

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 28th August, 1979

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

THE LATE LORD LOUIS MOUNTBATTEN

Condolence: Motion

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [4.32 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That this Legislative Council views with horror the circumstances which resulted in the death of Lord Louis Mountbatten.

We express to the British people—and particularly to The Royal Family and members of his immediate family—our deepest sympathy on their tragic loss.

We honour the memory of a truly great leader, especially his role as Supreme Allied Commander in South-East Asia during the second World War. In this, and through his many other important tasks in times of peace and war, he helped to shape the course of history.

The British Commonwealth of Nations has much to thank him for.

In moving this motion on behalf of the House I would like to say that one of the most remarkable abilities of Lord Louis Mountbatten was to make those who worked with and under him feel that they had a very close association with him. This is something which every leader would wish to have, but, unfortunately, very few do. All around the world today people will be claiming that they had an intimate friendship with and appreciation of Lord Louis Mountbatten.

I do not wish to discuss in too great a detail his war efforts and how they directed the course of the British Empire or his very close association with the Royal Family. In his position as Supreme Allied Commander in South-East Asia, his leadership was of great significance to Australia. This was at a time when Australia was at great peril. He first set up his headquarters at Mount Lavinia in Ceylon; subsequently he was given the title of Lord Louis Mountbatten of Burma. Many Australians knew and served under him during this very important time in Australian history, and when the Japanese were driven back he moved his headquarters to the Cathay Hotel in Singapore.

I perhaps was brought up under the colour of Lord Louis because my father was the successor to Sir Charles Gairdner as Commander of the Armoured Corps in India at the time when Lord Louis was Supreme Commander and Viceroy. My mother was Lady Mountbatten's aide during that time in India.

Lord Louis had the delicate task of forming the two countries of India and Pakistan and undoubtedly the Mountbattens' contribution to the British Empire at that time was immense. Whilst there was a lot of bloodshed involved, partition was a very difficult operation to perform, and his remarkable command and leadership helped in this most delicate task.

We should include in this condolence the members of Lord Louis' family who were with him at the time of his death, because they are well known to many in Western Australia. His daughter, Lady Patricia, and her husband, Lord Brabourne, own properties at Esperance and Boyup Brook and were often seen in the south-west. They became involved with the people both in the town and in agriculture when they spent their annual week's holiday. Perhaps it was not a holiday because they took farming very seriously; and really lived the part of Australian farmers. In fact I recall that they even carried the bathwater out for newly planted trees in their garden. I know the people of Esperance would like to be associated with this motion of condolence.

For those who do not know Earl Mountbatten's son-in-law (Lord Brabourne), I would say that apart from handling the very considerable family estate in England, he also is a film producer of some note. As well as making very fine documentaries about Lord Louis Mountbatten he was one of the first successfully to produce Shakespeare on film with *Romeo and Juliet*. He also featured the London Ballet Company portraying Beatrix Potter's characters on the screen.

In addition, he filmed Agatha Christie's *Orient Express*, which was another magnificent production.

While we very much regret that one of Lord Louis' grandchildren died with him, we hope the remainder of the family, with whom we know Lord Louis was so closely associated and of whom he was so fond, will survive the very serious wounds they received in the accident.

I hope the House will support this motion.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.41 p.m.]: On behalf of the Opposition I support the remarks made by the Hon. David Wordsworth

in moving the motion of condolence to the British people and the immediate family of Lord Louis Mountbatten.

In my opinion, of all the commanders who served in the second World War, Lord Mountbatten would certainly have been the most popular, right from the days when he commanded the destroyer *Kelly*, through his activities in combined operations, until he was the Supreme Allied Commander in South-East Asia, and later on when he completed the difficult task of effecting the changeover in India.

This is a great tragedy and we extend our condolences to the Mountbatten family. It is a family which has put a great deal into the welfare and good order of our Commonwealth and has made a magnificent contribution to the English-speaking peoples of the world. The original family name was Battenberg and Lord Louis' father suffered considerably at the hands of the media because he had that name. He strove very hard to prove his point and he succeeded admirably.

We extend condolences not only to the family of Lord Louis Mountbatten, but also to all those people who suffer because of the fruitless action in Northern Ireland. Today 17 British soldiers have lost their lives in a bomb and gun attack. After thousands of years of civilisation, surely it must come home to people that no problem can be solved by bloodshed. I do not think the people who perpetrated this terrible crime, this dastardly act, have advanced their cause one bit. If anything, they have retarded it.

The motion moved by the Hon. David Wordsworth has our full support.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.44 p.m.]: I support the motion. During World War II I found myself serving in a number of theatres of war, and towards the end I found myself in South-East Asia. I can testify to the great esteem in which the military forces under Lord Louis held their commander.

Lord Louis was a big man in every way. He was a very great man for the British Commonwealth of Nations, and, indeed, for the world. Such men are rare and when they appear we can compare with them others of their time and through history. Lord Louis had a special quality and great ability. He had the capacity to get results and to be a man of the people. As I understand it, he was never happier than when he was mixing with people who were doing a job.

It was my fortune at the end of the last war to find myself in Burma, and, although I had no personal contact with the great man, I knew of him from those with whom I associated. I never

dreamt I would be standing in this place to support such a condolence motion. I do so with great humility and sincerity. It is a great tragedy for us all.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [4.45 p.m.]: I thought it had been agreed that this message of condolence would be moved by the Government and supported by the Opposition. As other members have spoken to it, I must rise to say on behalf of the National Country Party that we, too, are extremely distressed about the news we have read. We would like to be associated with the remarks made by the Hon. David Wordsworth and the Hon. Des Dans.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [4.46 p.m.]: I would briefly like to add a tribute to Lord Louis Mountbatten, who was one of the great inspirational leaders during World War II. One of his greatnesses was that he combined his ability as a war-time commander with great ability as a politician. We hear a lot about his role during the war, but I think we should remember his role as the last Viceroy and first Governor General of India. With great delicacy and care he managed to steer the two great republics of India and Pakistan into independence. I think we owe him a great tribute for what he did there as well as for all he did during the war.

Lord Louis was therefore one of those towering figures and, because he did so much in war and in peace which has benefited the world, I think it is a great tragedy that the perpetrators of this crime saw fit to use him as an example to serve their ends.

The **PRESIDENT**: Honourable members, as an indication of your support of this motion I ask you to rise in your places for one minute.

Question passed, members standing.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie, and read a first time.
2. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and passed.

2. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and passed.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd August.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [5.03 p.m.]: As one of the people who, for some 15 years, was known as a "cow cocky", I did not think I would see the day when I would be standing in this House speaking on a Bill of this nature.

There was a time when there was no dairy industry organisation which dealt with the marketing of butter. That was when farmers were at the mercy of the butter factories and the distributors. The industry has come a long way since then. The butterfat industry, as we call it, has seen mostly "downs" during that time. The butterfat industry was never really a very remunerative business. In fact, it was a peasant's business for many years. Even those people in the industry who had high production had to struggle for many years before they developed viable farming units.

I am a little like Mr Dans. I have often wondered what the word "polyunsaturated" means. Does it have a meaning at all, or is it a word which is used for commercial purposes? As one searches through the dictionary, one can find the word "poly", but not the word "polyunsaturated". I believe it is a word which has been used by advertisers to get rid of the product. I believe it is a trick played on the public.

I have always believed that butter was better than margarine. People like Mr Williams, of course, believe that in their cases—and quite rightly so—they are better off if they keep away from fats. However, I do not think that the majority of Australians are greatly affected by using butter if they do proper exercise. If people walked instead of riding in motorcars everywhere they go, they would suffer not the slightest effect from eating butter.

