have not done well. The producers are not paid their fair share on a notional basis. The price to consumers in Victoria is 72c a litre, in Tasmania 76c a litre, in New South Wales 78.26c a litre, in South Australia 72c a litre, in Queensland 85c a litre, in Western Australia 78c a litre, and in the ACT 66c a litre. We pay the third highest price for a litre of milk. It seems that the consumers are paying enough but, for various reasons, the producers are not getting a very big share. Unless the problem is solved the industry will die. We will see Western Australian consumers using milk products which are not fresh at their breakfast tables. They will probably have to use UHT milk which is quite an acceptable product if one cannot get fresh milk, but it is not the same. I think members from the north of the State will say that frozen milk is not a reasonable alternative to fresh milk.

The Government has to make a decision on this matter. In the first week of Parliament resuming, I asked a question of the Minister about the administrative details of the dairy industry with regard to the transfer of farm quotas. About a year ago a moratorium was placed on the transfer of quotas because things were happening which were not anticipated. Unfortunately I have to say, "I told you so". I told this House when we debated the Bill a couple of years ago that certain practices would develop if the Act came into force. The industry recognised the problem and finally the Min-

ister acted to place a moratorium on the transfer of quotas. The Minister said last year that he hoped that, by the end of the year, he would have new proposals in place. Nothing happened. At the dairy farmers' conference in February, he said he would have something shortly; still nothing happened.

I asked a question two weeks ago and he said we would have something shortly; nothing has happened again. People have large sums of money swinging on the Minister's decision. It is not a difficult decision to make. He has just failed to come to grips with the situation. I know of a situation where a producer has \$1 million riding on the Minister's decision. However, all the Minister says is that we will receive a decision shortly. I would not mind if "shortly" meant a week or two weeks, but we have been strung along for a year and I consider that to be unacceptable. I ask the Ministers in this House to request the Minister for Agriculture to make the decision this week or next week and to not put it off again because he is being unreasonable. These people cannot be kept on a string for much longer.

If the Minister did not want to make a decision why could he not have said that the decision would not be made for one or two years, instead of kidding the people that he would make a decision shortly?

I alluded earlier to the Bird Cameron inter-farm comparison reports. It can be seen that apart from a very small group of farmers, virtually no farmers last year ran a positive cash flow. It has been downhill all the way. Unless something is done to address the problem, the communities of Harvey, Brunswick, Boyanup, Capel, and Margaret River will be in trouble because they all depend heavily on dairy farming. It is an intensive form of agriculture and spreads dollars through those communities right down the line. I think it is a very good industry, one which provides a good service to consumers of WA and one which exists for no other reason than to provide consumers with a service. Unless action is taken forthwith, our State will suffer.

I ask the Government to consider two factors. Firstly, what is its position with respect to the Kerin plan? What will it do to take off the savage impost on WA dairy farmers? Secondly, when will the Government look at what it has done to the dairy industry by allowing that to happen? The Kerin levy is likely to be around 1.5c a litre, which is a ridiculous amount. Farmers will be liable to pay the levy from today, yet it has not been decided what it will

be. If that levy is 1.5c and the Government agrees to it, the dairy farmers' returns will be based on justified costs via the prices tribunal. That being the case, why does not the Government come straight out and say that the price of milk will rise by that amount and tell the people of Western Australia that the reason the price is going up is to support the dairy farmers in Victoria and Tasmania? Why not say that straight out, because that is the truth? It is not an untruth; it is not a lie; it is the absolute truth and the Government should tell that to consumers.

If the consumers do not like it, they can take it into consideration at a later date, but they ought at least have the truth laid before them. I do not really want to say any more than that tonight because I intend to address rural problems in debate at a later stage.

With those few comments, I support the motion before the House for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply and say how much I enjoyed having the Governor with us for the opening of Parliament.

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

SUPREME COURT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 June.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [9.34 p.m.]: I thank Hon. John Williams for his comments on this Bill and I will respond to his various inquiries as best I can. Mr Williams inquired firstly as to the terms of Supreme Court judgments to be entered under proposed section 146.

The position in this respect is that the details which will appear on the section 14 certificate and the judgment are specified in order 44, rule 3 of the Supreme Court Rules. I will make a copy of the relevant order available to the honourable member. Details on the certificate might refer to the fact that the judgment was originally a District Court judgment, and that the judgment was entered into the Supreme Court only for the purpose of enabling the judgment to be enforced in a part II country. If those particulars are specified, it will depend upon the terms of the legislation of the country in which the judgment is to be enforced as to whether the receiving court considers that the Western Australian judgment complies with the overseas legislation.

If Western Australia received a similar judgment and certificate from a part II country, in accordance with the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act 1963, that overseas judgment would be recognised as a judgment to which part II of the 1983 Act applied, that is, as a judgment of the Supreme Court of Western Australia. I refer the member to section 7(3).

No exception in sections 6 or 7 is based on the fact that the original judgment of an inferior court was entered in a Supreme Court only for the purposes of overseas enforcement.

As the scheme is reciprocal—and that is the basis upon which Western Australia recognises the judgements from other part II countries—it is expected that a Western Australian judgment under section 146 would be enforced in another country. If the deeming provision in section 146 does not meet with the approval of another country, that country could amend its reciprocal enforcement legislation to create a specific exception to provide for cases of inferior court judgments which are deemed in the country of origin to be a Supreme Court judgment.

The reason why section 146(2) is limited only to the purpose of overseas enforcement is that if not specifically confined to reciprocal enforcement of foreign judgments, there may be ramifications in areas outside reciprocal enforcement, for example, in the area of appeals.

The reasons for the different criteria in section 142 of the Local Courts Act and proposed section 146 are that section 142 removals are not limited only to the purpose of overseas enforcement of the local court judgment removed into the Supreme Court. In practice, the broader purposes are now most unlikely to be utilised. There may well be a case for amending the Local Courts Act in this respect, but certainly there is no case to duplicate its provisions for the District Court now.

Proposed section 146 is in the Supreme Court Act rather than in the District Court Act because section 146 is empowering the Supreme Court, not the District Court, to issue a section 14 certificate under the reciprocal enforcement legislation.

A section 14 certificate involves the Supreme Court rules and the reciprocal enforcement legislation refers to the Supreme Court. Overseas countries for reciprocal enforcement purposes recognise Supreme Courts. One would therefore expect those overseas countries to look for such a provision in the Supreme Court

Act rather than the District Court Act. When the Local Courts Act is looked at for related purposes, consideration could also be given to bringing the local court provisions into line with what is now proposed.

