

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 21 August 1985

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

### *Election*

The following members were elected Deputy Chairmen of Committees, on motion without notice by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House): Hon. John Williams, Hon. Lyla Elliott, Hon. Robert Hetherington, and Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

## SESSIONAL ORDERS

### *Adoption*

Debate resumed from 20 August.

**HON. G. E. MASTERS** (West—Leader of the Opposition) [4.37 p.m.]: My colleagues and I have had a careful look at the motion before the House which was moved by the Leader of the House. I make these points:

When the proposed new Standing Orders were introduced into this House and it was proposed to change the procedures dealing with questions, petitions, and the like, I was one member who strongly opposed the changes. I must acknowledge that I can now see some considerable advantages in the new method, but also I have some very strong reservations in other areas, and I know my colleagues share my feeling that some refinements need to be made and some changes are absolutely necessary.

I do not propose to oppose the motion before the House but I wish to move an amendment which I hope will overcome my fears and, certainly, the reservations of members of the Opposition.

I move an amendment—

To insert at the end of the motion the following—

Provided that the Standing Orders Committee shall report not later than 21 days from the day on which this Motion is passed on the effect and operation of the said Rules.

I think the appropriate course of action is to continue with the procedures we adopted before Parliament rose in May this year; in other words, we should return to the new form that we adopted last session, but with a proviso that within three weeks or 21 days of this motion

being passed the Standing Orders Committee will report back to the Legislative Council. That 21-day period will provide sufficient time for those members who have some reservations about the matter to put forward their thoughts and arguments to the Standing Orders Committee and the committee could then consider those reservations and possible changes, and in reporting back to the House could hopefully reflect the reservations of some members and make further alterations to our Standing Orders and the methods whereby we deal with questions in particular.

In summary, the amendment will have the effect that we will carry on as we did prior to this session, but the Standing Orders Committee is to report on the aspect of reservations of members.

**HON. P. H. LOCKYER** (Lower North) [4.40 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition because I think it is through that amendment that we can best deal with this matter. I call upon all members who are concerned about some areas of these sessional orders to ensure that they approach one of the members of the Standing Orders Committee to put their point of view. I understand some members are happy with the method of asking questions. However, others are not. Personally I feel that the matter does need more fine tuning. I think many members are concerned that the questions are not put in their booklets early enough in the afternoon.

Even though I support the amendment I feel it is essential that members approach the Standing Orders Committee. That committee has already put forward its point of view; but that does not mean that it cannot be reviewed. If members are to vote on this matter in 21 days they should ensure that their points of view are put to the Standing Orders Committee in order that that committee can present a proposition that is acceptable to everybody.

Amendment put and passed.

Question, (motion, as amended), put and passed.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 20 August.

**HON. FRED MCKENZIE** (North-East Metropolitan) [4.44 p.m.]: I guess I am lucky today because I have been given the first opportunity to make some comment on the Federal Budget. I think that, despite all the whim-

perings and wailings by members on the other side of the Chamber, they will find it very hard to knock this Budget.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Ha, ha!

Hon. N. F. Moore: What about taxation?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I indicated yesterday that I wish to see whether we can proceed for a good portion of this session allowing members to speak without being interjected upon. I have said on previous occasions that members do not have to agree with what others say, but they will each be given an opportunity to properly put their point of view. I believe we should respect the rights of others to put their points of view. Hon. Fred McKenzie currently has my permission to submit his.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I wish to quote from an editorial appearing in today's *The Australian*. That newspaper, traditionally, does not support Labor Governments. It states—

Mr Keating's Budget is essentially concerned with economic management rather than with social reform. However, although it contains few initiatives of the kind dear to the hearts of Labor supporters, it does not disregard what the Treasurer has described as "Labor's social priorities".

It is a prudent Budget, and when taken in conjunction with last May's economic statement and the stance taken by the Federal Government at this year's Premiers' Conference the total budgetary package is tougher than Australians have come to expect.

Its major purposes appear to be twofold. Its first objective is to secure a continuation of economic growth and a significant increase in the number of jobs available in the private sector. Its second aim is to provide relief for some of these sections of the population most adversely affected by the recession.

Special assistance has been promised to the young unemployed, and increased financial aid will be given to the related area of education. Social welfare payments to the most desperately needy have been augmented in real terms.

I have heard it said repeatedly in this place that the Federal Government and this Government have not taken notice of the plight of the rural community.

Hon. W. N. Stretch: That is very evident.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: That may be Mr Stretch's opinion. However, in relation to farmers, *The Australian* stated—

Farmers will benefit from various measures, in particular by a reduction in excise duties and tariffs to which they are now subject.

I take issue with Mr Stretch in relation to how far we have gone in assisting farmers. There are more than just farmers in our community. For example, I have been unhappy about the treatment given to welfare recipients. I represent many people who are social welfare beneficiaries. The editorial in *The Australian* stated that the Budget contains few initiatives of the kind dear to Labor supporters. I acknowledge that. However, I think all sections of the community have to make sacrifices in these harsh economic times. They are not something new. They have been with us for many years. However, it is pleasing to see that a Federal Government has the initiative to tackle the many problems that confront it in an attempt to share the burden equally among all people in the community.

I recognise that many people in my electorate are unhappy about the Budget. In fact, I should have been more radical in relation to the treatment that social welfare beneficiaries have received. I know that members opposite have educated me about the needs of the farming community and I have taken that into account, despite the fact that we have had a record grain harvest and will receive record earnings from that harvest. However, it is very hard to explain to some people the realities of the situation.

Rather than being as apprehensive today as I was yesterday in respect of what the Federal Government might do and how it might affect the chances of the Burke Government's being re-elected next year, I think we can be very grateful for the responsible attitude adopted by the Federal Government. That attitude will certainly mean that members opposite will have to scamper back to their electorates at every opportunity in an attempt to ensure that they give themselves the maximum opportunity of being re-elected. The one weapon the Opposition thought it might have had is gone. I am very appreciative of the efforts of the Federal Government to assist the State Government. The Federal Government has also achieved a reduction in the deficit. It is a very substantial reduction from \$6.7 billion to \$4.9 billion.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: What was the actual deficit?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I do not have those figures at my fingertips. Perhaps the honourable member would like to tell me what they are.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): I am sure that the member will provide them in a separate speech.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Let us consider some of the Budget initiatives. An extra \$5 a week is allocated for single people under 18 who have been unemployed for less than six months. The health vote has been increased by 9.6 per cent to \$6 701 million. The education vote is up by 9.4 per cent. There is to be a \$70 million three-pronged attack on youth unemployment. With regard to Medicare, the one per cent levy is to stay in place, but the threshold is to be raised to exempt more low income earners from paying the levy.

With regard to rural aid there is to be no excise on diesel fuel from 1 November.

Hon. W. N. Stretch: That is less than \$1.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The honourable member cannot complain—rural industry has copped something from the Budget. Furthermore, tariffs on grain harvesters are to be replaced by a local production subsidy from 1 January. That should be of interest to Hon. A. A. Lewis as a former dealer in farm machinery.

The defence vote has been increased by 10 per cent to \$6 535 million. There are to be no new or increased income taxes, sales taxes or excise duties. An amount of \$22.1 million has been allocated for a national campaign to combat drug abuse. An additional \$48 million has been allocated to the ABC, which is renowned for serving country and remote areas. I could go on forever about the good things in the Budget.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: I want to know about this no excise at all.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am quoting from *The West Australian*. I bothered to read it this morning. It appears that Hon. A. A. Lewis did not. I will repeat, for the benefit of the honourable member, what *The West Australian* said about rural aid. It reads—

No excise on diesel fuel from November 1. Tariffs on grain harvesters to be replaced by local production subsidy from January 1.

Those are the benefits to the farming community.

I turn now to the Governor's Speech and its implications for Western Australia. I have no doubt that the Federal Government has been helped by the responsible and good management of the Western Australian State Government. In the less than three years we have been in office we have demonstrated to the people of Western Australia just how well we can manage the Western Australian economy.

Employment in Western Australia has increased by 8.7 per cent. That figure was mentioned in the Governor's Speech and can be compared with the national average of 5.8 per cent. Furthermore, we have a Budget surplus this year. Certainly it is a small surplus of \$811 773. That compares favourably with the previous Government's record. The State's finances now reflect the results of almost 2½ years of frugal and sound financial management. When we took office the State's finances were in a parlous condition. The O'Connor Government left a deficit that threatened to blow out to more than \$30 million in 1982-83.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is absolute rot. It has been disproved so many times. You have repeated it so often you are starting to believe your own garbage.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: It has not been disproved. The honourable member has not had access to the Treasury. We have. We can prove our statements.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Have you?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I have not personally had such access, but the Government has.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: So you are believing the garbage that is being fed to you?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: It is not garbage. It is the honest truth. I cannot help it if members do not believe it; that is entirely up to them. The majority of people in this State certainly believe it. When we took office the Budget threatened to blow out to a deficit of \$30 million. There were only four months left of that financial year. We reined in the deficit to \$14.2 million by the end of the financial year. In the following two years we have had small surpluses.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Tell us all the additional taxes you have put on—the financial institutions duty, the tobacco tax, the whole bit. This is called financial management, is it?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Taxes and charges imposed in this State in the last two Budgets, have been quite reasonable. Certainly we had to introduce some additional taxes because the previous Government left us in such a sorry plight. However, we reined in the deficit. I do not want to repeat the speech I made on the one-day sitting. It left members opposite sitting in their seats with not a word to say.