I do not think the fact that butter does not spread as well as margarine is important in connection with the use of butter. I like the taste of butter, and I do not like the taste of margarine. One can be reasonably certain that the consumption of butter will have no ill-effect if a reasonable amount of exercise is done.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What exercise do you do?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do quite a lot of exercise. I go up to my property sometimes twice a week, but at least once a week, and I do a hard day's work there. I do quite a bit of walking around my property, so I do the full share of exercise for a man of my age. I am sure that I probably do more exercise than the majority of people who drive around in motorcars. If people want to go to the corner shop they use the car, even to buy a packet of cigarettes or the paper. I would be inclined to walk if it were only a short distance. As a matter of fact, I walked down to the bottom of Howard Street and back from Parliament House yesterday. I could have gone in a taxi or a bus, but I preferred to walk.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Did you walk back?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Returning to the subject matter, I hope that the proposed dairy blend will result in an increased use of butter. I am not very optimistic that it will do so. People have become attuned to walking through supermarkets and buying table margarine—the so-called polyunsaturated stuff—because it is cheaper than butter. A big factor in relation to the sale of butter is the higher price involved in its production.

I can remember the time in 1933 when farmers received 8d. a lb. for butterfat. The cost of production to a dairy farmer who had a really top-class herd was then 11d. per pound. Persons like myself who had been in the game for only about two years lost more than 3d. a lb. for butterfat in those days.

With those words, I support the measure.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [5.08 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the legislation. Undoubtedly we have had a very interesting and wide-ranging debate on the subject. It is good to see the interest which has been created by this legislation. I am sure that it would give joy to the dairy producers in this State.

We have considered the respective health risks of margarine and butter. Indeed, we have debated the subject of butter making better lovers. It would appear to me—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is your view on that? Do you have an answer?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It appears it is not so much the butter which causes the trouble, but what it leads one to do that causes the heart attacks! However, it is good to see that, in respect of the use of butter, members all seem to be fairly hearty and strong. Perhaps as they become older they might move into the use of dairy blend, which might make a difference to them.

With due seriousness, I think when one considers the subject one finds there does not seem to be any cause-and-effect relationship between butter and heart attacks. This is fairly important. Perhaps there has been promotion of the relationship of butter and heart disease, and a certain amount of evidence has been presented; but in actual fact there is no conclusive evidence to tie the two.

Undoubtedly heart disease is associated with various lifestyles. These include, of course, stress, whether one is overweight, high blood pressure, lack of exercise, and smoking. It must be admitted that high blood cholesterol could be affected by diet, but it is more likely to be affected by some of the causes on the list I gave.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Diet can bring the cholesterol level down, but there is not a great deal of evidence to show what sends it up.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Members have asked what is meant by "polyunsaturated". It is said that the word is not found in the dictionary. I have managed to obtain a definition for members. I am informed that fats are made up of "building blocks" or fatty acids which consist of a combination of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen atoms. Most fatty acids have from eight to 24 carbon atoms, each of which can combine with four hydrogen atoms or their equivalent. When all carbon atoms have their full complement of hydrogen or equivalent atoms, the fatty acid is said to be "saturated". If there is one hydrogen atom short of a full complement, it is referred to as "mono-unsaturated". If there are two or more atoms short, it is known as "polyunsaturated".

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Very interesting. It will be difficult going out to dinner, trying to keep all that in your mind.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Most foods contain all three types of fatty acids; and it is the balance between the three which determines whether the food is referred to as "polyunsaturated" or "saturated". I hope that I have not confused members too much with that definition.

Members have mentioned the durability of margarine. It appears that there is a chemical antioxidant in margarine which enables it to be kept for longer periods.

A great deal of criticism has been made about the use of dairy products in the diet. I am assured that dairy products are and will remain an important part of a healthy diet.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Balanced diet—very essential.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Right from birth.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: From the womb to the tomb, do you reckon?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Members have asked what is dairy blend, as there is no definition in the Bill before the House. Dairy blend has been determined by regulation. I am informed that a dairy blend can have between 12 and 20 per cent of vegetable oil in it. In other words, it contains 70 to 80 per cent of butterfat. The dairy blend may be used for cooking, in the same way as other dairy products; in other words, the same as butter.

I think it was Mr Williams who asked why it was necessary to have a square container. I am told by those who are interested in the manufacture of margarine that it is a disadvantage to put it in the square container because such containers cost more to produce or to buy. However, it must be argued at the same time that there is an advantage in the square container because it occupies 20 per cent less space in the refrigerator.

The Bill allows for the future marketing of margarine in packs larger than 500 grams. It is not intended that larger packs will be introduced at this stage. However, when it is thought that there is a need to sell margarine in packs up to one kilogram in weight, the Minister can so determine without having to bring another Bill before the Parliament.

Mr Thompson raised the matter of filled milk. I understand that filled milk as such has not any great keeping qualities. It is a reconstituted milk which has had added some vegetable oils and some dried milk.

UHT milk keeps for long periods of time without being refrigerated. It is whole milk which has been pasteurised in a particular manner. I am led to believe that filled milk as such does not have very great keeping qualities.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was the only product which would keep without refrigeration in the early 1960s.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Certainly there is less necessity for filled milk today. UHT milk is used extensively in the north-west; therefore, filled milk is not required. It is a pity that we do not have a manufacturer of UHT milk here; but the process involved is very expensive and there is probably a place for two companies only in Australia. One company operates in Queensland and the other in Tasmania. We do not use enough UHT milk in this State to warrant the setting up of a plant here.

Members have raised the point that this legislation should be repealed, because it does not perform a useful function. The Government believes the legislation is of benefit to dairy producers in particular and to the public in general, because the advertising of dairy products can be controlled. There is the ability within the legislation to control the amount of margarine marketed. In 1973 it was estimated that approximately 3 000 tons was marketed. I understand the present legislation allows up to 5 000 tonnes to be marketed. However, I believe only 3 000 tonnes is being produced per year at the present time.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: The figure of 1 400 tons was the amount laid down in 1972.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The current regulations allow 5 000 tonnes to be produced, but less than 3 000 tonnes was actually manufactured in Western Australia last year.

It was suggested also that dairy blend may not be of great benefit to dairy farmers in Western Australia, because we do not have very many butterfat producers as such. I believe the Hon. Neil McNeill quoted a figure of approximately 40 butterfat producers who do not produce any whole milk; but probably most of the 600 dairy farmers we have in Western Australia produce manufacturing milk in varying quantities and some of that would be used for butter production.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: I said there are only about 40 farmers remaining registered and licensed as manufacturing milk producers.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is what I am saying. Most of the other farmers would be producing milk, but it is not all sold as whole milk. They would be involved in a portion of butterfat production.

Whilst we might consume more butter than we produce in Western Australia, it should be remembered that the price is determined throughout the whole of Australia. Therefore, it is important from the point of view of production of dairy products that as much dairy produce as is possible is sold. We should not say, "We produce

less butter than we consume, therefore, we should not worry about this legislation."

The Hon. Neil McNeill: I did not say that.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is in the interests of all that as much butter as is possible is sold throughout the whole of Australia.

The labelling of dairy products was discussed also. Section 32A has been deleted, but the remaining part of the section will prevent the labelling or advertising of margarine as if it were a dairy product. Margarine contains no butterfat and is not a dairy product.

I hope I have satisfied members with my answers to the various points raised. I may not have covered all the points raised by the Hon. Neil McNeill; but I hope I have answered most of the questions asked.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. D. W. Cooley) in the Chair; the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 6 amended—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: When I was speaking in the second reading debate I asked why the Margarine Act, 1940-1973, should be retained and what its purpose was. The Minister has said the real purpose of the Bill is to prop up or protect the dairy industry. If we have a free enterprise Government which believes people should have a choice, it should recognise that people are now being denied a choice and this has been the case since the introduction of the Margarine Act.