I thank Mr Williams and the Opposition for their expression of support for this Bill and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 June.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [9.40 p.m.]: This is a small Bill on a very narrow issue. It was therefore surprising to be struck with the wide range of reaction which emerged in the course of the second reading debate.

In the first place we had Mr Pandal happily speaking on behalf of most of Opposition indicating his support for the Bill, but with reservations. His general line, as I recall it, was that it seemed sensible to free the Public Trustee from the advertising provisions in all cases, but he would prefer to see some other means found of adequately directing such matters to attention. On the whole, we had support for the Bill from Mr Pandal.

From other speakers, such as Hon. Max Evans, and I think Mr Gayfer as well, we had opposition to any change from the existing situation. There was yet another line of thought which suggested that we should discontinue the present practice but find another.

I arranged for the debate to be adjourned following those comments to allow me to follow up in rather more detail the specific points to which the Public Trustee had referred in requesting this measure in the first place. I guess it really comes down to finding some sort of dividing line between what is practical by way of reasonable administrative requirements and what is not.

I concede at once there is nothing magic about the figure of \$250. It could equally have been set at \$200 or \$150, or for that matter \$300 or more.

Basically I believe I should stay with the view that some sort of dividing line is necessary. Perhaps by way of illustration I can indicate some of the cases with which the Public Trustee deals.

The Public Trustee informs me that on the last occasion on which unclaimed moneys were advertised there were 84 individual cases, 32 of which were below \$250. A number of them were below \$100; one was as little as \$12; another was \$17.

Members will appreciate that somewhere along this spectrum one reaches the point where the game is not worth the candle. The advertising costs \$12 itself, so that we get through what is left of one estate on quite a pointless exercise. There are also substantial administrative costs in arranging for the relevant records to be maintained and the advertisements inserted. The Public Trustee is dealing with inquiries, almost 100 per cent of which never lead to anything.

Of the 84 estates advertised on the last occasion, and despite numerous inquiries which apparently were stimulated by the advertisement, only two possible cases are still being considered. Of the estates, 82 have been proceeded with under the Unclaimed Moneys Act.

Only two cases have remained for further consideration. It remains unclear whether those two will lead to any beneficiary receiving anything. That is not surprising, because it is in the nature of the administration of estates that the Public Trustee, perhaps unlike Wesfarmers—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I was talking about Wesfarmers and the others.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Unlike commercial organisations, in the ordinary course of events the Public Trustee has an obligation to chase beneficial recipients as best he can, not simply by writing to the last known address, but by making all reasonable inquiries of beneficiaries who are known.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I think you will find the companies do the same thing under the Unclaimed Moneys Act.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Perhaps they do. I would suggest that the Public Trustee probably feels a heavier obligation for the

administration of estates to take the inquiry further. When that sort of inquiry has been pursued for six years without result, the chances of achieving results, even after a couple of advertisements in the public notices section of *The West Australian*, are quite large.

Added to that are the sorts of costs which emerge. They become out of all proportion to what is being handled.

I know that trustees do not proceed with their charging system in the same way as solicitors or perhaps accountants, receivers, auditors and so on, where every item of attention gives rise to a charge. Every telephone call is worth probably at least \$10 of time to professional officers. Every time an inquiry by letter is replied to—I am not sure of the figure, but I would not be surprised if it was \$15.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: He has to do something some of the time. Is that not what he is there for?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: He does. What I am trying to point out to the member is that at the end of the day, if the estate is small enough, and if after six years of effort to chase down the beneficiary one has not got anywhere, the additional costs really only eat up the funds for no good purpose.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They are going to the Government. It is deducted off the total funds.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I do appreciate that. But even in terms of money going to the Government as opposed to going to the beneficiaries, there is something to be said against just burning up whatever remains there for its own sake. The fact it is only going to the Government is not an argument for saying, "It is better to waste it altogether rather than to let it go in that way, or to build up costs unnecessarily."

Hon. Max Evans: What labour costs will you expect to save if you do not do all these things?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: That is difficult to quantify because the costs involved are not so much the advertising costs, which can be quantified and have been quantified at \$12 a time, but the sort of time taken up by the staff with inquiries which, in practice, do not lead anywhere.

What I am saying to the House is that it does seem sensible, the question having been raised by the trustee, to relieve him of the more pointless aspects of the work that he does. It is a question of the dividing line and that is to be set by regulation; it will not be set by the legislation itself.

If it is thought that \$250 is perhaps excessive for this purpose and that any point would be served by juggling that figure down to \$200 or some other figure—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Twenty five dollars would be a good thing—two lots of \$12 and \$1 for the Government.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: If somebody wants to make some suggestion for a reasonable alternative, I am trying to indicate that this is not a case for being intransigent or stick-in-the-mud, and I would be interested in the views that were expressed. In general, however, there is a point where the exercise simply is not worth either the time or the funds involved in pursuing these questions further. For that reason, I suggest to the House that the Bill in its present form ought to be regarded as acceptable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon. John Williams) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I understand the quandary the Minister for Budget Management is in, but he must realise that members here are trying honestly to look after the small people who may have moneys due to them under the Public Trustee Act. That is all we are trying to do, and we drew a comparison for the Minister's benefit the other evening in respect of how a large company under the Unclaimed Moneys Act would advertise for all moneys over \$10 to ad infinitum—advertising in the *Government Gazette* and chasing up people and believing, because of that, that the company is able to distribute some of these moneys to worthy people.

I tried to explain to the Chamber how grateful people are when they receive those amounts—the widows, the workers with their wages, and so on. They are all very grateful to think that they are to be given a few dollars which they may have missed out on. The Public Trustee Act is different from the Unclaimed Moneys Act. The Unclaimed Moneys Act obliges people to publicise in the *Government Gazette*, but one is not obliged to publicise in the newspapers. One can, but is not said one must. Under the Unclaimed Moneys Act a company will deduct its advertising costs and

send the balance to the Public Trustee. That goes straight into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Under the Public Trustee Act the Public Trustee must advertise in the paper. It may cost, as the Minister said, \$12 a time to advertise and, if it does, why not bring the figure down to \$25, because then one will have tried twice and would still be \$1 in front, and the Government will still make a profit? I am dinkum about this because it is not the Trustee's money and it seems to me, judging from the way the Government is talking, that it wants to have as much profit as it can to swell its coffers.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I assure you that is the last consideration I have in my mind.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is how it appears to me, but I am speaking about the alternative—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You know me better than that!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am not accusing the Minister for bringing the Bill forward, but whoever has introduced the Bill has adopted a hard line on it and is certainly not out there trying to get the money back to its rightful owner or wherever it belongs. That is my belief.