I remind people of the importance of having a Labor Government in office. I am sorry about only one thing, and that is that I am not to face the electors in the 1986 election. I am very unhappy about that because it would be a wonderful time to be re-elected. I cannot see as far as 1989, but I would be very happy to be in the position of those members who are then to face the electors. I am sure that my colleague, Hon. Tom Stephens, would have the same view.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It will be a pleasure, yes, an absolute pleasure.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Let us now consider some of the things that we have achieved in the last 12 months. I have already spoken of the Budget surplus of \$811 000. We have had a very buoyant year. In spite of the doom and gloom spread about, farmers have still planted their acreages. We are trying to help them. If any State Government has done anything to try to assist farmers—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! There is audible conversation between Hon. Colin Bell, Hon. A. A. Lewis and Hon. Kay Hallahan. I ask those members kindly to listen to the speaker in quietness.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Perhaps the honourable members do not like to hear what I am saying. I know that it is bad news for members opposite, but I have to get the message over. I hope the members do listen intently because last year we received \$2 674 million for our agricultural products. It was a record. I mentioned earlier that there was a record grain harvest exceeding nine million tonnes, including 6.5 million tonnes of wheat.

Perhaps I can put it this way: The Australian Confederation of Industry or some similar body congratulated the Government. It is hard for that body to congratulate Labor Governments, but it said the Government had done very well. It was a combination of good management and good luck. I will be charitable, I will acknowledge that there has been some good luck; but I would like members opposite

to acknowledge that there has also been good management. We must be fair about it. I try to be fair with members opposite by bringing in these points. There has been good luck, but I must emphasise that there has been a lot of good management.

Let us see how the confidence of the people in the community is reflected. As far as retail sales are concerned, there has been an increase of 23.7 per cent in two years. Surely that is not a bad barometer of the community's confidence! Couple that with the number of bankruptcies, where there has been a 25 per cent reduction. This has occurred during the period of the Burke Labor Government. There has been a heap of achievements, and we will remind the community of them. People have short memories and they forget, but I will be doing my best to remind people of the wonderful record this Government has and the sacrifices it is prepared to make to ensure that the community is well looked after.

Several members interjected.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: To give members an example—I am not talking about peanuts—because of the need for the Commonwealth to reduce the deficit, which it has indicated is happening successfully, we were left in a bit of a hole in respect of preschool education. However the State Government accepted that challenge and it is prepared to pick up the tab for that shortfall in education funding for preschool to the extent of \$4.86 million. Credit must be given where it is due. We must take this matter seriously and congratulate the Government on picking up that sum of money in an area which will have an important effect on the future of education in our society.

On the other hand the State Government has played a leading role in respect of the agricultural costs crisis when compared to other State Governments around the nation. The Burke Government has been endeavouring to fight higher fuel taxes. We have been approaching the Federal Government indicating to it the crisis in agricultural areas in respect of costs, and we have taken a stand to fight these higher fuel taxes. We have pointed out that the Federal Government is taking more than its fair share and therefore we believe that it should take into account the amount of revenue it is receiving currently from fuel taxes.

We have launched a campaign for the reduction of tariffs and other barriers. The Federal Government has taken notice of that. As a

member of the Government I have had to go along with the pace at which deregulation has proceeded. I think it has been far too quick, but it has been done to assist people in the rural areas. Deregulation has made the situation very difficult for a number of workers in the rural areas, particularly those working in the railway industry. In my opinion, it has been too rapid, but on the other hand great concern has been shown in the rural areas.

Hon. N. F. Moore: You do not mind if I quote you?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: We have provided substantial assistance to non-metropolitan dwellers on electricity and water charges recently, and there has been a real reduction in Government charges.

Several members interjected.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: In regard to the State fuel franchise levy, that has been frozen in 1985-86.

Hon. N. F. Moore: You said you wouldn't put it up at all.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Since its introduction in 1979, when it was set—

Several members interjected.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: All right, Mr Deputy President, let me quote a few figures. Members are talking about the levy of the State Liberal-Country Party coalition Government. During the last three years of that Government's term the levy on petrol rose by 105 per cent, compared with 17.3 per cent during the three-year term of the present Government.

Several members interjected.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: There is now a suggestion that we should wipe out the fuel levy altogether.

Hon. N. F. Moore: We have committed ourselves to it.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Where will you get the \$40 million from? Be honest.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I am being honest.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! I will not have debate between members in the Chamber. At times I will accept someone interjecting on the main speaker, but when it becomes a subsidiary debate, then I will start to name members.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: One of the members interjected that the Opposition had committed itself to getting rid of the fuel levy. That just shows how incompetent they are.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr Edwards is coming very close to being thrown out of this Chamber, I might add.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: That shows how incompetent people sitting opposite are to form a Government. I take it Mr Moore is a shadow Minister and will be a responsible Minister in a Government.

Hon. N. F. Moore: At the next election.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Heaven knows when that will be. Let us have a look at it. The member has not taken these things into account. The State's road building effort would be cut dramatically.

Hon. N. F. Moore: There would be no reduction.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: There would be a significant reduction in the allocation of road funds to local authorities—

Hon. N. F. Moore: It is all irrelevant.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Local government rates would rise dramatically in country and city. Country people would be the worst hit as they depend on good roads. Most of the fuel levy is raised in the city while the largest proportion is spent in the country—approximately two-thirds of the total raised. The bituminising of country roads would cease and city highway and freeway development would end.

Hon. N. F. Moore: No.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Main Roads Department would have to compete with departments like Education and Health for scarce funds from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The Main Roads Department would inevitably be cut down.

Hon. N. F. Moore: That is not true.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The member keeps saying that is not true. Tell me the next one is not true. Listen very carefully.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I have read it. It is Mr Grill's letter, is it?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: The next point I wish to canvass—and I want Hon. Norman Moore to listen very carefully and he will find this point hard to deny—is that the matching provisions under the ABRD fund would be invoked by Canberra, and Western Australia would lose a further \$90 million over the next 2½ years. The best yearly estimate of annual loss by the Main Roads Department for 1986-87 is \$21 million, in 1987-88, \$46 million; and in the year 1988-89 the figure is \$23 million.

Hon. N. F. Moore: That is not true.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Hon. Norman Moore must be in cuckoo land. He should know that there are matching funds.

Hon. N. F. Moore: We will be raising the revenue and the amount will be equal. It will come from other sources.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Not through a levy? What other sources does the member have?

Hon. N. F. Moore: It does not have to be done through a levy at all.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: He cannot answer that.

Hon. N. F. Moore: As long as the money is received, that is all that matters.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: If this levy were disbanded as is proposed we would have to rely on the railways to cart all goods stuff because the roads would fall into disrepair with the amount of heavy traffic on them.

I now turn to the next point. An immediate signal would be given to Canberra that road needs in this State do not have a high priority. This would lead to the Federal Government exercising its discretion under the Australian land transport development fund to further reduce Western Australia's allocation of Commonwealth road funding by 10 per cent and allocate it to the States of New South Wales or Victoria, which are putting the pressure on for additional funds. The State's major industries of agriculture and mining would be prejudiced. The members opposite claim they are representing these people!

Hon. N. F. Moore: You are not going to a lot of trouble to claim you are not saving any money.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: They would be prejudiced because they depend on an efficient transport system and good roads. If the member wishes to argue about the road levy he can see the answers. Opposition members are foolish. They do not know what they are doing.

Hon. N. F. Moore: That document is based on a false premise.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: It would be a terrible thing if the people of this State gave its management into the hands of the people opposite.

I now turn to some areas in my own electorate to which I think the Government needs to pay some attention, and in particular refer to the area known as Redcliffe where recently the Tonkin Highway was opened. The work that was necessary in that area is now completed

and I think it is time to undertake the housing redevelopment scheme that has been talked about by the State Housing Commission for so long. There are many vacant blocks in that area. The road programme which probably delayed redevelopment has now been completed and I think it is high time the State Housing Commission looked at the development of that area because it is in a depressed state and certainly needs attention. I ask that the Minister for Housing be given a copy of my speech in order that he can make a response about what the State Housing Commission intends to do in respect of the Redcliffe area. This area is within five miles of the G.P.O. It is within easy reach of Perth, is fairly well serviced with public transport, and is a suitable area for redevelopment. It is a crying shame to see so much vacant land there. It is time the housing development in that area got under way.

While I am on the subject of matters concerning the Minister for Housing I wish to comment on the neighbourhood occasional day care centre required in that area. I refer to a letter sent to the Minister for Housing on 15 July 1985 from the City of Belmont wherein this matter was raised. The Minister replied—

Thank you for your letter of the 28th of May, 1985 in which you advised that the Child Care Planning Committee considered that the establishment of the above Centre in Sydenham Street was too close to the Belmont Day Care Centre and would be better sited in an area where there is a greater need.