In the second reading debate I referred to a solidified oil used for cooking which is marketed in this State. People buy it in the belief that it is a vegetable oil and does not contain animal fat. In fact, I believe it contains approximately 65 per cent animal fat. People buy this product because they are health conscious and want to cut down on the amount of animal fats they absorb. However, they believe this product to be polyunsaturated.

There is only one product on the market which is polyunsaturated solidified oil. It is made in New South Wales and marketed in this State, but it is not always readily available.

Recently I read in the Press that a factory would be set up in Bunbury. This factory would require oil seeds to be grown here and it could be

of benefit to Western Australia. This venture will be to the benefit of all the people of the State. It is possible the factory will manufacture dairy spread also. In order to encourage people who make their living by growing oil seed crops, and other people involved in the venture, we should remove all the restrictions contained in the Act so that this company and other companies throughout Australia can market the product which people want. People cannot buy solidified oil at a reasonable price, and it is in very short supply. Of course, liquid oil is very expensive and people are being denied the right to choose the products they want.

I would like to ask the Minister why it is necessary to have a Margarine Act. Is the dairy industry in such a state that it cannot stand on its own feet? It has been subsidised heavily for many years and it will continue to be subsidised. Of course, some of the whole-milk producers do not need a subsidy, because they are sitting on little goldmines.

The Act should be repealed. The Minister has not researched the subject adequately and he has not produced sufficient evidence to justify the existence of such a restrictive Act on the Statute book.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I had not intended to speak during the Committee stage, even though I considered the Minister's reply to the second reading debate to be very inadequate. However, I rise on a point made by the Hon. Ron Thompson. I am afraid I have been provoked by him, because he made the statement that the dairy industry is in receipt of very heavy subsidies, or words to that effect.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has been subsidised for years.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I wonder whether the honourable member can tell me the amount of subsidy made available to the dairy industry. I doubt that he could. I could not give him the precise figure; but it is not a heavy subsidy. The greatest subsidy ever made available to the entire dairy industry was the sum of \$50 million many years ago. The dairy industry is not now in receipt of anything like that sort of financial assistance.

The Hon. Ron Thompson took issue with the Minister's comment that the purpose of the Bill is to protect the dairy industry. I may not be using the precise words of the member, but that is the gist of what he said.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He said it was for the benefit of the dairy industry.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I would like to restate the general proposition. Interests within

the dairy industry or butter-producing industry, whichever is responsible, have recognised butter is at a disadvantage in the market place, because of its lack of spreadability when refrigerated compared with the only other competitive product which is margarine. As a result, the back-room boys have set to work and have discovered that, by including a certain proportion of a vegetable oil product in butter, they can increase the spreadability of butter under refrigerated conditions. This makes the product more competitive with margarine.

In my view the purpose of the Bill is not necessarily to benefit the dairying industry. The purpose of the Bill simply is to tidy up the definition of "margarine", and to allow for the use of the term "dairy blend". A far more valid reason for this Bill is that those people who buy dairy blend will know that it is not a vegetable oil product. If a person wants to purchase a consumer product, without an animal fat content, he should not buy dairy blend.

The Bill will also provide that the term "dairy blend" will be acceptable. The purpose of the Bill is not necessarily to benefit the dairying industry. The production of a more spreadable type of butter may well be to the advantage of the industry.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I endeavoured to say that it would be of benefit to the dairying industry to ensure that margarine, and other butter-like products, will not be advertised as "butter". I believe the Bill is of benefit to the dairying industry and also to the consumers. If it achieves only that small benefit, it is worth while. I agree with those members who expressed the opinion that people have some difficulty in understanding which products are polyunsaturated. Until recently I was not aware that if one wants to buy the safest of the margarine products one has to purchase polyunsaturated table margarine because it is made from unsaturated vegetable oils. I am led to believe that ordinary table margarine, although made out of vegetable oils, does not necessarily have to be unsaturated. The vegetable oils can be saturated, the same as in lard and other animal products.

This legislation will be of benefit not only to the dairying industry, but also to the consumers.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

**IRON ORE (HAMERSLEY RANGE)
AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd August.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [5.35 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. To date there has been little debate on it, either in the other place or in this Chamber last Thursday. As a matter of fact, it almost passed through the Legislative Assembly without anyone noticing it.

Despite that fact, this is a most important and interesting Bill. It brings to light some far-reaching principles related to our great iron ore industry in the Pilbara. To my mind, the measure introduces four main issues.

Firstly, there are the basics upon which the iron ore agreements were founded, and I believe in this we see a remarkable illustration of the way "open government" should work. Secondly, there is the question of roads and, more particularly, those in the Pilbara. This is a matter of great significance to me and about which I have spoken on many occasions in this Chamber.

The third main point is the contribution which the iron ore industry is making to this State, and to this nation. Fourthly, for the first time we have in this Bill a new concept of the payment of rentals for mineral leases. Those are the four points I want to discuss.

As all members are aware, iron ore agreements were entered into with all the principal iron ore companies which came to the Pilbara, or Western Australia, in the 1960s. At that time the agreements were quite inspiring in concept and, in addition, they set the scene for what is, in fact, truly "open government" in this State.

On many occasions the Premier's inspirational leadership, in the development of the Pilbara, has been questioned. In the early 1960s—the time about which I am speaking—the present Premier was Minister for the North-West and Minister for Industrial Development. He was responsible for the completion of the iron ore agreements. His remarkable foresight at that time is well illustrated in the agreements themselves, and the amending Bills we have been required to consider in this place from time to time.

I do not want to canvass the full contents of the Hamersley agreement, which is typical of those which apply to all other companies. Basically, it provides for the export of iron ore, then the

processing of iron ore, and ultimately the manufacture of a metal product, in progressive stages.

The agreement which we will amend tonight lays down the guidelines which will be followed by the iron ore operations and the State Government, with regard to all actions, present and future, concerning the iron ore industry. Every alteration to the agreements must be embraced in amendments which must be presented to this Parliament and debated. Every amendment to an agreement has to be ratified by this Parliament.

In 1968 the members of this Chamber discussed the tenure of mineral leases. In particular, those discussions set the scene for the second part of the Hamersley company's mining activities, at Paraburdoo. In 1972 there was the hiving off of certain tenements when the nexus with Hanwright was severed.

In 1976 an amendment to the agreement provided for altered obligations on the part of the company, thus opening the door for the beneficiation plant. That plant was completed recently. The amendment altered the commitments of the company in respect of the processing of iron ore, and it immediately brought into train the expenditure of something like \$370 million, which included infrastructure expenditure.

Each amendment to the original agreement must come to this Chamber, be discussed and debated, and approved by this Parliament. To me this is an excellent example of "open government" in practice.

In his introductory speech the Attorney General spelt out the purpose of the Bill. He explained that a sum of \$4.5 million will be raised in rent prepayments. That is for the first part of a five-year, \$24 million road-building programme. The roads concerned include the Tom Price-Paraburdoo Road, which is to be constructed and sealed at a cost of over \$7 million. It will be completed by the end of next year. The Nanutarra-Tom Price Road will be improved and upgraded as far as the Paraburdoo turn-off. A sum of \$10.6 million will be spent over the next five years, and the upgrading will include the bituminising of 70 kilometres.

The Attorney General also mentioned that the Rocklea-Paraburdoo Road will be improved at a cost of \$2 million, and this will include a large bridge over the Hardey River. And lastly, a sum of \$4 million will be spent on a connecting road to the national highway. This road will be constructed and sealed.