Being associated with a company, I have quoted 600 names which it has published and which it has gone to great lengths of trouble to find. The newspaper is good because newspapers allow people to inform other people. The Minister may say that people do not read that particular section of the newspaper and that one might, as the Minister said, put in 83 advertisements with names and so on, but I do not think people miss that even in a large newspaper.

Nevertheless, they might not miss it and every opportunity should be given to them to find out. I think that the limit of \$250 is far too high. We should be looking at whether, indeed, it costs \$12 a line to advertise, because at \$25 the Government is still in front by \$1.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Mr Gayfer forgot FID tax, and that would cut the \$1 down even more.

I presume from the debate that there is never any individual costing against that estate—that any cost of chasing down the rightful owner of money is a cost to the Crown rather than to the estate? In other words, if there is a \$100 estate for which one is looking for an owner and one puts two advertisements in the newspaper, will the person receive the \$100 estate or the \$100

less the cost of advertising? In referring to the Minister's expression "cost effectiveness" as if there is going to be nothing left of the estate, I presume that actually it means there will be nothing left of the estate to give to the Government and that the whole of the estate will go to the person if he or she is found?

I think that this Bill is designed to allow the minimum amount to be laid down by regulation. If the Minister would give the Chamber some assurance as to that figure, Hon. H. W. Gayfer and others perhaps would be happy to go along with that. I think we need that assurance—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We will be in trouble when the regulation comes through.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right; otherwise the regulations will most surely go.

Earlier when the Minister was speaking I was not sure whether he referred to the fact that an advertisement could be for multiple estates.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Oh, yes.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It has been agreed upon. It is not done currently, is it?

Hon. J. M. Berinson: It is.

Hon. MAX EVANS: I would clarify that it is to be for multiple advertisements. That would be \$12 per line and I understand that the charge on the estate is a percentage of the value of the estate. Therefore, there will be no cost against the estate for the extra work done or the cost of the advertising.

This point opens up another line of thought in respect of unclaimed moneys and so on. The whole process of following these unclaimed moneys up and advertising them could be a pain in the neck when it comes to deciding a cut-off point. The same thing occurs with liquidation—wages can be the unclaimed moneys. However, this matter is somewhat different because it is dealt with in a person's will. The person may have decided where they wanted their money to go. It was their last wish, and everything possible should be done to fulfil it. I have been the executor of many estates, and that is what one tries to do—carry out the person's wishes. One loses money; there is no doubt about that. However, one tries to do everything for these people, although some of these estates are worth only \$5 000 or \$10 000, with small amounts to go out to various beneficiaries. This is the difference with CBH and Wesfarmers. The Public Trustee is a trustee which is given a job to do to the best of its ability. These large amounts are fairly material

to the people who would be receiving them. It is just that last line of approach on which they may proceed to get it. To a pensioner \$250 is quite a material amount.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I find it very hard to get impassioned in defence of the original proposal, because I must say that I sympathise very much with what has been said.

Let me clarify two matters of fact. The first is that the \$12 cost to which I referred—and this will weaken my position even further with Mr Gayfer—relates to the cost of both advertisements, not one, so that it would explain Mr Evans' query about the cost per line.

The second question was raised by Mr Wordsworth and, as I understand it, it relates to the fact that the charges against the estate by the trustee do not relate to individual services, but are a sum related to the value of the whole estate. To take up Mr Wordsworth's comments again, he used the term "cost effectiveness". I guess that is really what we are talking about. It is not a matter of who will end up with the money; it is certainly not a question of the Government looking for the odd windfall of \$12 or \$17 which will go into revenue if it is not collected. In other words, it is not a question as to whether it is cost effective in the sense of the value of the estate as opposed to the cost of the charges that are being made.

What we have here is a cost effectiveness question in which one compares the size of the estate, even if it can be distributed, with the costs of the effort of trying to find the people at the end of the line. At that point I suggest one reaches a situation where the game is not worth the candle. That is roughly what I have been saying throughout and I think it is the case.

I indicated earlier that, in the last set of advertisements, the Public Trustee included 84 separate estates and it led to the possibility of only two being pursued further. Only one of those would be cut out by this provision.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Mr Berinson, you give some; you lose some.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I was quite impressed with the detail Mr Gayfer provided in his original address related to the number of people CBH were able to actually locate at the end of the day, and that is an important difference, because in the example he is able to draw on he has an organisation which has people out in the field, which has directors who apparently know many people or who have a number of contacts, and in both formal and informal ways one eventually has a reasonably high degree of

placement of the funds with the people to whom the funds actually belong. The problem with the Public Trustee is that with the best will in the world and after intensive effort, at the end of the day one comes to these advertisements and virtually nothing is placed.

It was suggested by one of the speakers that there is no cost, because the public notice section is not read. As I am led to understand, there are indeed quite substantial numbers of inquiries, but virtually none of them leads anywhere with the result that, after these procedures, out of 84 estates only two were worth inquiring about further.

Suggestions have been made that the figure of \$250 might be excessive. I have conceded well in advance that I am open to suggestions on that, but I think Mr Gayfer's \$25 suggestion not only fails to take inflation into account, but also does not take account of the current exchange rate. Indeed, it hardly takes into account current postage charges.

I am quite happy to reduce this to a figure which would eliminate only those at the lowest edge of all of this and, if the Chamber is agreeable, I am prepared to reduce the \$250 to \$150.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about \$50?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I am not accustomed to this bazaar atmosphere.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about the little people? If you halve it to \$50 you are getting somewhere.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: We are starting at \$250. It appears Mr Gayfer wishes to reduce that figure to one-fifth. It is just a matter of being practical.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is being practical, very practical.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I do not want to make a big issue of it. It is obviously a very small issue. If it is acceptable to the Chamber I am quite happy to recommend that the regulations be amended so that the figure is reduced to \$100, but I believe that is as far as one should go.

Hon. MAX EVANS: The Attorney General related the amount of time to the amount of money. Really we are talking about the cost of the advertisement and the amount outstanding. The Attorney appeared to be saying that the

smaller amount related to a shorter period of time—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Following the advertisements there is further time and money spent in responding to inquiries which, on the whole, lead nowhere.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: We look as though we are getting somewhere. However, I put to the Committee the possibility that, if we accept a figure of \$100 here, straightaway there will be a move to insert that figure in the Unclaimed Moneys Act. Of all those little people to whom I referred last week, only 38 out of 600 related to an amount over \$250. I would have to go through the list again to find out how many of those amounts were under \$20 or \$30. However, if the amount of \$100 is used here, there will be a rush to insert it as the lowest amount in the Unclaimed Moneys Act and all the little people will be missed out.