The council received that reply from the Minister to its application for a centre to be constructed in that area. The site was not suitable according to the Minister. The council followed up the matter by saying—

In Redcliffe there are a number of aboriginal families and a Neighbourhood Centre in that location would be of great assistance to them. It is also an area where there is a great number of single parents and the Occasional Day Care Centre will be of benefit to these persons.

Council, at its meeting held on the 17th of June, 1985, resolved that another application be made to you for lots 1326 and 1327 Sydenham Street to be granted to Council free of charge for the establishment of a Neighbourhood/Occasional Day Care Centre.

The council has written to me requesting my support for its application, and that is precisely what I am doing in this speech. I am lending my support to that proposal. I do not want to become involved in the argument of where the centre ought to be located. This matter can be settled amicably between the parties concerned. There is a need for a centre of this type to be established in Belmont and the parties responsible should see that it comes to pass. If the need for the centre is established the parties can get down to the job of sorting out where it ought to go and have it operating as soon as possible.

I wish to raise a matter which concerns the provision of power services underground. I emphasise "underground". I raised the matter of underground power previously, particularly in those areas where there is a sandy terrain and I got a reply from the Minister at the time who said he was passing on the comments I made to the town planning people. I appreciate that, but despite that action, nothing seems to have happened. The Urban Lands Council continues to sell land without any requirement for underground power when it is developed. These blocks can be alongside a private developer who undergrounds the power. I can supply plenty of examples, and I know it is cheaper by about \$600.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Per block.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I accept that; actually it is a bit under \$600. Once the power is underground little maintenance will be required. At the moment we have the tremendous cost of the lopping of trees in local government areas which goes on year after year.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: It looks much better.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Yes it does. One can buy the land cheaper because there is a saving of \$600 and in percentage terms compared to the cost of a block of land the amount of \$600 is not high because blocks of land are very expensive. One only has to look in the papers to see that even in the poorest areas land is expensive, so we have to do something about underground power and get rid of all of these problems. The council is responsible for the cost of having trees lopped and as the trees get older the tops of the trees are taken off and they look horrible and untidy.

Then there is the damage that is caused in stormy weather. I do not think we are asking too much, so I am asking the Minister to look again at this matter. I happen to know that this

proposal is supported by the State Energy Commission, so we have made some progress. The SEC does not support its introduction in every area, only where it is suitable, and no place is more suitable than in the sandy soils of the metropolitan area. It may be difficult to put the lines underground in other areas and I would not press that point, but no real attempt has been made to put power underground. I will keep raising this matter until people sit up and take notice. I think it is necessary that power be put underground, and aesthetically it is a very important advantage.

I want to refer now to lawyers.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Hear, hear!

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am glad Mr Dowding said that because I hope he takes notice of what I am about to say.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: This is the last chance you will have before he gets to Maylands.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I have to say about Mr Dowding that he always listens.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: But he doesn't do anything.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: He does. If one puts a fair case to him he delivers. I have had many arguments with him—make no mistake about that—but he is a very good Minister and he will be sadly missed in this Chamber. I will miss him because for part of the time he was here we were in Opposition and his actions while we were sitting opposite were of great assistance in getting the Labor Party elected. Now we will be here for a hell of a long time. When he goes to the other place he will be just as valuable to members there.

I want Mr Dowding and Mr Berinson to listen very closely because this matter affects Mr Berinson as Attorney General. A gentleman in my electorate has visited me in recent times and has driven me crazy about a deal involving him and some other chap. He alleges his lawyer was incompetent. I do not know whether the lawyer was incompetent and I do not know whether my constituent really understood what the matter was all about.

We have to tighten the rules a bit, and this is where the Attorney General comes in. This is not the first case of this type that I have had. If it were the first I could understand it, but this has happened on at least two occasions and I am very concerned about it. It revolves around the credibility of one person against another. It is something which should be looked at and it could be overcome quite easily.

My constituent engaged a solicitor to act on his behalf, and the solicitor did that. My constituent told me he gave the solicitor certain directions but that the solicitor went against them and settled the case. The client told me he had no right to do so because he had told the solicitor not to settle. How does one sort that out? All it needed was some written authority to be given by the client to the solicitor. One can see where the matter falls down—the solicitor has no written authority to act. Apparently the silent rule is that he does act for the client.

I got rid of this gentleman, or so I thought, by dropping the case in Mr Berinson's lap. My constituent said he was fed up with me because I could not do anything for him and he was going to go to Mr Berinson. Members would not believe it but this man rang my office yesterday and said he wanted to see me because Mr Berinson could not fix the matter for him. I do not blame Mr Berinson—I am on his side. If he were able to do anything I am sure he would; I told the man that.

My constituent complained about his lawyer to the Law Society of Western Australia which referred the matter to the Barristers Board. So this man has been there and to Mr Berinson and back to me. God knows where he will go next! So that members can be clear in their minds about this matter I will read the reply this man received from the Law Society. It is as follows—

The Committee had before it all the relevant information including all the correspondence forwarded by you together with your letter of 12 June, 1984 translated by the Telephone Interpreter Service.

This man required a translation, so there may have been some misunderstanding in communication between him and his lawyer. He required the interpreter service so that he could properly correspond with the Law Society. The letter goes on as follows—

After due consideration of all the material before it the Committee concluded that this was clearly a case where there was a conflict of facts between yourself and the solicitors. In the circumstances, due consideration of the matter does not disclose circumstances such as to require or enable the Council of the Society to take further action in connection with this matter.

If you remain dissatisfied with the manner in which the firm has dealt with your affairs it is open to you to seek indepen-

dent legal advice with respect to the matter. Furthermore a formal complaints procedure is available to you through the Barristers Board of Western Australia.

He took the cheapest way out, and I do not blame him; he did not seek legal redress. I know one can do that, but it becomes expensive. He went to the Barristers Board, and provision exists under the Legal Practitioners Act for that to be done. The board wrote back to him in the following terms—

I advise that your complaint has been considered by the Barristers' Board.

It is felt on the basis of the information supplied and particularly on the basis of the conflict in the information given by you and . . . —you saying that you did not consent to the proposed settlement and the practitioner alleging that you did—that it is not open to the Board to make any finding in relation to your complaint. The Board has therefore resolved that it should not, of its own motion, take any further action in relation to this matter.

That is a logical explanation. He has been all over the place and is dissatisfied and unhappy with his members of Parliament. I ask the House: What can one do in a situation like that? The point I am making is that it could have been avoided had there been some form by which written authority could have been given to the solicitor to settle the matter on the man's behalf. He claims he did not give the solicitor authority, and the solicitor says that he did.

I am asking the Attorney General to tighten the rules so that this sort of conflict does not occur and people do not expect us as legislators to resolve the problem for them. We cannot resolve the problem, but we can do something about tightening the rules to ensure that there is no confusion and that solicitors have the authority to act. I ask the Attorney General to look at the matter.

I want to refer to another matter which came to my attention recently; that is, the fees charged by the legal profession. I am not casting all legal people in the same mould, but I want to relate the details of a case which came to my attention.

A member of our society was charged with a number of offences and sought legal advice and representation. He entered into a contract—I am not sure if that was what it was called, but it was a written document—which set out that the fee for the exercise would be \$50 000. That



is a lot of money in anyone's terms. Members can understand a person who is under stress and who is looking for a good barrister to defend his case to enter into such a contract. The barrister to whom I refer is well-known but I will not mention his name.

I am not raising this matter so that action will be taken. I understand that nothing can be done because a legal agreement was drawn up between the barrister and the litigant. I am aware that the Attorney General is fully conversant with the case.

The outcome of the case was that the barrister advised the litigant to plead not guilty. He did as he was advised and the case took only two days to be heard in the court. I am not sure of the work that was involved by the barrister prior to the case being heard in the court but the charge of \$50 000 appears to be excessive. It leads me to think that I am in the wrong game when I hear of such high fees being charged!

I would have thought that the barrister would have said, "All right, things change and instead of the fee being \$50 000 I will make it \$25 000." However, the barrister still wants his \$50 000.

I understand that if the litigant had not pleaded not guilty the case would have taken at least one month to be heard in the Supreme Court. Under the circumstances it would have been prudent of the barrister to reduce the fee. I am sure that his client expected him to do so.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Have you taken the matter up with the Barristers Board?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: That may be the next course to pursue.

The contract was that the litigant would pay the barrister \$50 000 before the case was heard, but he paid only \$22 500, which leaves an amount outstanding of \$27 500.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House to show how easy it is to get into such a situation. Apparently the client asked for an itemised account and he was advised by the barrister that he did not operate in such a way and that the client had agreed to the retainer of \$50 000. I believe that under the circumstances the outcome of the case should have been taken into consideration by the barrister.

I support the motion.

[Questions taken.]

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [5.53 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion, and like other speakers in this debate,

convey my good wishes to his Excellency the Governor and Mrs Reid, not only for the part they played in the opening ceremony of this Parliament a few days ago, but also for the way in which both of them are discharging the responsibilities of their high office.

As I move around my electorate and meet people who have had direct contact with the Governor and Mrs Reid it is apparent to me that without exception the people of Western Australia look forward to a long and continuous term of office on the part of his Excellency and Mrs Reid.