The purpose of the Bill is to enable the State to receive prepayment of rentals to the tune of \$4.5 million. That sum of money will enable the State to get on with the job of building the roads immediately; we will not have to wait for the availability of State funds in order to commence the work.

On many occasions in this Chamber I have spoken on the subject of the Pilbara roads. Particularly, I had a great deal to say on Wednesday, the 12th April, 1978, when speaking during the Address-in-Reply debate. My comments appear at page 642 of *Hansard*, 1978 and I particularly spoke about the importance of the Pilbara, which is the area dealt with in this Bill. During my speech in 1978 I described how a handful of people—less than 50 000—were working in the area. I also mentioned that one-third of one per cent of the Australian population was earning something like 10 per cent of Australia's export income.

I said that royalties in excess of \$50 million per year are paid by the iron producers to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I pointed out to the members representing rural electorates that Tom Price and Paraburdoo—the towns to be serviced by the money raised through this legislation—had a population comparable with the population of the towns of Northam and York. I wondered how members in this House who represent the towns of Northam and York would feel if their communities were 250 kilometres from the nearest bitumen road. Of course, in the intervening time the population of Tom Price and Paraburdoo has grown.

Something like \$3 500 million capital investment has been made in the Pilbara, but I have to remind members that the benefit of that colossal expenditure is not felt in the Pilbara; it benefits the foundries and fabrication shops in Perth, Melbourne, and the other capital cities of Australia.

I would like to quote from page 642 of the 1978 *Hansard* where I am reported as follows—

I believe Western Australia has to achieve recognition of the enormity of the Pilbara's contribution to the national economy and the standard of living throughout Australia. I believe this significance should be reflected in the assessment of the road needs in the Pilbara, and in the north of Western Australia.

I do not need to point out that roads are probably the most important component of the infrastructure of any community, and that certainly applies in our region in the Pilbara. The

value of these roads can be measured only by the exports which go through the coastal ports of Dampier, Cape Lambert, and Port Hedland, and which are valued somewhere in the order of \$1 000 million a year.

A colossal job has been accomplished on roads in the last 10 to 12 years. The North-West Coastal Highway was constructed at a cost of \$31 million at 1967 to 1974 values. The Meekatharra-Newman Road was finished in 1977, and this cost \$23 million. The Port Hedland-Broome Road will cost about \$40 million, and it will be black-topped by the end of next year. On this road alone the expenditure will be about \$17 million of Commonwealth and State road funds this financial year. In addition to these funds, there has been the enormous expenditure on the national highway in the Kimberley which followed on from the old beef road scheme. On roads we have witnessed a rate of expenditure of a magnitude quite unheard of in Western Australia up to the present era, and it is almost with a hushed voice that I must say in this Chamber that a third of the road funds available from Commonwealth and State sources is being spent in the north of Western Australia in a region where approximately 4½ per cent of the population of the State lives. I make no apology for this apparent disparity in expenditure, and I do not think the State makes any apology. This is good government, and I wish the Commonwealth could learn a lesson from what the State is doing.

My speech last year was based largely on an address given by the Commissioner of Main Roads (Mr Don Aitken). I quoted him on that occasion, and I concluded my comments on roads with this statement, which is very relevant to the Bill we are now discussing—

It is interesting to note that the commissioner used the term "Governments" rather than just "Government". Clearly the State Government is rather hamstrung, because of the lack of availability of funds. I hope the Minister for Transport will make every endeavour to see that the Commonwealth Government recognises the essential need; but in addition I hope he as the Minister will see that State policies also recognise this great disability under which this very important and large component of our community in Western Australia exists.

Following a very helpful interjection by Mr Wordsworth, I went on to say—

... what I am saying to the Minister is that the sequential development policy of established priorities certainly is desirable,

but positive action to implement the policy cannot be delayed.

Within the capacity of the State Government—Mr Wordsworth's Government—these priorities have been established. They have been clearly spelt out and positive action has been taken. I believe this is exemplified in the Bill before us this afternoon.

I applaud the State Government; I applaud the way it is tackling this real task with vigour, with imagination, and with flexibility in planning. No doubt the \$24 million programme described to us on this occasion will not remove all the problems, but it is a good start.

The \$4.5 million advanced by Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. in the first two years is of great significance because it will enable a start to be made on this excellent programme; it will give impetus in the early stages of the programme which we see unfolding.

Just the sealing of the road between Paraburdoo and Tom Price next year will increase the movement of people between these two important towns. It will provide the social intercourse which is so essential for their well-being.

The roads between Paraburdoo and Rocklea and Rocklea and Nanutarra will not be sealed for the full length, but a road will be provided which will stand up to all weather conditions for all practical purposes. This will provide access to the North-West Coastal Highway and thus to the southern part of the State. In addition to that, it will give access to other towns on the coast such as Onslow. These towns are very important for the recreational needs of the residents of the Pilbara, and Hamersley Iron recognises this need. The company has subsidised the West Pilbara Shire Council for the erection of about 10 or 12 chalets at Onslow. Of course, these chalets will be available for all citizens, but they are available particularly for the people who work at the Hamersley Iron sites at Tom Price and Paraburdoo.

The last part of the road programme outlined by the Attorney General when introducing the Bill was the link with the national highway. There is no chance that this will end nowhere, and so at the end of the five-year programme, I firmly believe that part of the Newman-Whim Creek Road will be carried on to link with this road.

By the end of 1980 the Broome Road will be sealed, and, of course, work is to be done on the Halls Creek-Fitzroy Crossing part of the national highway, but there is no doubt at all in my mind that the Newman-Whim Creek Road will proceed

concurrently and that the national highway will be carried northwards to join up with the work outlined to us in the programme which will be set in motion by this legislation. When this connection is made, it will provide the shortest route for the people of Tom Price and Paraburdoo to travel south to the city of Perth. It will be sealed for its full length, and a great breakthrough will have been made.

Automatically, the result will be that the pressure will be eased on the Nanutarra Road. The heavy transport will no longer go by way of Nanutarra; the road hauliers will choose the shortest and fastest route by way of Newman and Meekatharra and then down to Perth. As time goes by, the road will be carried further north and it will join the North-West Coastal Highway in the vicinity of Whim Creek. This will give the people of Tom Price and Paraburdoo direct access northwards to the coast; it will be about equidistant from these towns to both Port Hedland and Karratha.

I cannot overemphasise the importance of the road works which we will be able to commence with the passage of the Bill. The measure is not only important economically and commercially; but it is also equally important socially and sociologically. The benefits which will accrue to the communities involved are of great significance. The road will enable free social intercourse between towns and I am referring to the towns on the coast as well as the inland towns. Members of sporting and recreational bodies will be able to travel between those towns freely for competition. People will be able to enjoy educational and cultural pursuits, or just simple family outings. The road will facilitate holidays on the coast, or perhaps just shopping sprees for families.

People do travel these distances now, but over the present rough roads it is quite an ordeal whether as a family travelling in a car, or a football team or any other group travelling in a bus. The people will no longer be "locked in" in these inland towns such as Paraburdoo, Newman, Tom Price, Packsaddle, Rhodes Ridge, etc. The sealed road linking Paraburdoo and Tom Price to outside destinations will be a colossal step forward for the stability of these inland communities. It is possibly as important as any other single factor in helping to settle our disturbed industrial relations scene in this region.

In commencing my speech tonight I spoke of the interesting implications of the Bill. Royalties paid by the iron ore producers go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Contrary to general opinion, there is a built-in escalation in the

payment of royalties. In point of fact, royalties are not paid on the tonnage produced, but on the f.o.b. value of the iron ore as it crosses the wharf. This means that every increase in price is reflected automatically in the amount of royalties paid by the iron ore producers.