I do not see why we are frightened to give back a sum of money to people. I can hear general agreement around me with the figure of \$100. However, that is a lot of money to some people and we should be looking at setting a figure below that. To some people \$50 is a lot of money. The advertisement is still only being placed twice at a cost of \$24, so the Government will still be \$26 in credit.

I believe we should agree that the figure of \$50 be used, because \$100 is too high. It is all right for the likes of us in the Chamber, but what about the little bloke? That is who I am worried about.

The bottom figure in the Unclaimed Moneys Act is \$10 and, if we take this step here, we shall soon see a Bill in this place seeking to change that figure to \$100.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [10.11 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [10.12 p.m.]: Now that the Bill has passed through the Committee stage and the Minister has on board the comments made at the time, I indicate

that I feel very deeply about this matter because I have had a lot to do in regard to trying to get rid of unclaimed moneys. I have done this over many years with a great deal of success, but if the regulation comes in at \$100 I will look very seriously at disallowing the regulation in order to get it to the more practical and sensible figure of \$50. I give the Minister that warning.

HON. MAX EVANS (Metropolitan) [10.13 p.m.]: I am concerned about two matters, one being unclaimed moneys and the other the executor estates of trusts. Trustee money is so much more important than other money and perhaps we should come back to a more realistic figure. Trust moneys go to persons.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.14 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Address-in-Reply: Amendment

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [10.15 p.m.]: The House should not adjourn until I have made one or two points and have set the record straight. Hon. J. M. Brown, during the Address-in-Reply, made some statements which I consider to be scandalous, mischievous and to some extent irresponsible; or, if not, certainly they showed a gross hypocrisy or a lack of knowledge of some of the matters he was talking about.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Nonsense.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me demonstrate what I mean. He accused the Opposition of moving an amendment to the Address-in-Reply which, I think he suggested, would embarrass or offend His Excellency the Governor of Western Australia and certainly would be seen to be criticising the Governor and would cause him concern.

Let me make it quite clear that the Opposition applauds the appointment of Professor Gordon Reid as the Governor of Western Australia. He brings honour to that position. Certainly his very charming wife backs him up completely; so there should be no mistake about the Opposition's position in this respect. The amendment to the Address-in-Reply is quite proper and great care was taken with the wording of it so as not to cause any offence whatsoever. In the words used we extended re-

spect and courtesy to His Excellency the Governor of Western Australia and certainly meant no offence. I remind members of the words used in the amendment as follows—

and begs to inform Your Excellency that in the opinion of the House the Government of Western Australia has failed to impress . . .

Those words were carefully thought out. To continue—

Accordingly, this House respectfully requests your Excellency to use his best endeavours to persuade the Government to inform the Commonwealth Government . . .

And so it goes on. Those words were carefully considered. Certainly no disrespect is intended. Indeed, it is the duty of the Opposition, if it thinks there is an issue of great importance, to bring such an amendment forward.

Hon. J. M. Brown: It is disgraceful.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That amendment was supported by Liberal members of this House, by the National Party and by the Independent member. I remind Hon. Jim Brown and members of this House of events which occurred over past years. I will quote from *Hansard* vol. 207 of 1975. On 18 March 1975 an amendment to the Address-in-Reply was moved by Hon. Ron Thompson. There were seven ALP speakers in support of that amendment and in fact every available member of the Labor Party in the House supported and spoke on that amendment. A division was called for and there was solid support from the ALP which voted en bloc as usual. The debate began at 9.00 p.m. and finished at 1.45 the next morning. A division was held and every Labor Party member supported the amendment. The fact that they did not have the numbers, of course, is beside the point. Are Government members suggesting that the amendment was a frivolous one?

Hon. J. M. Brown: It was a shameful act.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! This is an adjournment debate and I will not allow any interjections whatsoever.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. Are members of the Labor Party suggesting the amendment was a frivolous one? In 1976 an amendment to the Address-in-Reply was moved by Hon. Grace Vaughan and there were four Labor Party speakers on the amendment. The debate

ensued from 7.40 p.m. to 11.00 p.m. on 7 April 1976. Page 309 of *Hansard* shows that that amendment was as follows—

However Members of this House express their concern that the Legislative Council has been brought into public odium and disrepute because of the Government's failure to initiate and implement those constitutional and electoral laws.

Having used those words, there was a division on the amendment on 7 April in which all Labor Party members once again voted en bloc to support that amendment. Is the Labor Party suggesting that amendment was frivolous, and that it was moved because they knew jolly well it could not be carried? If they do, that shows utter hypocrisy.

In vol. 215 of *Hansard* of 1977 on page 549 the Labor Party again moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. It was actually moved by Hon. Roy Cloughton. Six Labor speakers spoke on the amendment and debate lasted from 8.06 p.m. to 12.30 the following morning and the following words were used—

However, we deplore the fact that the electoral laws of Western Australia are based on malapportionment of electorates, and that this Government has failed to introduce legislation to provide for electoral reform;

That was a very long debate. There was a division and all Labor Party members supported that amendment.

Only a few days later, on 24 August, in the same volume of *Hansard*, Hon. Lyla Elliott moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply and that debate lasted from midnight until 1.30 a.m. Once again the words used were—

Hon. Mark Nevill: Do you support any of those amendments?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The words used by Hon. Lyla Elliott were—

However, we the Members of the Legislative Council desire to express our deep concern at the high level of unemployment in this State—the highest since the depression of the 1930's—and to register our disgust at the callous disregard shown for the working people of Western Australia by the State and Federal Liberal/National Country Party Governments.

Those are the sorts of words that have been used by Oppositions in amendments to the Address-in-Reply, and on each occasion those

words were supported completely in a division. Again, as a ploy by the Labor Party, every single one of them voted for that amendment.

In vol. 223 of *Hansard* an amendment was moved on 10 April 1979 by Hon. Robert Hetherington, and he will recall it well. There were six ALP speakers together with the mover of that amendment. Once again a division was called for and once again every single Labor Party member voted for the amendment.

Other Labor Party members suggested that those amendments were frivolous and not intended to be carried. Were they mucking around? I suggest not. I suggest that, if there had been sufficient votes supporting the Labor Party, those amendments would have been carried and the Labor Party would have been pleased that the amendments were carried. So, they are either completely false and hypocritical in their comments, or they were playing games at that time. Either way, they should be ashamed of themselves.