In the course of perhaps half an hour or so I want to canvas a number of matters which touch briefly on a national issue, a State issue, and some more parochial issues of direct concern to my electorate.

I was one of eight nominated delegates of this Parliament who attended the recent Constitutional Convention held at Parliament House in Brisbane. It was my second such convention, the first having been the Constitutional Convention held in Adelaide in 1983. If nothing else, my attendance at those two conventions has cured me of any romantic notion I might have had of those people whom we fondly refer to as the founding fathers of the 1890s. Any such notion I might have had about the function they discharged 90 odd years ago has vanished, because anyone who attends the conventions very quickly sees the point that perhaps not unlike the conventions of the 1890s, the conventions of the 1970s and 1980s are in the main dominated by a small group of generally highly intelligent people who play the major role in the proceedings, perhaps because in the course of the year they have become most intimately involved in those items which eventually reach the agenda.

That observation aside, my reason for raising the question of the Constitutional Convention is to draw the attention of the Parliament to what I consider to have been the abysmal behaviour and contempt displayed by the Premier of this State when he attended the Constitutional Convention in Brisbane recently and the contempt with which he treated its proceedings.

A Government member: For allowing you to go?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: If Mr Burke had been a delegate to the Constitutional Conventions of the 1890s, with the level of negativism which he managed to bring to the conventions in Adelaide and Brisbane, we might never had

had a Federal system of Government in this country. I might add in parenthesis that that might have not been a bad thing.

It is a great pity to see, in a forum of that kind, the Premier of a State take such an abysmally negative and destructive view of the proceedings of the convention. I venture to suggest not one other leader of any political persuasion in Australia played a more destructive role, albeit a pompous and sometimes immature role, than the Premier of this State. He swept into the convention, stayed a very short time, made a lot of negative comments while there, was rebuffed—unnoticed by the media—in a very serious way and then was able to leave the convention chamber and head off to amuse himself elsewhere in Australia.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Do you think the role this foreshadows for the future of the convention is significant? I would venture to say that the fate of the convention will reflect that the Premier was spot-on in all respects.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I regret to say that not one other Labor leader, apart from Mr Bowen, subscribed to the view given to this House just now by the Attorney General. As a matter of fact I refer to the humiliating defeat Mr Burke suffered when he called on the convention, to use his own words, to put itself out of its misery. He saw fundamental flaws in the way the convention had conducted itself and saw no good reason why it should continue; yet at the end of that debate only people like himself and Mr Bowen, who is a deadly foe of that kind of forum and would prefer that our Constitution were sorted out by league footballers and television actresses, supported Mr Burke.

The fact is that the convention in Brisbane decided by an overwhelming vote to continue its life, albeit in a modified form, but substantially in the same form as it has been for the last 12 years.

Mr Burke stood apart with Mr Bowen in calling for the end of these conventions, and he was rebuffed soundly and humiliatingly, not only by the Liberals and the National Country Party people present, and by those representing local government, but by those representing other Labor States, particularly the Labor State of Victoria.

Having made those remarks, it is now incumbent upon the Premier of Western Australia to give the people of this State and the Parliament some definitive understanding of where he stands and where this Government

stands on the question of future Constitutional Conventions in the modified form under which they will continue.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The second matter that I want to touch on during this Address-in-Reply debate has particular relevance to my own electorate and, I dare say, to the electorates of other members. The Police Commissioner's statistics indicate that it is a matter of significance for the State as a whole. I refer to what might fairly be described as the explosion of suburban crime.

Some two years ago my interest in the matter began, perhaps in the most human way of all. My house was broken into on two or three occasions which led to my asking some questions in this House of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to try to determine whether the problem was a local one in South Perth or whether it was a problem of a wider nature. At that time the responses I received from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services were sufficient to convince me and many people in my electorate that we were in fact dealing with a social and criminal problem of major proportions. If anyone suggests otherwise he need only refer to the annual reports of the Commissioner for Police under the category of "Breaking and Entering". I think that category covers both private dwellings and non-residential dwellings.

In the past four years we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of breaking and enterings—to the tune of 34 per cent. For example, in 1980 there were 17 008 breaking and enterings of homes in Western Australia; in 1981 the figure rose to 19 349; in 1982 there was a minuscule reduction to 19 223; in the following year, however, there was devastating news because the figure rose to 24 412, which is perhaps the most dramatic increase of all of the years to which I am referring. Then in 1984, the last year for which figures are available, the figure declined very slightly to 23 371. Notwithstanding that slight decline in the last year for which figures are available, there has been an increase in the number of breaking and enterings in round figures in the last four years of over 6 000, which in itself represents the increase of 34 per cent across Western Australia.

It is no secret, although it has not been said out loud or admitted officially by the Minister or the Government, that police operating in suburban areas, are at their wits' end in trying

to come to grips with that problem. I suggest that we are possibly looking at a situation where the police stations in the suburbs are grossly undermanned, and I hope the Minister will address himself to that subject in the forthcoming Budget.

Hon. Tom Knight: It is an increase of over 100 a week.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Yes, indeed. Grandiose figures are bruited about by the Minister for Police and Emergency Services and other members of the Government, about how the numbers of members of the Police Force are being generously increased. I think the last figure we heard related to an increase of 150 officers a year.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: Just because it is an increase does not mean it is grandiose, but just an increase.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I was not suggesting that the increase was grandiose. On the contrary, I am suggesting that the increase was insufficient. I said, however, had Mr Hetherington cared to listen closely, that it was regarded by the Government and the Minister as some sort of grandiose and generous increase. That is the point I am making.

If members care to examine those figures as I have done, even, for example, those of the past seven years, they will find there has been an increase in police strength throughout Western Australia of about 23 per cent. Using 1977 as the base year, we had a police strength in this State of 2 345 personnel. That was an increase of 57 personnel on the previous year. In the following year, 1978, we saw an increase in raw terms of 145. In 1979 we saw an increase of 68; in 1980 an increase of 85; in 1981 an increase of 13; in 1982 an increase of 37; in 1983 an increase of 131 under the O'Connor Government; and in 1984 an increase of 63.

My point in mentioning those figures is that they are confusing, to say the least. We are frequently told by Governments—not only by this Government but also past Governments—or we are led to believe, that the Police Force in any given year will be increased to the extent of 150 or perhaps 100 personnel. Yet the figures I have just mentioned indicate otherwise. The figures appear to indicate to me that they are discounted by members of the Police Force who retire, resign, or in some other way leave the force. There does not appear to be an increase in real terms in the period I examined, to which successive Governments have made annual reference. So

it is not true, I suggest, to say that any Government is increasing the Police Force by 100 or 150 personnel because it appears that the figure of 100 or 150 annually is discounted by those people who resign or leave the force.

Nothing seems to be working. I put it to the House and to the Minister, if he cares to examine it, that perhaps what we really need to combat the problem is some form of suburban crime squad. Members might recall that earlier this year the Government reacted very quickly when it was suggested that there was a major increase in crime by street kids in the heart of central Perth. That received much publicity and, as is the wont with this Government, anything which receives publicity, generally speaking, gets fixed up pretty quickly. It always puzzled me how the Premier and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services on that occasion were able, at the last minute, to find a way out of the problem that had been presented to them. Very quickly they were able to discover that more resources were available than they had led us to believe and those resources were being permitted to combat that problem involving the street kids in central Perth.

One is entitled to ask now, as I asked on that occasion, why was it that the Government could not equally find more personnel or more money to provide more overtime to personnel to combat the rising suburban crime rate to which I and other members have made reference on many occasions? It appears that where there is a will there is a way. Since there was no will on that occasion to come to grips with the problem of suburban crime, the way was not announced because the Government had no desire to find a way.

Finally on that point, I make a brief reference to an organisation which has become very active in the metropolitan area in recent months. I refer to the organisation called Citizens Against Crime. Unfortunately, that group has been the target of some fairly ungenerous comments by not only the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, but also some other Government members.

I do not agree with all of the group's aims. However, the formation of that group arose out of a sense of frustration on the part of ordinary law-abiding citizens of this State, particularly in the urban areas of this city, about their inability to see some attempts being made to repress criminal activities in the suburbs. It is natural, therefore, that those people would want to vent their frustrations by banding

together and calling on their politicians to become more supportive of the Police Force and to provide it with the wherewithal to combat that growth in suburban crime. Unfortunately, that group has become the target of ungenerous comments by the Minister for Police and Emergency Services when, in fact, the organisation is bending over backwards to be supportive of the Police Force of this State and particularly of the police whose job it is to combat suburban crime.

I wish to touch briefly on an associated matter which comes to mind when one reads the State-wide crime statistics. Again, the annual report of the Western Australian Police Department for 1984, in appendix H, deals with drug-related charges in Western Australia. It shows some rather curious and peculiar statistics. For example, it deals with statistics from 1979-80 to 1983-84 and looks at the age brackets of the people who become involved with the drug trade in various ways. I repeat that the heading is "drug-related crimes". The total number of drug-related charges for the 1983-84 financial year was 3 591. Interestingly, the number of people under the age of 18—in other words, the number of youths in Western Australia who show up in those statistics having been charged with drug-related offences—totals a mere 326. I remind members that the total number of drug-related offences for that year was 3 591, yet only 326 youths were involved. That is something less than 10 per cent of the total. Under the law, a youth is someone under the age of 18. It seems, then, that we may have been directing our efforts in the anti-drug campaigns at the wrong people.