It is a basic tenet of our Government policy—in fact of the policy of most Governments which follow the Westminster system—that the minerals of a country belong to the Crown; they are the property of the people. Therefore, it can be said that the iron ore producers are paying \$50 million a year for the right to exploit our property, our minerals.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Before the suspension I was referring to the fact that our Government holds to the basic tenet that minerals belong to the Crown and, therefore, it is justified in exacting royalties. In other words, the iron ore operators are paying the Government \$50 million per annum for the right to exploit our minerals. For this reason these royalties are paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: How much?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The total royalties paid by the Pilbara iron ore producers is in the order of \$50 million per annum.

Ever since I have been here—and before that time—I have personally advocated that a proportion of this sum be siphoned-off from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and spent on roads or some comparable essential need in the region. I felt that the iron ore in the Pilbara produced a windfall to the State and it was not unreasonable to see the royalties from part of it being spent on essential services for the area. In the past my advocacy has never been successful.

But this Bill provides for increased rental as opposed to royalties and this is calculated on the basis of 25c per tonne on all iron ore on which royalties are paid. Clause 9(1)(b) of the agreement in the parent Act reads as follows—

... the Company will in addition to the rentals already referred to in this paragraph pay to the State during the currency of this Agreement after such anniversary as aforesaid a rental ...

... equal to two shillings and sixpence (2s. 6d.) per ton on all iron ore or (as the case may be) all iron ore concentrates in respect of which royalty is payable ...

The anniversary, as the Attorney General told us when introducing the Bill, is the 15th.

Now we find that this rental is to be applied to local roadworks, albeit it is only by way of advance; it is prepayment of the rentals which the company would be paying, in due course, after the 15th anniversary in 1981. It would seem that this Bill has broken new ground. Perhaps, in the parlance which people like to use in government, it has created a precedent.

It is not included in this Bill and it was not mentioned by the Attorney General, but it is my understanding that this \$24 million-programme has been arranged so that \$12 million will come from normal road funding from Commonwealth and State sources, but that dollar for dollar will be paid from a source that is not normal road funds. In other words, it is coming from the Treasury; it is part of this rental which will go to road funds—\$12 million over a five-year period—by way of the Treasury. Clearly, the first \$4.5 million referred to in this Bill is coming from that source. It seems abundantly clear that this is the basis upon which the Treasury has reached this agreement, after negotiation between the Hamersley Iron company, the Minister for Industrial Development, who has responsibility for the administration of the iron ore agreement Acts, and the Main Roads Department.

It is my fervent hope that this is the pattern for what we will see in the future. I can only hope that this concept will grow in scope as time goes by. I believe this additional reservoir of funds is just the sort of money we need to make a real encroachment on the problems we have in front of us with roadworks in this region.

As I mentioned, this rental is based on 25c per ton of actual production. As I see it, the Hamersley Iron company has an installed capacity now to produce 47 million tonnes a year. By the way, even with the recent 10-week stoppage the company will exceed 30 million tonnes production of iron ore this year.

This installed capacity to produce 47 million tonnes per annum will produce almost \$12 million per annum additional rental in a few years when the 15th anniversary has been passed. That figure is not peanuts.

I spoke previously of the remarkable foresight which was shown in the drawing-up of these agreements in the early 1960s. Perhaps in those days we did not envisage the growth of tonnage to this great amount, but my goodness, what a tremendous bonus for the State we are receiving by the placement of this clause in the agreement in the original Act.

Currently the rental paid for the mineral leases to the Mines Department under the agreement

Act is \$66 891.65—that was last year's figure. The calculated rental for these leases was \$67 000, but because we have the potential production of 47 million tonnes a year we are now looking at an additional rental income of almost \$12 million a year.

I think we must keep in mind—I did not see it mentioned in the Attorney General's introductory speech—that this situation applies after 15 years of production. In other words, it will be 1981 for Tom Price, but in fact it will be 1985 for Paraburdoo; so it will be some few years before the high figure will be reached. The additional rental applies to all ore—lump, fines, concentrates, pellets or any other processed ore we produce in the future.

By the way, it is interesting to note that the actual figure for royalties in 1978 paid by the Hamersley company was \$19 206 000; in 1977 it exceeded \$21 million; and in 1976 it exceeded \$20 million. Royalties vary with grade and where the iron ore is produced and sold to Australian steel mills the royalties are very low. This does not apply to Hamersley Iron so much as it does to the Newman Mining Company.

I refer now to a proposition I have canvassed before in this House. The royalties paid by the iron ore producers in the Pilbara are not high by world standards, but to offset this relatively low royalty payment the companies have been required to provide their own infrastructure.

We find public utilities such as schools, hospitals, and police stations in places like Tom Price, Paraburdoo, Dampier, and Karratha which normally would have to be and should be provided by the Government have been built and maintained by Hamersley Iron. I have rationalised this before, but I repeat: a combination of a reasonably low rental accompanied by the company providing the infrastructure really adds up to a free-of-interest, long-term advance by the company to the State. In other words, it could be rationalised that the State is providing the infrastructure, but the money is advanced to provide it well forward of the date the State possibly could find it from its own resources. It is a wonderful arrangement which was completed back in 1963, I believe.

One of the matters, mentioned earlier, to which I wanted to refer is what, in fact, we do with roads in the Pilbara and the obligations the iron ore companies have in respect of roads. I would like to read part of clause 10(1) (d) of the original agreement. With regard to obligations, this paragraph provides that the company shall construct—

... such new roads as the Company reasonably requires for its purposes ... after discussion with the respective shire councils through whose districts any such roads may pass and subject to prior agreement with the appropriate controlling authority (being a shire council or the Commissioner of Main Roads) as to terms and conditions the Company may at its own expense and risk except as otherwise so agreed upgrade or realign any existing road

Further on we find reference to the roads built by the company being available for general public use.

In fact, Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited has constructed many roads which are in general use by the public. The roads are not only within the townsite boundaries of Paraburdoo, Tom Price, and Dampier. Under the current and projected normalisation programme these roads will be vested in the local authority. I am thinking of roads such as that between the townsite of Tom Price and the mine site, which is used by the public entering and departing from the town on the way to Wittenoom, Paraburdoo, or Nanutarra; and the road between Paraburdoo and the airport, on which Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited has already arranged for the Main Roads Department to spend \$2 million. That section is part of the Paraburdoo-Tom Price Road and it is one of the roads mentioned by the Attorney General as being subject to construction with the funds to be made available as a result of the Bill now before us.

Now we see the next stage; \$2 million will be spent in 1979-80 and \$2.5 million in 1980-81, which as I have mentioned are repayable advances and will reduce subsequent rental payments under the terms of the agreement Act. In fact, the State will be paying interest on those advances.

The arrangement covered in the Bill does not really reflect any great generosity on the part of Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited. Rather, it illustrates commendable co-operation which reacts to the benefit of the State, the company, and the residents of Tom Price, Paraburdoo, and the area. By making \$4.5 million available in advance of the commitment under the Act, the task may be proceeded with earlier. It has given impetus to the start of the \$24 million programme.

The discussion on road responsibility introduces two other very interesting aspects which should be discussed briefly. There is quite a definite move away from the crippling financial imposition

borne by the mineral developers. All levels of government—Commonwealth, State, and local—are accepting the fact that they should meet certain commitments in respect of the infrastructure associated with the wonderful towns which have been developed. I think in future we will progressively move further in this direction and expect that all costs normally accepted by the Government will also be provided by the Government in this part of the State.

I have already referred to the normalisation which is going on at this very time but the trend can be very clearly demonstrated by the arrangement the Premier made at the last Loan Council meeting, when one of the major projects for which funds could be borrowed overseas was for the integration of the electricity supply system throughout the Pilbara. Hopefully, the companies will no longer have to carry that type of burden.