The amendment moved by the Opposition in this place, which was supported by the Independent and National Party members, was a very serious amendment on a serious matter—that is, the Bill of Rights which is before the Senate and which we feel is of great importance to the Western Australian community. We carefully worded that amendment so that we did not offend. At least we can say that we tried to get the maximum out of it.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You had the numbers.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course we did on that occasion. I suggest that there were at least five occasions that I have quoted when, had the Labor Party had the numbers, their amendments would have carried too. There was nothing wrong with the amendment. It was carefully worded and showed the respect that His Excellency the Governor deserves.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You are a bunch of bully boys.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Labor members have no respect for this House whatsoever. They play games and are frivolous. The sooner they can destroy the Legislative Council, the happier they will be.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [10.23 p.m.]: I wish to comment on the same matter because not only were remarks made by Hon. Jim Brown during his second reading speech, but also I was approached privately by a member of the Government requesting me to take action

under Standing Order No. 188 to rescind my amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Government members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I am trying to listen to Hon. P. G. Pendal and I am finding it increasingly difficult.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Standing Order No. 188 was referred to me by a Government member so that I could reconsider the position and move to rescind the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, an amendment which was carried last week.

I make no apology for having moved and then spoken on that amendment. I was happy to see the amendment carried and I make no apology whatsoever. Hon. Gordon Masters has made it clear to the House that what was good enough for the Labor Party and its members to have done 10 or 12 years ago, and on many occasions before and since, is good enough to be done now. He lulled members opposite into silence because there is no answer to that sort of hypocrisy whereby Government members have said that it was proper for them to have done this 10 years ago but it is now improper for Opposition members to do it today.

Secondly, is it not interesting that not once in the course of the debate last week on the amendment was this sort of objection raised by the Labor Party? Indeed, so seriously did the ALP take the matter that the best it could do was to offer one speaker on the amendment. It was therefore not an issue at that time: One wonders why it has become an issue one week later.

Thirdly, if it was offensive in any way to the Governor, to the Crown, or to the Parliament, I suggest that the Standing Orders would have prevented us from moving such an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. Therefore, one can only conclude that since the Standing Orders permitted it to be done, albeit unsuccessfully by the Labor Party in the past, it is perfectly reasonable, not just in the hands of the Opposition, but in the hands of every member of this House.

Further, I suggest that Hon. Jim Brown may well have been in breach of Standing Order No. 83 which states—

No Member shall reflect upon any vote of the Council except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

Hon. Mark Nevill identified himself as the writer of the note; I did not identify him. Neither Jim Brown nor Mark Nevill, nor anyone else on the Government side, moved to rescind the amendment according to Standing Order No. 83. Given that they did not do that, I suggest that Hon. Jim Brown is in breach of Standing Order No. 83 because it states quite explicitly that no member shall reflect upon the vote of the Council.

Point of Order

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: The appropriate time for Mr Pendal to be raising this matter was at the time of the member's comments. In highlighting a breach of Standing Orders, he is now in breach of the Standing Orders himself because he is reflecting on the Chair at that time. If the member was out of order at that time, the Chair would have ruled him out of order and Mr Pendal would not now have the right to reflect on the Chairmanship of the House at that time.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Has any member of the Government side felt—

Government members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Obviously it will be difficult to close this debate if members continue to interject or hold across-the-Chamber chatter. The member has the right to be heard in silence as each member has the right to rebut his comments.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It is inappropriate for Hon. Jim Brown to reflect on a vote of this House when he had, in accordance with Standing Order No. 83, the facility open to him to move that such a vote be rescinded. The fact that he did not do that, I think, indicates the hollowness of what he said.

This was not a question of numbers; it was a question of principle. It was a question upon which many members of this House correctly felt there was some need for an expression of view by this House to the Federal Government via His Excellency the Governor. I suggest that the Governor, who was appointed by this Government, has a far more robust understanding of what Parliament is than to be offended by what happened in this Parliament last week. Professor Reid is a student of politics and history and he may well say to himself privately that this sort of action by a House of

Parliament, regardless of what the Executive wants to say or do, is precisely why we have Houses of Parliament and why they must discharge their duties properly.

Minister for Education: Comments

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [10.28 p.m.]: I do not believe the House should adjourn until I refer to comments made by the Minister for Education on the Channel Two news this evening. He made comments which I consider to be below-the-belt comments about an alleged incident that occurred 20 years ago.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Is it true?

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon. John Williams): Order! I have spoken twice before and this is the third time. Members are forcing me to take certain action which I am loath to take. I will not allow any interjections at all.

Hon. N.F. MOORE: The comment made by the Minister is not true. I deny categorically that what he said was true. In fact, I propose to take legal advice to see whether what he said was libellous or defamed me in any way. Thus I put the Minister on notice that those sorts of comments will not go unchallenged.

HON. J. M. BROWN (South-East) [10.30 p.m.]: I just want to respond briefly to the comments that have been made by two mem-

bers of the Opposition parties. Standing Order No. 83—

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: Order! I have not made a ruling on Standing Order No. 83. I propose to ignore Standing Order No. 83 because in this position it is not effective.

Hon. J.M. BROWN: That is exactly right; it is not effective. The motion has not been carried. If Hon. Phillip Pandal is aware of that, he does his party a disservice by suggesting that the motion had been carried and that I was breaching Standing Orders. The motion has not been carried; it has been amended. That is what the Address-in-Reply debate is all about.

I said that it was shameful that the Government had to convey to the Governor such a message, because it had not been done since 1973. We are all well aware of why it was carried in 1973; the same reason applies in 1986. We have not got the majority in this Chamber. An amendment to the Address-in-Reply in either Chamber has not been conveyed to a Governor since 1973.

I do not disagree that it is politically expedient for Oppositions to move amendments to Address-in-Reply motions. It has always been part of the operation of Parliament. However, in my opinion, to move an amendment and have it carried in opposition to the Government's wishes, and to convey it to the Governor, is a shameful and disgraceful exhibition by members of the Opposition.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

NATURAL DISASTERS

Flood Levels: Bassendean

75. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

In the *Eastern Suburbs Reporter* of 11 and 18 March 1986 articles appeared concerning flood levels at Bassendean. In one of those articles it was stated by a spokesperson for the Water Authority "that an impact report would be released by mid-April outlining the reasons for the review and the background to issues surrounding the Swan River."

Will the Minister advise—

- (1) Whether the newspaper report is correct.
- (2) If so, whether the report has been released.
- (3) Will he provide me with a copy now or when it is released?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) In general terms, yes. It was the Water Authority's intention to release a report entitled "Swan River—Causeway to Middle Swan Road Assessment of the Impact of Floodplain Filling on 100 Year Flood Levels" by mid-April 1986.
- (2) No. The report is still in draft form.
- (3) Yes, upon the final report being released.