One would have to admit that, if all of one's attempts to solve this problem are aimed at dissuading youths from becoming part of the drug trade, one would have to assume that they represent the majority of people playing around in the drug trade, using drugs, or in some way or another accounting for the majority of those involved in drug-related offences; but this is not so.

Earlier this year, arising out of the Prime Minister's direct interest in this matter, a campaign was announced by the Federal Government, requiring the support of the States to combat the use amongst young people of various drugs and narcotics. On 21 December last year *The Australian* carried a story about the announcement by the Prime Minister. Mr Hawke is quoted as saying—

We must educate our youth about the damage and danger of drugs and we must do more to rehabilitate those in our society with drug-related problems.

I have no argument with that and no right-thinking person would have any argument with it. Indeed, at the same time that Mr Hawke was placing emphasis on the need to educate young people away from drugs, we heard similar comments from other people. A Federal Minister repeated that the campaign would place a strong emphasis on educating Australian youth about the damage and danger of drugs. In the same article in *The Australian* of 21 December, comments were made by a spokesman for the Minister for Youth and Community Services in New South Wales, Mr Walker, who said that his department had to regard heroin essentially as a police problem in spite of the number of young addicts. He went on to say that the department had increased the accommodation in youth refuges around Kings Cross to try to protect homeless children.

The whole of that anti-drug campaign is predicated on the belief that it is a problem predominantly of youth. Yet, the crime statistics to which I have referred do not reflect that as a fact. I repeat that the people under the age of 18 account for a mere nine per cent or 10 per cent of the total of drug-related charges in 1983-84.

Therefore we may be spending millions of dollars on campaigns directed at the wrong people. Who says, for example, that we ought not to direct the bulk of campaign funds to people in the age group over 21 years who in this State accounted for almost 2 000 of the 3 500 drug-related charges? Is this Government spending and have previous Governments spent money on a section of the community which accounts for a minority of drug offences in this State? It is worth considering, because no Government in this day and age of financial stringency likes to waste money, particularly when the money might be better directed at those people who have the most need.

I make a last ditch attempt to persuade the Minister for Budget Management, who sits in this House and is responsible to a large extent for the framing of the State Budget, to right some of the wrongs of the past and to begin to direct some resources into the pro-family or pro-marriage groups. At the moment those resources are directed almost exclusively into pro-divorce facilities. I will quote seven or eight paragraphs of information on this matter

which provides a clear demonstration that Governments are more inclined to spend money mopping up after people have marital troubles. They direct very parsimonious amounts towards maintaining marriages and the family environment. I quote—

But marriage, it seems, is less popular with governments who, over recent years, have channelled extensive resources into divorce.

In the past financial year the Federal Government spent \$1 250 million on divorce and its associated costs.

This includes the costs of the Family Court, legal aid in the Family Court, and supporting benefits for single parents subsequent to divorce and separation.

To continue—

On the other side of the equation just \$4.1 million was allocated to marriage support services,—

I ask members to listen to this point in particular. To continue—

—a sum which amounts to only 0.3 per cent of the money spent on divorce.

The article goes on with a point that has relevance not only to the Federal Government, but also to the State Government. It is for that reason a few weeks before the State Budget that I draw the Minister's attention to the matter. I will make a request in this regard. The article continues—

In addition to this, many State Governments have recently reduced or completely withdrawn financial support from the constituent bodies of the National Marriage Guidance Council.

Among them our own WA Government has this year withdrawn all funding from marriage counselling services.

The article further states—

... there is a desperate need for a decentralisation of counselling services to country areas.

That may ring a bell more with country members of this Chamber than with me. The article continues in this vein—

A couple who separate or divorce and incur Family Court costs and supporting parents' benefits, cost Federal Government in the region of \$8 000 a year.

Additional costs to State Governments include increased demand for child care services and low cost housing.

Marriage guidance counselling costs a mere \$200-\$300 per couple.

The article concludes—

It's about time both Federal and State Governments took a fresh look at the marriage/divorce budget, and by adopting a positive attitude to marriage support, started to put the account into credit.

Perhaps no-one in this Chamber is untouched, directly or indirectly, by the harshness and the tragedy of marriage breakdowns, particularly over the last 10 or 15 years. One has to be careful about being judgmental on a matter as delicate as that and one with which most people have had some experience. The article I read is a plaintive call on behalf of a group which asks what seems to be a more than obvious question: Why is it that, to put it brutally, such miserable amounts of money are allocated to marriage support services? In some cases even that miserable amount has been withdrawn from such organisations as the National Marriage Guidance Council. At the same time an immense amount of money, some \$1 250 million, in some way or another is diverted from the public purse towards divorce and its associated costs.

I request the Minister for Budget Management in the course of the next week or two, even if he has put to bed his final figures in the Budget, at least to examine that area to see whether it is possible to divert some State funds to marriage guidance groups, be they church-backed or lay organisations operating in this State.

Finally, I reflect on the veracity or otherwise of that now famous Government propaganda exercise which was aimed at convincing the people of Western Australia to a contrary viewpoint than that they have fast been arriving at in recent months. Members will recall that the Government, funded by the Labor Party, has advertised extensively on radio and television and in the newspapers in order to convince people that State taxes and charges have been raised at a very moderate rate. The question arises that if that is true—I suggest that it is palpably untrue—why would the Government have to rely on hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of advertising in order to convince people of something which would normally be quite apparent to them? If someone receives from the State Government a tax or charges bill representing a moderate increase in such charges, would that not be apparent to the recipient? The recipient of a State Energy Com-

mission bill, a payroll tax account or a land tax assessment would know if those increases had been moderate.

Why is it that the Government has had to resort to an unprecedented campaign to convince people that all is well in the State of Western Australia?

Hon. Graham Edwards: It is not the Government.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I have explained that I accept the Labor Party funded those advertisements.

Hon. Graham Edwards: You are on the defensive already.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Not at all. I suggest the boot is on the other foot, and it is now this Government which is having to justify to the people how it can say on the one hand taxes and charges have risen in a moderate way, yet its own Budget figures show conclusively that the tax take from the people of Western Australia in the last two years has been, at a minimum, a 42 per cent increase. They are not Opposition-inspired figures; they are not figures that I have dredged up over the tea break to support my argument. They are figures that are available from Mr Berinson's own Budget document. Had there been a private company or private individual in this town who had sponsored advertisements as untruthful and as dishonest as those, he would have been charged by now under the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act of this State, or been taken to the Trade Practices Commission for false advertising.

Yet because it is the Government, no action has been taken. It has been committed to making the most outrageously dishonest claims in trying to bolster up its chances in the hope that in the next few months people will forget the obvious—the obvious being that they are now paying 42 per cent more to their State Government than they were two years ago. Can anyone tell me what section of the community or industry in this State has been able to experience the glorious situation where, in the last two years, its income has increased by 42 per cent?

The question can be asked of members representing rural constituencies. How many farmers would there be whose incomes have increased by 42 per cent in the last two years? How many businesses in country towns and in the suburbs have had an increase in their income in the last two years of 42 per cent? The answer is obvious. There are very few people who would have experienced that sort of rise

and certainly not the housewives of this State who would not have had anywhere near that sort of increase in their own family budgets. Yet this Government has the temerity to parade before the people of this State things that are patently false and misleading in the hope that it can gloss over those terrible rises that have been inflicted in one way or another on the people of this State. Unless people forget it, while the Government trumpets its capacity to allegedly give a 10 per cent cut in the land tax assessments for people in Western Australia, the fact is that income from that land tax has increased 50 per cent since this Government took office.

Stamp duty has increased by 45 per cent. How can anyone say that that is restraint? How can anyone say that that is going to contribute to a situation where people can learn to live with rising costs in their businesses or on their farms or in their homes? In the case of licences, many of which are administered by the Minister for Racing and Gaming, the income from those has increased over 100 per cent, from \$38 million in 1982-83 to a massive \$81.7 million in the space of two years. Again, this Government has the temerity to tell us that it is showing a great deal of restraint in its budgeting, and a 42 per cent increase in the tax take is somehow an example of that restraint.

I hope that when the next State Budget is brought down within a few weeks a real lesson will be shown to us in how to be financially accountable and restrained in spending, because so far in its first 2½ years in office, this Government has shown no capacity for that. I think that the proof will be how successful the Government is. The fact is that the Government resorted to a very expensive media campaign of classic propaganda; if you tell them a lie often enough, people begin to believe it.

Having canvassed those matters, I support the motion.

**HON. GARRY KELLY** (South Metropolitan) [8.06 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion. I wish to comment on a couple of points that arise from Mr Pendal's speech. At the outset of his speech he mentioned the Constitutional Convention in Brisbane and the alleged humiliation the Premier suffered at that forum. The second vintage of the Constitutional Convention has been around since about 1973, and it was designed to provide a forum and a body to discuss and debate suggested amendments to the Constitution under which the Commonwealth was formed as a result of an Act of the Imperial Parliament in 1900.