The second matter which arises in connection with roads is that a great deal of discussion has taken place about the Pannawonica access road. It is a favourite topic of discussion by members of the Opposition when they make their junkets into the Pilbara. The State is spending almost \$500 000 currently on the access road to Pannawonica but it will produce only a dirt road and will have some shortcomings as far as all-weather characteristics are concerned. The same clause relating to road obligations, which Hamersley Iron has been ready to pick up applies also to the Cleveland-Cliffs agreement Act. If Cliffs-Robe River Iron Ore Associates would come to the party, this road could be progressed to sealing as the Hamersley Iron roads have been.

I believe the difficulty arises with the definition of the term "a road which the company reasonably requires for its purposes". Hamersley has put a broad interpretation on it, in that if its communities need such roads, it will contribute. Cliffs-Robe River has not accepted that. If it needs a road between the townsite and the mine site, it is a road which is reasonably required for company purposes, but the important social benefit of putting a road from the townsite to the main highway is ignored by this company. I hope we can overcome this impasse and have a road to serve the people of Pannawonica and get them out to the North-West Coastal Highway on a good, sealed, all-weather road.

The last matter I want to introduce is the question of the blatant untruth which has been perpetuated in relation to the sealing of the Pilbara roads, apparently for political advantage. It was referred to during debate in the other House, but it has been referred to frequently by many people ever since the election campaign in

1974, when it was claimed that the then Leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Court) promised that the inland Pilbara roads would be sealed within the life of the 1974-1977 Parliament.

I was at that public meeting at Tom Price at which the Premier was reported to have made that statement; so also was another aspiring candidate for election to this Parliament (Mr Brian Sodeman) who is now the member for Pilbara. The Premier said he would have "a blueprint" prepared for the progressive sealing of the inland Pilbara roads, and that is exactly what he has done. In fact, we are discussing part of that overall blueprint for the sealing of the Pilbara roads when speaking to this Bill and the part it will play in giving effect to the plan.

The Minister for Lands will know the difficulties we have had. I must mention that in the preparation of the overall Pilbara road plan a great deal of urging and encouragement was given by local members to ensure that, in point of fact, we did get down on paper the broad planning which would be followed for the road system in the Pilbara.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I will endorse that.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The Minister for Lands will remember—because the discussions were still going on when he took over the portfolio of transport—the difficulties in completing what I choose to call a "blueprint". Difficulty was experienced in relation to approval from Canberra for the national highway programme. There was the problem of relocation of the Great Northern Highway, to delete the route through Nullagine and Marble Bar and reroute the highway where it would service the iron ore industry in the future. The people in Canberra had to be convinced that was the proper route for the national highway.

A measure of uncertainty still exists about small sections of the final route. Clearly, the road will pick up traffic which will be generated from the future towns at Rhodes Ridge and Goldsworthy area "C", from Marandoo, Wittenoom, and other towns, and also in the first instance from Tom Price and Paraburdoo. There is still a question mark about exactly where the road will drop from the tablelands into the Fortescue Valley; perhaps it will pass through the Rio Tinto Gorge. A problem exists in relation to the Sherlock Valley alignment, as the drivers in the recent Repco trial found out.

However, with pressure from the northern members, work by Ministers and their departments, and coercion of the Commonwealth

people the plan did emerge, and in the speech I made last April I outlined the nature of the plan.

There is no way in the world that the Premier could possibly have made the alleged promise. At today's costs we are looking at something in the order of \$150 million to seal about 1100 kilometres of road. Whatever else the Premier does, he understands facts and figures better than anyone I know of. Without the injection of colossal additional and new Commonwealth funds he could not possibly have achieved within 10 or perhaps even 20 years the programme it is stated he promised he would achieve. Knowing this, there is no way he could ever have made such a stupid claim. As one who listened to him intently at that meeting at Tom Price six years ago, I can vouch for the fact that he did not make such a statement. The people who persist in claiming that he stated all these Pilbara roads would be sealed by 1977 are perpetuating a deliberate untruth. Their actions are most reprehensible.

I welcome any progress in my longstanding objective to achieve normal road access for the community in inland Pilbara. Therefore, I welcome the Bill and unreservedly support the second reading.

THE HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [8.00 p.m.]: I would like to commence my remarks by congratulating the Hon. John Tozer on his excellent speech which was typically John Tozer, in the sense that it was well researched and well documented, and showed his obvious great understanding of the problems of the Pilbara; which is more than I can say for some city-based lawyers these days who would claim otherwise.

I rise to speak very briefly in this debate because for five years I experienced the rigours of the Pilbara roads, having lived in the Karratha-Tom Price area for five years in the early 1970s. Being relatively active in those days, I spent a great deal of time driving from town to town, and on many occasions I drove along the Tom Price-Nanutarra road, which is quite famous for its often very poor condition.

To keep myself sane on those trips I used to compose in my mind letters to the Premier of the day about that particular road. Fortunately at the end of the journey I was so pleased either to get to Tom Price or to reach the bitumen at Nanutarra that I never got around to writing a letter; which was probably fortunate again in that some of the language I would have used would not be fit for human consumption.

Therefore, I am delighted to see legislation before the House which will help to provide decent, all-weather roads in the West Pilbara

area, and particularly the roads around the mining towns of Tom Price and Paraburdoo.

I will conclude by congratulating the Hon. John Tozer, the member for Pilbara (Mr Sodeman), and the Hon. Bill Withers for their efforts over many years to improve the roads. Being interested in the development of the area they have worked extremely hard to achieve some progress in respect of the improvement of the roads in the Pilbara. This legislation, together with the Government's other programmes, is a step in the right direction.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [8.03 p.m.]: It has been a great pleasure to hear the comments made by members, and particularly the comments of the Hon. John Tozer who with his usual meticulous care has researched every detail of the Bill. I would like to express appreciation also for the support given to the Bill by other members, including the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Withers, and Mr Moore.

Mr Dans asked a question about royalties. He wanted to know whether any iron ore is not subject to the payment of royalties. The answer is, "Yes." This is set out in the agreement. The iron ore on which royalties are not paid is that which is sent abroad for testing. As Mr Tozer would know very well, the only ore on which royalties are paid is that which is shipped or sold. Ore which is used for testing purposes does not carry a royalty.

I would like to say it is not often a member is prepared to devote such time and effort as that devoted by the Hon. John Tozer to a study of all the intricacies in relation to a Bill such as this. Not only is Mr Tozer very well aware, as a result of his personal knowledge, of all the details in respect of these mining areas and the district roads, but also he has made a study of the agreement itself and of the various amending agreements to which he referred. By virtue of the positions he has held in the area, both in his former capacity and now as a member of Parliament, he has been intimately concerned with the negotiations which have taken place with the mining companies.

In a way that few members of this Parliament or of the public recognise, he has understood just how successful an agreement this one has been. He has pointed out that with great foresight arrangements were made for an increase in the royalties after a period of 15 years, and those arrangements are now bearing fruit. Mr Tozer referred also to the fact that a quite unique arrangement has now been made which has no parallel anywhere else; that is, today royalties are

being paid in advance. Admittedly they are being paid on a very slightly discounted basis, but nevertheless they are being paid in advance and are being used to provide the roads this area needs so urgently.

This House should be grateful to Mr Tozer for his speech. Those who did not hear what he has said—and even those who heard it—would do well to read in detail his speech when it is reproduced in *Hansard*. I would like to express to him the appreciation of the Government for his work, because all too infrequently someone sits down and carefully analyses what was planned and what has happened. So frequently we engage in making plans for the future, but we do not later examine the situation to ascertain what did happen. Another thing we do all too commonly is assume that things will happen in a certain way; and, of course, often they do not happen that way, but are altered by the ability, the perspicacity, and the application of human beings.