COURT ORDERS

Reciprocal Enforcement

77. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Attorney General:

Could the Minister advise of the names of the countries party to the reciprocal enforcement scheme referred to in his second reading speech on the Supreme Court Amendment Bill 1986 delivered to the Legislative Council on Wednesday, 11 June 1986?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The names of the countries to which reciprocity has been extended are found at pages 226-228 of the 1985 Index to Western Australian Legislation, a copy of which has been provided to the member.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Advertising Costs

145. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Industry and Technology:

- (1) How much has been spent by the Department of Industrial Development on media advertising in each month of this financial year on—
 - (a) television;
 - (b) newspapers; and
 - (c) radio?
- (2) How much was spent in the following way on media advertisements—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area; and
 - (b) in country areas?
- (3) How much of the department's communication budget remained as at—
 - (a) 31 December 1985; and
 - (b) 31 March 1986?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) (a) to (c)

Month	Television	Newspapers	Radio
1985	\$	\$	\$
July	—	1 227	—
August	—	6 458	—
September	58 834	12 896	172
October	68 906	23 111	1 118
November	114 559	14 512	—
December	—	7 479	—
1986			
January	29 116	9 161	—
February	4 203	6 571	—
March	—	4 218	—
April	90	1 266	—
May	22 091	1 177	—
June	117 388	15 500	—
	\$415 187	\$105 576	\$1 290

- (2) (a) \$412 119;
- (b) \$63 000.
- (3) (a) and (b) See (1) above.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Advertising Costs

194. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Industry and Technology:

- (1) How much does the Minister's department or the Technology Development Authority pay each year for its television advertising and promotion?
- (2) What tangible benefits are claimed to arise from the current television advertising?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I refer the member to the answers provided to questions 142 and 145.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Albany Highway-Duncan Street

196. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that on 28 July 1983, I asked his predecessor whether lights would be installed in Albany Highway, Victoria Park, near Duncan Street?
- (2) Is he aware Mr Grill said signals were being considered?
- (3) Is he aware of a fatality on the nearby crosswalk on Saturday, 16 March 1985 and the promise that "further investigations" would be made by the Minister?
- (4) Is he aware that on 23 April 1985 after criticism by me of the delay, his office contacted me asking my opinion of where lights should be located?
- (5) Is he aware that as a result, local people's suggestions were gathered by me, and forwarded to his predecessor for consideration?
- (6) Further to his predecessor's letter to me of 11 July 1985 will he say what action, if any, has been taken to improve safety at this intersection?
- (7) If no action has been taken, what is the reason?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (7) Agreement was reached with the Perth City Council recently on desirable treatment at this location. It is proposed to provide pedestrian operated pelican signals early in the next financial year.

LIQUOR

Palace Hotel: Plot Ratio Bonus

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

- (1) Is it correct that the owners of the Palace Hotel site were given a plot ratio bonus if they were to preserve part of the Palace Hotel?

- (2) If so, is there any obligation on the owners in these circumstances to preserve the interior of the building including the entrance, staircase, and lounge?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There is an obligation to preserve the interior of the building, although alterations will be needed to accommodate its new use as a bank.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Beldon: Classrooms

200. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

Further to your answer to my question 114 of 17 June 1986 can the Minister advise when the next stage of classroom additions is likely to occur?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

At current rates of enrolment growth, provision of additional permanent accommodation at Beldon will be made from a future Budget in several years time.

EDUCATION: SCHOOLS

Scarborough Electorate: Building Programme

201. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister provide a breakdown of the commitment to spend \$5 million on schools and programmes in the Scarborough electorate?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The member will be aware that pre-election commitments are currently being examined in the light of the national economic situation. Until that examination is completed, I am not able to advise the full extent of programmes in the Scarborough electorate.

EDUCATION: SCHOOLS

Victorian: Drug Problem

202. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the recent Victorian Government survey of 9 000 students which revealed a major drug problem in schools in that State?
- (2) In view of the findings of the Victorian school drug survey and the recent statement in Western Australia by a policeman at a seminar on drugs, that every high school has a drug problem, will the Minister institute a factual study to identify the extent of the drug problem in Western Australian schools?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes—the survey did not indicate the prevalence of drug use in schools. It was a survey of school children and their use of drugs.
- (2) No—in terms of the use of drugs by school-aged children, there is sufficient evidence around Australia—and within this State—to indicate the directions our prevention programmes should take.

FISHERIES

Equipment: Import Duty

217. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Does imported equipment for the Western Australian fishing industry carry import duty?
- (2) If "Yes", what is that duty?
- (3) What action does the Government propose to take?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (3) The matter of import duty is a Commonwealth responsibility. If the member has a specific item of equipment in mind and provides details, inquiries of the appropriate Commonwealth department will be made.

FISHERIES

Imports: Dumping

218. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has the Minister received complaints of subsidised imported fish being dumped on Australian and Western Australian markets?
- (2) If so, what action has been taken?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Complaints were received last year in relation to salmon.
- (2) A report was prepared by a consultant, a summary of which will appear in the next issue of *Fins* Volume 19, No. 3.

FISHERIES

Imports: Misnamed

219. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has the Minister received any complaints of the marketing of imported fish in Australia or Western Australia wrongfully marketed under the name "Dhufish"?
- (2) If so, what action has been taken?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

MR MATHER

Visit: Sponsorship

220. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Is the Department of Employment and Training involved in the sponsoring of the visit of Mr Mather the Director of the Apex Charitable Trust in England?
- (2) Who is paying the cost of bringing Mr Mather to Western Australia?
- (3) What is the cost?
- (4) What functions have been or are being organised for the proposed visit of Mr Mather?
- (5) How many people have been invited to each function?
- (6) What is the expected cost of each function?

- (7) Who is paying for each function?
- (8) What is the total expected cost of the proposed visit of Mr Mather?
- (9) What is the total cost to the Western Australian Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (9) Mr Mather is visiting Western Australia in connection with the activities of the Department of Employment and Training.

To collate the information the member requires would take considerable time. If he has a particular reason for his inquiry he can communicate it to me and I will consider it.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Services: Cost

221. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What is the total number of consultants used by the State Government between 1 July 1985 and 16 June 1986?
- (2) What is the total cost of these services?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The member will be aware that it will take considerable time and expense across the whole range of Government activities to extract the information he is seeking. If he specifies his reasons for requiring the information, I will give consideration to applying resources, which will have to be diverted from other tasks, to provide the information he seeks.