I am glad Mr Pental has at least been disabused of the fact that the founding fathers in those earlier conventions in the 1890s were altruistically motivated. Everything was far from lovely in those debates because a lot of horse trading went on before the Commonwealth of Australia Act was arrived at. The trouble with the Constitutional Convention is not so much the organisation but rather what comes out of the convention and what the various political parties do with the decision of the convention. The hard part is getting a referendum carried.

If we cast our minds back to the Adelaide convention of 1983, we recall that a number of resolutions came out of it. The simultaneous elections proposal was one. It is called the Terms of Senators question, and when it became a referendum there were also questions on the interchange of powers between the States and the removal of outmoded sections of the Constitution.

At the Adelaide convention the Liberal Party supported all those proposals and as far as terms of senators went, the Fraser Government sought that referendum in 1977 itself. The Federal Government went away from the 1983 convention with agreement on a number of referendum proposals. When it came to running them as referendums, the Opposition decided it was politic to oppose those. It went back on the vote it gave at the Adelaide convention and opposed them at the December election when the referendum was held.

The history of constitutional change in this country is that, with one notable exception, if either of the major parties oppose a proposed alteration, that alteration does not succeed. As soon as the Liberal Party made the decision to renege on the stand it took at the convention, those referendum proposals had an uphill battle.

I do not think the Premier was humiliated at all in the decision the convention took. He was stating a point of view that if the participants in the convention were going to carry on in the way they had in the past, the convention was becoming a very expensive talk-fest.

While I agree with Mr Pental's disagreement with Lionel Bowen's proposal of, I think he said, former politicians, league footballers, and ballet dancers forming a committee to look at the Constitution and suggest amendments to it, it could not be less successful than the present system. I hope the players in the body politic of the Australian Commonwealth are serious about looking at the Constitution and updating

its provisions, because a document written in 1898 or 1899 cannot be Holy Writ in the 1980s. It must be able to be amended, and there must be a certain amount of acceptance of a meaningful amendment process and a desire to play by the rules that the convention process lays down.

Another point raised by Mr Pental was the matter of a group called Citizens Against Crime Associated Inc. I have had several dealings with that group. I met with its members on 30 January this year for about two hours, and, strangely enough, again six months later on 30 July this year. It is a group concerned about the rise in crime in the suburban areas of Perth in particular, and I believe that its members are sincerely concerned about the increase that they perceive in the crime rate. They want action taken and remedies found to prevent the increase in crime and to reduce the incidence of crime.

I spent four hours in discussion with that group and perused a questionnaire that was published in the Press—I do not know if it reached suburbs north of the river, but a questionnaire was published in a local newspaper south of the river. My discussions with the group indicated to me that it seemed to look at only one way of tackling the crime problem, and that was to increase penalties—to lock people up and throw the key away and everything would be all right. It is a much more complex problem than that. The questionnaire itself contained leading questions, and although they did not mean it, the questions talked about putting people in the stocks, and whipping and so on.

The group lost credibility with me by that approach. It also implied that the Government had a vested interest in the furtherance of crime—that was the basis of one of their questions.

Although the group is justifiably concerned about the crime problem, its way of going about it and its suggested solutions worried me a little. Mr Pental said the group supported the police in their attempts to combat the incidence of suburban crime, but the group's answer would virtually be one of wanting a policeman on everyone's doorstep. That is basically its solution to the crime problem. Of course, apart from being hideously expensive it has all sorts of ramifications about the sort of society in which we want to live. The group's approach is unhelpful and unproductive, and is a resort to sloganeering without serious consideration of the problem.

I wish now to discuss the Government's record, and in particular its record of holding down Government charges. The Government has done an excellent job of containing costs and charges, and the advertising campaign that the Labor Party has run in the last month or so has not been a lie at all, despite the comments of the previous speaker. It has been a campaign to draw the attention of the public to the work the Government has done in the last two years to contain costs and charges to the public.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is a very woolly campaign.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I do not think it is woolly at all. It is a campaign based on fact; it is telling the truth. It would not incur any trouble with the Trade Practices Commission. The campaign sets out what the Government has done. The Government's tack has been to hold down charges so that families and businesses can carry out their functions within the State with the least impost that the State Government can impose on them. The taxes and charges announced in July this year are a case in point. It was the second successive year that most major State Government charges have been cut in real terms. There will be no increase in 1985-86 in six major Government charges, and all other charges will increase by less than the inflation rate, which has been assumed for this financial year as running at seven per cent.

That contrasts with the period of the last Liberal-National Country Party Government, when nearly all the charges rose by more than the inflation rate and some by as much as three times the inflation rate.

The Government's aim in setting these charges and in formulating and following its policy has been to preserve the living standards of families and to allow business to get on with the job of supporting the economic recovery. Mr Pandal raised some points about increased Government receipts—I think he said the increase was 42 per cent. A lot of that increase is due to the fact that the economy has recovered. Of course Government receipts will be increased in a time of economic recovery. I would have thought that that was something to be applauded. However, for some reason the Opposition wants to criticise the Government for the boost received as a result of its policies, and also to criticise it when the economy is benefiting from those policies.

I will now compare some of the charges of this Government with the record of the previous Government. These comparisons are of the Court and O'Connor Governments in the 1980-81 to 1982-83 financial years, during which period the CPI increase was 30.6 per cent; and the Burke Government's performance between 1983-84 and 1985-86, during which period the CPI rose by 21 per cent. I must say that there has been a decrease in the inflation rate in that period, due in no small part to the accord between the trade union movement and the Hawke Government.

Let us take the cost of electricity charges. For the period of the Court and O'Connor Governments electricity charges rose 50 per cent; for the period of the Burke Government, 23.8 per cent.

Let us look at the increases in charges for domestic metropolitan sewerage. Under the Court-O'Connor Governments the increase was 90 per cent; under the Burke Government the increase in charges has been 16.6 per cent. Under the Court-O'Connor Governments rent for a three-bedroomed State Housing Commission home increased by 41.4 per cent over three years; under the Burke Government the rent has increased by 18.6 per cent. The Opposition has made great play about removing the State fuel tax, yet under the Court-O'Connor Governments the tax increased by 105 per cent, compared with a 17.3 per cent increase under the Burke Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: The increase was 0.1 of 1c.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: The comparison in percentage terms is even more startling—105 per cent compared with 17 per cent.

Perhaps one of the most stark comparisons can be found in third party vehicle insurance charges. Under the Court-O'Connor Governments the charge increased by 176 per cent; under the Burke Government there has been no increase. I refer to one more figure which affects people in the north of the State—Stateships freight rates. Under the Court-O'Connor Governments those rates increased by 40 per cent; under the Burke Government they have increased by 16.5 per cent. Those are just a few of the charges relating to a comparable period of Government.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: How many years did the Court-O'Connor Governments rule?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I am talking about the three-year period from 1980-81 to 1982-83.



When one looks at those figures one sees that the Leader of the Opposition's repeated claim that the present Government is a high-taxing, high-charging Government compared with Liberal Governments does not stand up. Members should look at the figures; I cannot see how anyone could make a statement like that. The figures destroy the argument completely. The reductions achieved under the Burke Government are real, whereas the Liberal Government achieved almost none.

The Burke Government has been able to keep costs down as a result of contributions made to Government revenue by the WADC and Exim Corporation. Admittedly those contributions were fairly small last year, but as years go by they will increase and the Government's diversification of its sources of revenue will give it the ability to hold down charges. That ability will be enhanced to a greater degree.

Hon. N. F. Moore: You are going into business are you?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Is there anything wrong with that?

Hon. N. F. Moore: It is not what Governments are for.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: That is the member's opinion.

The statement by Mr Hassell and other Opposition spokesmen that they would disband Exim and get rid of the WADC are simply straight ideological statements—they are extreme right wing statements.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Drive!! What absolute tripe you talk.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: They are. Why would the Opposition want to dismantle enterprises which are producing a benefit for the State, increasing revenue, and taking the pressure off ordinary taxpayers?

Hon. P. G. Pental: Tell us about Exim's revenue.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I do not have the figures in front of me.

Hon. Tom Knight: No, you would not.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Members should give the corporation time.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. G. Pental: Strangled at birth!

Hon. GARRY KELLY: That is what the member would like to see.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will come to order when I call for order. Hon. Garry Kelly should ignore all interjections and not answer members' questions and direct his comments to the Chair. Then he will have no problems.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: It has to be conceded that Exim had a stormy passage when it was first floated. Those days are behind the corporation, and it will go on to become a valuable asset to the State.

The figures I have quoted prove that the Burke Government has been very successful—

Hon. P. G. Pental: In putting up taxes.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Rubbish! It has been successful in administering the State's affairs in a sensible fashion to produce the greatest benefit to the people of the State, particularly the average family which has benefited enormously.

I would like to touch on a number of other points. The other day a visitor came to my office who had had a bit of trouble with a franchise agreement he had entered into. He was in the transport business, and it is a subject I will take up later in some detail with the Attorney General. He bought a courier round under a franchise agreement and paid \$14 000. In return he was given access to the principal firm's radio network, a particular round, and customers. For the outlay of \$14 000 he got a return of \$420 a week.