In this case we had an outstanding leader in Sir Charles Court who years ago saw the potential for the State in this arrangement with Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. He set down the guidelines from which we are now obtaining some results. It is something we and also the public should recognise.

I express to Mr Tozer my appreciation for his comment, and I thank other members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd August.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [8.10 p.m.]: When the Hon. R. F. Cloughton moved the adjournment of the debate on the Bill, he hoped he would be present tonight to say a few words about it. However, as he has been unavoidably called away from the House, he has asked me to make a few comments.

Mr Cloughton welcomes the Bill, which is in line with things he has said in the past about the need for greater and better policing of the regulations. He regards the Bill, as I do, as a step

in the right direction. However, there are one or two matters which perturb us, and we wonder whether the Bill goes far enough.

As the number of pleasure craft on the rivers has grown, even as the number of motor vehicles on the roads has grown, we have been forced to introduce regulations. Sometimes perhaps we wait too long and are forced to make regulations following events rather than in anticipation of events.

I am glad that now all craft are to be forced to follow the rules of the road, as I think they are called in the Minister's speech. I find that terminology a little odd, but I can understand it. I wonder if all people who own boats, particularly those driven by internal combustion engines, are competent to drive them. I well recall the story of the grandfather of a person I knew quite well many years ago. This grandfather was one of the first people to own a motorcar; and when he wanted it to stop he used to pull very firmly on the steering wheel and say, "Whoa!"

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Would honourable members refrain from audible conversation while another member is speaking in a debate?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Fortunately it is possible to laugh about that story because the person did not run into or hurt anybody; he always managed to stop the car in time. In due course he was wise enough to let his daughter drive him around. However, had everyone driven like him, we could have had more tragedies.

In fact that person was not competent to drive. Of course, now we have road rules, and before people are allowed to drive motor vehicles they are tested and licensed; they must prove themselves competent to drive a vehicle. I am wondering whether we should do something along those lines in respect of people who own boats. With the best intention in the world, some boat owners could well be not fully competent to use their boats. As boat numbers increase, perhaps we need to make the regulations more stringent. Not that I care for making regulations unduly stringent; I do not want to multiply rules unnecessarily. However, I am sure the Attorney General will consider this matter.

The other point I wish to mention is that a story is told of a person who bought a new boat and thought it was safe. On his first time out he found it had two anchors, which he thought would be sufficient. He found one anchor was too light, and the other was a sand anchor; and he could have found himself in very real trouble had not someone else been close by to help him out.

I wonder whether we should now consider also the possibility of having seaworthiness or riverworthiness checks on boats before they are sold. I wonder whether such checks should not be made compulsory at sales outlets. However, I do not want to pursue that subject.

We welcome the Bill as far as it goes because it is a step in the right direction. It has been made necessary by developments in the growth of pleasure craft on our rivers; but it would be a good idea if the Government looked to the matters I have raised and perhaps looked further ahead.

The last time I spoke about an amendment to the Western Australian Marine Act, I said that we seemed to be amending that Act all the time. It seems that there have been three amendments in the last fortnight. Perhaps it is time for some work to be done on updating the Act, as has been done under another Bill to be before us shortly. Perhaps there should be some consolidation and forward planning so that the Act is brought up to date, and projects into the future.

Apart from those comments, I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [8.16 p.m.]: I support the provisions in this legislation regarding infringement notices. That is a matter worthy of consideration by the House.

Lately much concern has been expressed about pleasure craft, the people using them, and the safety of the boats. I do a little fishing in outside waters and I am concerned about the people who own bondwood boats. A few mishaps have occurred recently which have involved bondwood boats.

This relates to what Mr Hetherington said. People buy bondwood boats, some of which are 15 or 20 years old, or maybe even more. About three months ago when I was returning from Garden Island I saw some people who barely made it into the anchorage at Cockburn. The boat had about two inches of freeboard by the time it arrived. It had burst a seam.

Of course, people buy these boats unsuspectingly, thinking they are safe. However, in the long run it is not safe to keep using old boats if they are made of bondwood. If one owns an aluminium or a fibreglass boat, one has a good chance of making it back to shore.

I helped the man of whom I am speaking to move his boat into the harbour and I was most concerned about his situation. I voiced my criticism of his foolhardiness in going out in such a boat. It was not a very calm day, either.

My main concern is in relation to section 205 of the Act. That is a very small portion of the Marine Act, which deals with pleasure craft. When we speak of "pleasure craft", we mean boats which are not for hire—the type of boats of which I have been speaking. People go fishing in them in outside waters.

When the Bill was introduced in another place, I contacted the Harbour and Light Department and asked for a copy of the regulations. I said, "When can I pick them up?" I give due credit to the current manager of the department. I was told that I could have them within about two hours, so I went in and obtained them.

I, with the Hon. Norman Baxter, can remember an occasion when a Select Committee was inquiring into the crayfishing industry. A boat named *Katie Jo* was lost at Dongara. I requested the regulations covering all craft from the Harbour and Light Department, and 2½ years later I received some of them.

On the recent occasion the department readily made the regulations available. However, when I received the regulations I discovered that they consisted of the navigable water regulations, of course, which are the governing regulations and are contained in quite a sizable book; another set of regulations covering six pages; a couple of single-page regulations; and another 31 regulations on loose pieces of paper. That is what I received from the department. Some of the regulations in the last batch are on multiple pages, not just single pages. I do not know how a person who wants to do the right thing can sift through all these regulations. Some of them are out-dated; some replace other regulations. I do not believe I could sort them out myself, and I think most members of Parliament understand a little about regulations.

It is ridiculous to present regulations in this form. It is difficult for a person to memorise them but that is what he has to do if he is to use them when he is out in a boat. One has to know sking areas, navigation areas, channels, and all that sort of thing.

I think it is time we ceased brow-beating boat owners for not upholding the regulations. There should be a booklet which puts in a simple way the relevant regulations. The booklet should not use the phraseology of the regulations. It should say, "You can do this, you can do that, and you can do something else in this area." All the regulations should be sorted into areas covering the Swan River, some of the inland rivers down south, and the ocean—sheltered waters and blue water.

It is most necessary for us to consider boat safety if we are to help the people who use boats. Anybody can go and buy a boat without any prior qualifications, and without any boating experience at all. A person can step into a boat, hope for the best, and go to sea. He may not have any safety gear.

The advice I would give to those people who buy a boat and do not know much about it is to join a power boat club immediately. The clubs make sure before the boat is put into the water that the owner has all the necessary safety equipment. The Cockburn Power Boat Club, of which I am a member, is more strict than the Harbour and Light Department because it ensures that a member's boat has two anchors, and double all the necessary equipment. The club does a very good job. When one goes out, one knows one has more equipment than is necessary.

I feel that ultimately boats will have to be inspected, and the owners will have to be given some test to determine whether they are capable of handling a boat. The simplest dinghy with an outboard motor on it can be very dangerous even on the Swan River. Some of the big craft do not observe the speed limit. I have seen people in a 12-foot dinghy, out for a little fishing or crabbing, and the dinghy has been almost swamped when a boat went zooming past, creating a large bow wave.

I support the legislation, but I would urge the responsible Minister to have the department produce a handbook to assist people with the safety regulations. I feel sure it would benefit the department in the long run if boat owners did not have to go through a maze of regulations.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [8.24 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments on the Bill.