HOUSING: ONE-BEDROOM UNITS

Fremantle: Tender

223. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Who submitted the successful tender for the construction of 24 one-bedroom units in Thompson Road—ex fire station—North Fremantle for Homeswest?

- (2) What was the tender price?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Cattia Investments Pty Ltd trading as Doncaster Homes.

- (2) The lowest tendered price was \$1 189 785 however negotiations with the two lowest tenderers resulted in a final contract price of \$1 064 680 being signed with the original lowest tenderer.

HOUSING: ONE-BEDROOM UNITS

Fremantle: Tender

224. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Who submitted the successful tender for the construction of 12 one-bedroom units and eight three-bedroom units in Harvest Road—ex ice works—North Fremantle for Homeswest?

- (2) What was the tender price?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Cattia Investments Pty Ltd trading as Doncaster Homes.
- (2) \$1 121 285.

HOUSING: THREE-BEDROOM UNITS

Fremantle: Tender

225. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Who submitted the successful tender for the development of nine three-bedroom units in Burford Place, North Fremantle?

- (2) Will these units be available for rental and possible sale to tenants on completion of construction?

- (3) If not initially available for rental, will the units be available for sale?

- (4) Are the units freestanding or terrace-style units?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Jaxon Construction Pty Ltd.
- (2) The units have been constructed for rental purposes.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Four units on lot 108 are terrace-style, five units on lot 105 are freestanding.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

Offices: Staff

226. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) How many staff members are there in each Minister's office?
- (2) What are the titles of each position?
- (3) According to Public Service classifications, what level is each position?
- (4) What salary applies to each level?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (4) As indicated in the Premier's answer to question 207 in the Legislative Assembly, full details of Public Service staffing arrangements in Ministers' offices will be set out in the Public Service list, as published each year by the Public Service Board, and tabled in both Houses.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS OFFICE

Reorganisation

227. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Is the Office of Industrial Relations the subject of a major reorganisation?
- (2) If "Yes", when was the office last reorganised?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

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

WATER RESOURCES

Fluoridation: Population Required

228. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is there any ruling which states that a town must have above or below a certain number of residents before it can be forced to put fluoride in the water supply?
- (2) If so, what are the conditions for fluoridating public water supplies?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The committee on the fluoridation of public water supplies had a general policy to recommend fluoridation for towns with populations of 2 000 or more.
- (2) Answered by (1).

DEFENCE

Coastline Surveillance

229. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police:

- (1) What is the level of surveillance of the Western Australian coastline for illegal operations, including the entry of drugs?
- (2) What additional surveillance was provided by the Federal Government following the request by Western Australia to the Commonwealth in October 1985, to extend its aerial surveillance of the WA coastline in a bid to restrict drug trafficking?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) As the questions raised by the member are of a somewhat confidential nature, arrangements will be made for him to be advised in writing on a confidential basis.

HEALTH

Prescriptions: Computer Checking

230. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Health Department installed the computer for analysing prescriptions from doctors and pharmacists in Western Australia?
- (2) When was it installed and when did it become operational?
- (3) What was the cost and how was this financed?
- (4) What will the operating costs of this computer be?
- (5) (a) Has the computer, to date, identified any drug addicts; and
(b) if so, how many?
- (6) Has the computer identified any suppliers of drugs to addicts?
- (7) Who carried out the functions of the computer prior to its installation and operation?
- (8) How many people are employed in this project, both prior to and since the introduction of the computer?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Installed over the period October 1985 to January 1986.
- (3) Hardware and software costs—\$80 000. 100 per cent funded by the Commonwealth under the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse (NCADA) programme for 1984-85.
Programming and data entry operators costs for 1985-86 funded under NCADA cost-shared arrangements (\$56 000 in total).
- (4) Estimated total cost—\$63 000.
- (5) (a) Yes;
(b) to date approximately 10 serious cases have been identified, with a number of cases of minor misuse.
- (6) The computer monitors "licit" not "illicit" use of certain drugs and is aimed to protect doctors from addicts seeking drugs from several doctors simultaneously on a pretence of illness.
- (7) The function was carried out by the same pharmacists as are presently doing so, but on a smaller scale on a manual basis.
- (8) Two data entry operators, plus approximately two-thirds of the time of a full-time pharmacist. The only increase in personnel are the two data entry operators, who continue to be employed under funds provided under the NCADA cost-shared arrangements.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

Consultants

231. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

Further to his answer to my question 186 of 19 June 1986, I ask—

- (1) Which consultants will be appointed?
- (2) What functions will they carry out?
- (3) What is the expected cost of appointing each consultant?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) It is anticipated that it will be necessary to appoint a variety of consultants in order to carry out research and consultation with Aboriginal communities, to provide technical expertise regarding the provision of utility services to Aboriginal communities, and for other associated purposes.
- (3) The expected cost of appointing each consultant is not known.

RONALD JOSEPH DODD

Charges

232. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Has Ronald Joseph Dodd appeared in any court to face charges since his parole on 6 September 1985?
- (2) If "Yes", on how many occasions has he faced charges?
- (3) What were the charges?
- (4) Was he found guilty as charged on each occasion?
- (5) What sentence did he receive for each charge he was found guilty of?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (5) Ronald Joseph Dodd was convicted on 31 January 1986 of possession of a smoking implement and fined \$250.

MOTOR VEHICLES: GOVERNMENT

Fringe Benefits Tax: Liability

233. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

With regard to the 18 449 Government motor vehicles registered—

- (1) Would he advise the approximate amount of fringe benefits tax that the Government will pay to the Federal Government on the motor vehicles?
- (2) Why did the Government not protest to the Federal Government against the fringe benefits tax because of the cost to this State and the taxpayers?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) \$1.7 million, based on 1985-86 figures supplied to Treasury by departments and authorities.

- (2) Requests have been made to the Commonwealth Government for the tax payments to be treated so as to have a neutral effect on the State's finances, just as in the Commonwealth's own position. This would have virtually eliminated the cost to the State. To date these approaches have not been successful.

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Margaret River: Funding

237. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) In view of the need for a new hospital at Margaret River will the Government make a firm commitment to provide funds for the provision of this facility?
- (2) If a commitment can be given when may it be expected that construction will commence?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) and (2) This project will be considered for funding as part of the capital works programme for 1986-87 and details will be announced at the time of the State Budget.