The deal worked quite well for about 12 months and he had no problems. There were about 12 other franchise drivers in this company, and after about a year some of their pay cheques started to bounce. Luckily the gentleman who saw me had not received any of those cheques. A few weeks ago towards the end of July the drivers were told their rounds had been sold to a third party. About four or five drivers would be absorbed into the new firm, but it was bad luck for the rest of them.

The principal of the firm told them, "If you do not like it you can sue me, but there is no money, so bad luck. I will pay you the wages I owe you to the end of July when the firm finished." The \$14 000 has simply disappeared. The point that worries me is that I cannot understand how a firm can set up a franchise agreement and then sell those contracts or rounds to a third party. If it is not illegal—smart operators probably make sure it is not illegal—it is highly immoral. The principal firm has taken \$14 000 each from about 12

people who have to supply and maintain their own vans. Their means of earning a livelihood has been sold from under them and there is nothing they can do.

This case is in the hands of the Corporate Affairs Commission, but that will not recover the money these people have invested. It may lead to the principal of the original company being convicted of some breach of company law, but it will not do any good as far as the money those people have lost is concerned.

The Government should look at this matter, and probably the conference of Attorneys General should look at it because it must be addressed on a nationwide basis.

I refer now to another issue. I suppose all members have received such letters, but I have received a number from the tobacco industry, usually in the names of people who work in that industry. They are almost form letters, and they complain about the decision of Federal and State Health Ministers in Brisbane recently that from next year cigarette packets should carry new health warnings. Those warnings must cover at least 20 per cent of the front and back panels of cigarette packets and advertisements.

The new warnings on the cigarette packets will include, "Smoking kills", "Smoking is addictive", "Smoking damages the lungs", and "Smoking causes cancer and heart diseases." The letters I have received accuse Governments of reaping millions of dollars in taxes from smokers, and by putting these warnings on cigarette packets the people involved in the smoking industry will be deprived of their livelihood.

It is suggested in the letters I have received from people in the smoking industry that their jobs are being put on the line by the State Ministers for Health and that jobs are not easy to get these days.

It is strange that the smoking industry should be complaining about funds that the Government receives from the sale of tobacco products because during the debate on the legislation to ban cigarette advertising the tobacco lobby made great play of the fact that one of the ways to reduce the consumption of cigarettes was to increase the price of cigarettes.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: You certainly did that.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: We did and it had the right effect because the increase in the price of cigarettes has resulted in a decrease in their sale.

I do not know what people are suggesting when they say that the Government receives millions of dollars from the sale of tobacco products. The converse of the argument is that if there is a decrease in the price of tobacco products it will produce an increase in consumption which will lead to an increase in the nation's health bill. Smoking-related diseases cost Governments millions of dollars a year.

The final matter I wish to raise is in the form of a bouquet to the Government.

Hon. Tom Knight: That is very strange.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: It may be strange to Mr Knight, but I am sure he will agree with me when he has heard what I have to say.

Towards the end of last year the Head Injured Society of WA (Inc) made a request to the Government for funding. Unfortunately, the request was received after the presentation of this Government's Budget in which funding for the society did not get a guernsey.

A vigorous campaign was waged and several questions were asked of the Minister for Health and the Minister for Budget Management in this Parliament. As a result of the pressure put on the Government the society was put through the wringer and its operations were closely examined. The society had to justify its existence, and because it did not receive any Government funding last year it was placed in the position where it had to curtail its activities.

The investigation was conducted by the Health Department and it revealed that the society performed a valuable role in the rehabilitation of head injured people and counselling and help for their families, especially those in a crisis situation.

Once the Health Department gave the society a clean bill of health, so to speak, the Government came to its aid by granting it \$40 000 per annum for three years. The grant will enable the society to employ a full-time officer who will take the load off many of the volunteers. The society has been run on a shoestring for many years without any direct Government assistance, although it has received assistance from the Lotteries Commission.

The Government grant of \$120 000 over three years will enable the society to establish programmes and procedures that are necessary for it to effectively function. The Head Injured Society, and the various medical support groups, carry out many functions which the Government would not be in a position to

undertake in terms of money spent. Much of the work is done by volunteers; and without their efforts the delivery of health care to people involved in societies of this nature would not be available.

I congratulate the Minister for Budget Management and the Premier for agreeing to fund the Head Injured Society. It is money well

spent and I am sure the society will justify the confidence placed in it by the Premier, the Minister and the Government as a whole.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. W. N. Stretch.

*House adjourned at 8.36 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### MINISTER FOR TOURISM

#### *Overseas Trip*

6. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Tourism:

In view of the Minister's response to question 722 of 2 April 1985.

- (1) Was the Minister engaged in an overseas trip for the month of September 1984?

- (2) If so—

(a) what was the purpose of the trip;

(b) how long was the Minister away; and

(c) where did the Minister go?

- (3) What was the total cost of the trip in respect to the Minister?

- (4) Was the Minister accompanied by staff?

- (5) If so—

(a) who accompanied the Minister;

(b) what was the purpose of the staff accompanying the Minister; and

(c) what was the total cost to the taxpayer for staff accompanying the Minister?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (5) I have further considered the member's question and am not prepared to divert the considerable resources necessary to answer it, unless there is evidence of an inappropriate or an improper activity in relation to these matters.

7 and 8. *Postponed.*

### ARTS: OBJECT FIVE

#### *North-west Tour*

9. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What State Government funds have been made available to Object Five Theatre Troupe travelling in the North West?

- (2) What involvement does the T.L.C. have in Object Five?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The Object Five Theatre Troupe, now travelling in the Pilbara, is the theatre team working for the 1985 arts in working life theatre project of the WA Trades and Labor Council.

The TLC has received from the WA Arts Council and Instant Lottery funds a total of \$33 375 for this project.

### MINISTER FOR TOURISM

#### *Overseas Trip*

10. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Tourism:

In view of the Minister's response to question 722 of 2 April 1985—

- (1) Was the Minister engaged in an overseas trip for the month of October 1984?

- (2) If so—

(a) what was the purpose of the trip;

(b) how long was the Minister away; and

(c) what was the total cost of the trip in respect to the Minister?

- (3) Was the Minister accompanied by staff?

- (4) If so—

(a) who accompanied the Minister;

(b) what was the purpose of the staff accompanying the Minister; and

(c) what was the total cost to the taxpayer for staff to accompany the Minister?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (4) I have further considered the member's question and am not prepared to divert the considerable resources necessary to answer it, unless there is evidence of an inappropriate or an improper activity in relation to these matters.

## ENERGY: GAS

*Connections: Cost*

11. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What is the average cost to the consumer of connecting a domestic property to the gas main:—
  - (a) within a 5-mile radius of Fremantle;
  - (b) elsewhere in the metropolitan area?
- (2) What number of domestic gas consumers are there within the 5-mile radius of Fremantle?
- (3) Have any steps been taken to equalise the cost of connecting to gas in the Fremantle and non-Fremantle areas?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) (a) This question should be referred to the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd;
- (b) no cost to consumer for connecting to the gas main; a nominal cost of \$15 is charged for the meter box.
- (2) As for (1) (a).
- (3) No.

## HEALTH: ALCOHOL

*Community Approach to Drug Abuse Prevention Project*

12. Hon. N. F. MOORE to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is it correct that the State Government has refused funding to assist the Kalgoorlie Alcohol Team—Community Approach to Drug Abuse Prevention (CADAP) Project to send a group of young Aboriginal people to Alice Springs?
- (2) If so, why was this funding refused?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs declined to fund a request to send a number of young Aboriginal people to Alice Springs. The submission did not appear to have any clear objectives or

goals and it was unclear what relationship it bore to the prevention of drug or alcohol abuse.

- (2) As above.

13 and 14. *Postponed.*

## WATER RESOURCES: DAM

*Menzies*

15. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

I refer the Minister to his decision to close the No. 2 Dam in Menzies, and ask—

- (1) When is it intended that the No. 2 Dam will be reopened?
- (2) Why hasn't it been reopened already?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) When satisfactory neutralisation of the gold tailings dams located within the catchment has been completed and confirmed by analysis.
- (2) Because neutralisation of the tailings dams has not yet been completed. The present situation is that nine out of 12 ponds required to be neutralised have been completed to the required extent.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

*Confusion: Duplication of Title*

16. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Community Services:

In view of the fact that both Federal and Western Australian Governments now have a "Community Services Department", will he give consideration to altering the name of the W.A. Department to end the very high level of confusion in the community that has arisen because of the duplication in names?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

No. The Western Australian Government was the first to adopt this innovative title which was subsequently adopted by the Commonwealth and other States.

# WATER RESOURCES: DAM

## *Menzies*

17. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that shortages of water could occur at Menzies as a result of the closure of the No. 2 Dam?
- (2) If so, what action does he intend to take to overcome this potential problem?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Action is being taken to complete the neutralisation of the retreated gold tailings within the catchment area as soon as possible.

18 to 20. *Postponed.*

# TRANSPORT: ROAD TRAINS

## *Kalgoorlie-Leonora Road*

21. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

Are there any restrictions which apply to the type of road train which can use the Leonora-Kalgoorlie road?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Yes. Road trains are restricted to an overall combination length of 33 metres and generally confined to combinations consisting of an articulated vehicle with one trailer or a rigid truck with two trailers. A limited number of permits have been used for road trains consisting of an articulated vehicle plus two trailers but complying with the overall maximum length requirement of 33 metres.