LIQUOR

Licensing Court: Referrals

238. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) How many referrals has the Minister made to the Licensing Court under section 3, subsections (3) and (4) of the Liquor Licensing Moratorium Act?
- (2) How many such applications have been successful?
- (3) Who were the successful applicants?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 133.
- (2) 49.
- (3) Successful applicants were—
Norseman Football Club
Mandurah Offshore Fishing Club
South Mandurah Bowling and Social Club
Zuytdorp Restaurant, Kalbarri

Schnitzel Inn Restaurant, Subiaco
Midland Guildford Cricket Club
Morley and Districts Recreation Club
Fremantle Lawn Tennis Club
Tomorrow, Perth
Lakelands Country Club
Club Oscar, Perth
Nollamara Lawn Bowling Club
South Hedland Bowling Club
Sams Seaview Restaurant, Port Hedland
River Resort, Murray Location
Cinta International, Perth
Tinelli's, Perth
Pelsaerts, Geraldton
Makkas, Perth
Silver Sands Tavern, Mandurah
Yampi Recreation Club
Lake King Tavern
Carnarvon Yacht Club
Augenio's Restaurant, Geraldton
Greenhead Liquor Store
Fascine Lodge, Carnarvon
The Theatre, Albany
The Bunbury Atrium
State Equestrian Centre, Millendon
Chasers Restaurant, Albany
Oceania Trading Exchange, Fremantle
Don Camillo's Restaurant, Innaloo
Wanneroo Districts Rugby Union Football Club
Lodge Capricorn, Two Rocks
WA Deaf Recreation Club, Leederville
Christies, Fremantle
Iseyd Restaurant, Perth
Papa Luigis, Fremantle
Harbour Mill Restaurant, Fremantle
Binningup General Store
Royal Perth Yacht Club, Fremantle Annexe
Romano's Northbridge
Cervantes Tavern
Kingsley Tavern
Kelmescott Tavern
Cadbury Schweppes, Osborne Park

Mandurah Recreation Sporting Club
The South Perth Bridge Club

HOUSING

Orange Grove: Purchases

239. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it correct that Homeswest has purchased two properties in Orange Grove, namely in Staniland Street and Reservoir Road?
- (2) What was the purchase price for each property?
- (3) For what purpose were the properties purchased?
- (4) What is the land area of each property?
- (5) How many residences are on each property?
- (6) How many residences will be constructed on each property?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Lot 430 Reservoir Road—\$71 750.
(b) Lot 11 Staniland Street—\$98 500.
- (3) The properties were purchased for future development. The existing house will be used for rental purposes.
- (4) (a) 4.729 8 ha.
(b) 2.244 9 ha.
- (5) (a) Vacant land.
(b) 1 house.
- (6) There are no current plans to construct residences on the properties. Future use will be dependent on zoning of land.

LIQUOR

Licence Fees: State Comparisons

240. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Referring to the Premier's announcement on 24 June 1986 that liquor licence fees will be increased to 11 per cent, will the Minister advise the current liquor licence fees in percentage terms in each of the other States?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Current liquor licence fees in percentage terms in the other States are—

- Victoria 9 per cent
- Queensland 8 per cent
- New South Wales 10 per cent
- South Australia 11 per cent
- Tasmania 8 per cent
- Northern Territory
 - 11 per cent (consumption on licensed premises)
 - 16 per cent (consumption off licensed premises)
- Australian Capital Territory 9 per cent

LIQUOR

Licence Fees: Industry Consultation

241. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

In view of the Government's stated policy of consultation with industry, can the Minister advise the following:

- (1) Were representatives of the liquor industry consulted prior to the Premier's announcement of an increase in liquor licensing fees?
- (2) If "Yes", which bodies were consulted?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister advises that in the past few months she has met and discussed matters of concern to the liquor industry, with each section of the industry. The increase in liquor licence fees was not discussed as this was a budgetary decision included with other measures in the economic impact statement.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Fringe Benefits Tax: Payment

61. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

What action has the Government taken to deal with the fringe benefits tax in regard to Government employees, bearing in mind that the

fringe benefits tax commenced today, 1 July?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

If the member is referring to the detailed administrative requirements of complying with the new provisions, these are in the hands of Treasury and will be developed as the need arises.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Government: Logbooks

62. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

I am not absolutely sure whether this question is in the Minister's area, but from his last answer it may well be.

- (1) As the Budget manager with responsibility for State finances, would the Minister indicate at least whether or not he has some knowledge of the use of Government cars and whether those people using Government cars are all required to have logbooks?
- (2) If that is the case, is it true there would be some 18 000 to 18 500 logbooks issued as from today for Government cars?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not aware of the detail of the administrative arrangements involved. However, I can say that among other efforts being made by the State Government in respect of fringe benefits taxes, there is an effort to simplify the procedures involved.

DECEASED PERSONS

Death Certificates

63. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is he aware that some bereaved families are experiencing serious delays in the issuing of death certificates in Western Australia?
- (2) Is he also aware that it takes five or six weeks to get a death certificate issued here, compared with about one week in Victoria and under two weeks in South Australia?
- (3) Would he look into the matter and see if the time can be reduced?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) Generally there is no excessive delay in the availability of certificates, bearing in mind that 14 days is allowed for lodgment of the information papers with the registrar, and time is then required for checking and compilation of the register. In straightforward cases I am advised that the certificate should be available approximately five days after lodgment of the documents with the registrar in Perth. There may be some delay if there is a defect in the information papers or if they are in transit from the country, and some further delay if the death is the subject of a coronial inquiry.

If the member has some specific instance of difficulty in mind, I would be happy to have further inquiries made.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Ngal-a Mothercraft and Home Training Centre: Funding

64. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Budget Management:

The Minister would be aware of Treasury discussions that have taken place with Ngal-a mothercraft home in South Perth.

- (1) Have final decisions been made in regard to Ngal-a's State funding?
- (2) If final decisions have not been made, would the Minister be prepared to receive a deputation on the matter to review any of those possible decisions?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) To my knowledge no final decision has been made in respect of Ngal-a's funding for 1986-87, and in fact no such decision would normally be anticipated until later in the Budget process.
- (2) The consideration of funding for Ngal-a is now subject to the advice of the Minister and the Department for Community Services, in that the decision has been made to move this item out of the Miscellaneous Services section of the Budget.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

*Ngal-a Mothercraft and Home
Training Centre: Funding*

65. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

Given that the position is as outlined by the Minister for Budget Management in answer to my last question, is the Minister for Community Services prepared to receive a deputation from local members and representatives of

Ngal-a mothercraft home in regard to the 1986-87 financial arrangements which, if carried out by the Government, could have a marked and substantial impact on that organisation's finances?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I will be visiting Ngal-a within the next two weeks. I have already made an arrangement to meet with that organisation.