22. *Postponed.*

# ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

## *Seaman Inquiry: Financial Assistance*

23. Hon. N. F. MOORE to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Has the Minister received an expenditure report from each of the individuals and organisations who were given financial assistance to prepare submissions to the Seaman Inquiry?
- (2) (a) If (1) is "Yes", will the Minister table these reports; and  
(b) if not, why not?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "No", which individuals or organisations have yet to lodge a report?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) This information is still being compiled and will be available in the near future.

# PLANNING: MEETING

## *Baldivis Hall: Public*

24. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is the meeting scheduled to be held in the Baldivis Hall on Monday, 28 August, 1985 open to the public?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so, what steps have been taken to advertise this meeting?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) A public meeting is scheduled for Monday, 26 August.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Advertisements in *The Sound Advertiser* on 14 and 21 August. In addition, the meeting is advertised at the public exhibition being held at the Rockingham Shire Office during the period 19 to 23 August inclusive. Letters have also been sent to ratepayers affected by certain proposals.

## EXPLOSIVES: TRUCKS

*Baldivis Road*

25. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that trucks carrying explosives are currently using Baldivis Road?
- (2) If so, does this mean that the Government condones the use of this road?
- (3) If not, will the Minister take steps to find out if it is correct that these vehicles are using this road?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. Baldivis Road is part of the prescribed route to minimise the exposure of the public to explosives in transit.
- (3) Not applicable.

## CHEMICALS: POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS

*Storage: Explosives Depot*

26. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Is the Government aware of any proposals to store PCBs at the explosives depot in Stake Hill Road, Baldivis?
- (2) If so, what are these proposals?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The PCBs will be stored in sound steel receptacles in a secure, continuously monitored area remote from any explosives stored.

When the quantity in storage is sufficient to make a freight container load, it will be packed into a freight container, in accordance with international maritime dangerous goods code specifications, and transported to France for disposal.

## TRANSPORT: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

*Concessional Fares: Abuse*

27. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that many MTT passengers are not paying the proper fare by using other people's Pensioner Health Cards and by over-riding?
- (2) If so, have any steps been taken to overcome this problem?
- (3) Is the Minister satisfied that there are sufficient Inspectors to prevent these abuses from continuing?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Without photo identification, the use of other people's pensioner health cards is nearly impossible to eradicate entirely. MTT surveys show that abuse of the ticketing system total less than 0.6 of 1 per cent. This is well below world standards.
- (2) Abuse of the public transport system is always under review and action is taken when and where necessary, including spot checks by inspectors.
- (3) The cost to completely eradicate abuses of the system outweighs the benefits gained. There are sufficient inspectors to hold them to an acceptable level.

28 to 30. *Postponed.*

## TRAFFIC HAZARD

*Mt Helena*

31. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a serious, and potentially dangerous, bottleneck occurs at the corner of Lion Street and Keane Street, Mt Helena, particularly at the beginning and end of each school day?
- (2) If so, what action is contemplated to overcome this problem?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Investigation will be undertaken at the beginning and end of the school day to determine the extent of the problem and, if necessary, examine possible means of improving the situation.

## HEALTH: DRUGS

### *Heroin: Trafficking*

32. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

What is the estimated amount and value of heroin trafficked in Western Australia each day?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

Not known.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### SPORT AND RECREATION: YACHTING

#### *12-Metre Championships*

11. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Are the reports correct which state that the Government is concerned that insufficient attention is being given to the world 12-metre yacht championships to be sailed off Fremantle in early February 1986?
- (2) If so, does the Government intend to make special arrangements to overcome the problem?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government is involved in the preparations for the America's Cup and it is, of course, aware that a series of races will be sailed off Fremantle for the world 12-metre yacht championships early next year. Those races will be organised by the Royal Perth Yacht Club. I hope the event will give us the opportunity to test the facilities we have already provided in Fremantle and which will be fully operational before those races are sailed.

I am in no position to say whether the Royal Perth Yacht Club is prepared. The Government is not making special arrangements. The facilities we are providing for the America's Cup will be used for the championships

and will be put to the test. In other words, it is intended to have a dummy run during that period.

## AMERICA'S CUP

### *Administrative Arrangements*

12. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is the Minister satisfied with the organisational and administrative state of the America's Cup arrangements at this stage?
- (2) Has the Minister received any reports expressing concern about the way arrangements are being made up to this stage?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) I am quite happy with the progress of the America's Cup arrangements to date.
- (2) It is true that I have made some comments to my ministerial colleagues in order that we may travel a little faster.

From my observations and the observations of others overseas the facilities already in place are first rate and in my experience are far superior to the facilities at Newport, Rhode Island.

Win, lose, or draw, as the head of the Italian syndicate told me the other day, the facilities provided will make Fremantle a world sailing venue.

### SPORT AND RECREATION: MOTOR RACING

#### *Grand Prix: Legislation*

13. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the South Australian Government's approach, by way of legislation, to handling the grand prix event?
- (2) If so, is the Government preparing similar legislation to set up a special corporation along the lines followed by the South Australian Government?



Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I am rather pleased with that question; it raises a completely different issue.

(1) I am very much aware of the corporation that has been set up in South Australia to handle the grand prix and also of the foundation set up in Brisbane to handle the Commonwealth Games.

(2) As an individual I would very much like to set up a foundation but I am not sure that we can do so at this stage.

I would need to introduce legislation to set up the foundation into this Parliament and get it through very quickly. Such legislation would deal with matters such as the sports extravaganza and other events outside the main event. In addition, it would allow the Government to receive sponsorship. That is the reason the foundation in Queensland and the corporation in South Australia were set up. Members will be aware that the Government cannot receive money even through a trust; and many organisations are not prepared to fund particular groups—there are two or three Australian challengers—but would like to be actively involved in the America's Cup.

We are considering the possibility of setting up a foundation but the time factor presents a problem. I am very much attracted to the concept of a foundation as was set up in Queensland but that State had a five-year lead time. I am also attracted to the type of corporation that was set up in South Australia.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It seems to be very successful.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is successful but a yacht race falls into rather a different category and poses many problems. In fact, the America's Cup will be run by the Royal Perth Yacht Club.

I speak as a member of this Parliament rather than as a member of the Government. Officers of the

America's Cup unit are coming to brief members of the Opposition on the current situation. I might add that I have been very much amiss in that I have arranged for members of the Opposition to be briefed and to be given all relevant information but I have not briefed Government members. Every day as we go down the trail on this big event other things are unearthed.

However, the two most important issues are well in hand: Firstly, if we are going to have a yacht race there must be a place to park the yachts and, secondly, a course has been set. If we wanted to hold a race tomorrow it could be done although there could be some hiccups.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

##### *Dispute: Ministerial Involvement*

14. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the dispute at the Port of Bunbury where a number of waterfront workers are disobeying directions given by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission?
- (2) Is it correctly reported that he will go to Bunbury tomorrow with his colleague, the Minister for Transport, Mr Grill?
- (3) If so, will he and the other Minister do all they can to persuade the workers to comply with the direction of Mr Commissioner Coleman; that is, resign from the Maritime Workers Union and rejoin the Australian Workers Union?

A number of ships are being held up at great cost and this move is imperative.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) I had a bet—not one which I expect to be held to and, since I have won, I will not be collecting it—that Hon. Gordon Masters would be unable to resist getting up and trying to fan the dispute which is currently taking place at the Port of Bunbury. I have won the bet, part of which was that, as usual, Mr Masters would get his facts wrong. I won both elements. The facts will

not assist the member because I am sure his interest is different from mine.

- (2) Yes, I am going to Bunbury.
- (3) I shall be holding talks with a number of people in Bunbury and what I shall say to them and what will be discussed is a matter upon which I will report to the House, if it is appropriate, in due course, and not now.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

##### *Dispute: Union Membership*

- 15. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Just for the deaf Minister's information, I ask again whether he is prepared to answer the question? Will he be advising those workers to apply themselves to the direction of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission—that is, to rejoin the Australian Workers Union and resign from the Maritime Workers Union? I ask him whether he will answer yes or no?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The member makes it even more likely there will be no dispute about the fact I did win the bet. I have already answered him and made it quite clear.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

##### *Dispute: Shipping Delay*

- 16. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Obviously the Minister is not prepared to answer, so I will ask him another question, as follows—

- (1) Is he aware one ship is tied up at the wharf and cannot get away? There are five ships outside the port of Bunbury which are not able to get in. By the weekend ten ships will be held up.
- (2) Is he also aware that the cost of holding up each ship each day is \$10 000? Even he can work out that ten times \$10 000 is a little more than most people would expect from a simple hold-up by 15 maritime workers.
- (3) Is he also aware that the ships are being held up and prevented from loading alumina, and that there is a load of caustic soda due over the weekend?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) I have had a briefing from my department upon the implications of the current dispute and I have had a meeting with the Bunbury Port Authority. I do not confirm all the facts that the member has put, but if he is really interested in the information I would be happy to obtain it for him in due course.