Mention has been made of the number of times Bills amending the Western Australian Marine Act have been before the House. I make no apologies for that. Since the Harbour and Light Department has been under the responsibility of the Minister for Transport, the Act has received a lot more airing than it has in the past. Previous Governments, both Liberal and Labor, have placed the department under the control of the Minister for Works, and the emphasis was more on construction. As it is now under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Transport, and as the manager of the department reports directly to that Minister, more emphasis than before has been placed on the problems associated with the waters.

Great credit is due Mr Clive Gordon, the manager of the department. Quite a number of legislative changes have been proposed, and it has been suggested that the Act be updated and rewritten. However, if that were to be attempted, perhaps we would experience the same difficulties as were experienced with the Mining Act when suddenly a conglomerate of changes took place, and no-one could identify each change in isolation. At least with the Bills presented to us on the Marine Act we have had the opportunity to examine each proposal in its own right.

I think there will be an updating of the Act after 1980, when the negotiations between the State and the Federal Governments are concluded. It has been agreed in Commonwealth-State negotiations that the Commonwealth will have jurisdiction over interstate and overseas vessels, and that the State will continue to be responsible for intrastate vessels, and fishing and pleasure craft.

The Harbour and Light Department, of course, is responsible for all craft within the three-mile limit. The fees charged for the registration of boats are not contributed in any way to the building of ramps and other such constructions. Such work is done by the Public Works Department, and a considerable amount of money is being spent on such work.

I note that a sum of over \$1 million is currently being spent on the Mullaloo launching facilities, with breakwaters and that sort of thing. Members must appreciate the high costs concerned with items.

Boating has become a very important hobby and sport for Western Australians. More money must be allocated to the facilities for the sport.

I was somewhat surprised to find that Tasmania has more boats per head than Western Australia, and that is despite the bad weather experienced in Tasmania. Nevertheless, there are over 50 000 boats in Western Australia and fairly strict control is exercised over them.

However, I endorse the remarks of Mr Thompson who recommended that people belong to yacht clubs and boat clubs. The discipline experienced within such clubs is the best way of ensuring safety.

Mention was made of the Fastnet race. I would like to think that the same sort of catastrophe could not happen in Western Australia because of the very stringent conditions imposed by yacht clubs and boat clubs. Indeed, one cannot go very far from Esperance or Albany without a radio, if one belongs to a yacht club. However, there were hundreds of yachts participating in the Fastnet

race—and it could only be described as an international yacht race—which had no radio, and no adequate safety gear; and in many cases, the yachtsmen had no experience.

Fortunately a great deal more expertise is exercised in the management of the yacht races in this State. This is just as well, because if extremely bad weather blew up during the Esperance to Albany yacht race, the participants would be in difficulties, as we do not have the helicopters and coastal safety craft which went quickly to the aid of the yachtsmen in the Fastnet race.

It has been suggested that the regulations should be reprinted; and I agree with the Hon. Ron Thompson that they are very extensive. An eminent QC is rewriting the regulations and is trying to put them in order. I hope his task will be completed in the near future.

Publications have been issued by the Harbour and Light Department. These publications do not rewrite the regulations, but they give boat owners a better idea of the conditions under which they should operate their boats. The Minister for Transport has set up an advisory committee comprising members of yacht clubs and others who have helped him considerably in the management of yachts on the Swan River and elsewhere.

There is no doubt that the Swan River is crowded with boats at certain times. As a result, some nasty accidents have occurred and this Bill refers to the situations in which boats must stop.

Another part of the Bill deals with the manning and seaworthiness of boats moving between moorings. Previously a craft could move freely within a port; but, as Mr Dans said quite rightly, some of those ports extend over a considerable area so that boats in an unseaworthy condition were putting to sea.

I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan
—Attorney General) [8.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Australian Labor Party: Policy

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [8.35 p.m.]: Not too long ago in the House the Hon. Lyla Elliott and the Hon. Fred McKenzie availed themselves of the opportunity in the adjournment debate to make reference to the election in New South Wales, dealing in particular with the upper House there. In line with the precedent established by those members at that time, I would like to speak very briefly on the adjournment debate and refer to matters concerning upper Houses and to other matters generally.

I am concerned that the Australian people should not be misled by the so-called “softening” decisions concerning nationalisation and other important matters taken by the ALP at its recent Adelaide conference.

The media generally has misled the public to the degree that one could believe that the socialist Labor Party now had a free and competitive enterprise manifesto. The facts are to the contrary and I remind the House that Labor politicians are bound by their conference decisions. Both the Labor Party and the ACTU still have as their first objective the socialisation of industry, production, distribution, and exchange.

The Labor socialistic nationalisation policy promises to distribute abundance, but is at a permanent loss as to how to produce it. Inefficiencies in nationalised industries would lead Australia to progressive impoverishment.

I would like now to quote excerpts from the recent Labor Party conference so that at least the readers of the 350 copies of *Hansard* which are published weekly will be informed.

I quote in the first instance from the Labor Party's platform in relation to State upper Houses. It reads as follows—

The ALP has retained its commitment to the abolition of State upper Houses—the Legislative Councils in NSW, Victoria, SA, WA and Tasmania would all disappear under Labor.

The implications of this policy are as follows—

Labor would remove an integral element of the democratic parliamentary process in each of these five States. The retention of the upper House abolition plank highlights the two-faced nature of the ALP's position on the Senate.

Then we pass to the Senate, and the policy on this matter reads—

The previous ALP policy that the Senate be abolished has been dropped, and has been replaced by the following proposals for

"reform" of the Senate. Labor would seek to amend the Constitution:

to ensure that the Senate has no power to reject, defer or otherwise block money bills

to provide that the Senate may delay for up to six months but not reject any other proposed law.

The implications of this policy are—

The ALP is ignoring the residents of the four smaller States. While the ALP would now retain the Senate, the proposals passed in Adelaide would result in the complete emasculation of the Senate. The Federal upper House would have no power at all over money Bills, and would lose its existing power of rejection over all other Bills.

The Senate would, in effect, become quite impotent. The ALP's proposals completely subvert the present constitutional role of the Senate as the States' House.

I would like to quote from the Labor Party's policy in relation to constitutional change. This is an important matter and reads as follows—

Labor will seek to amend the Constitution to provide for its alteration by a simple majority of the electorate.

The implications of this policy are—

The ALP proposes to remove the existing requirement that a majority of States must approve constitutional change, as well as a majority of the electorate. Thus NSW and Victoria could approve changes to the Constitution despite the combined opposition of the four smaller States.

I would like to proceed to another matter which concerns particularly the Bill we have just discussed and relates to offshore sovereignty. I quote from the Labor Party's platform again as follows—

Labor would retain exclusive control by the Australian Government over all offshore resources and implement a 200 mile economic resource zone around Australia's coast.

The implications of this particular policy are—

Labor would deny the States any influence over the control of Australia's offshore resources. The Liberal/NCP Government's special arrangements for joint authority over ocean resources would be abolished by a Labor Government.

I would like to quote from the Labor Party policy in respect of nationalisation as follows—

Labor will "initiate enterprise, both public and private, to regenerate Australian industry and to ensure that Australian equity is realistically maximised by such measures as using a restructured AIDC, developing a National Investment Fund as a source of finance, providing Government ownership, wholly or in part, and encouraging co-operatives".

The implications of that policy are—

Labor proposes to stimulate Australian industry by nationalising it. That is the clear implication of the above commitment. Labor would develop a "national investment fund" to mobilise taxpayers' funds to take over Australian enterprises.

I now quote from the Labor Party policy in regard to socialist strategy and this is particularly important. It reads as follows—

Labor is committed by its Platform to "an expanded interventionist role by Government, and a responsible development of the public sector to satisfy social needs and provide employment".

The ALP's list of economic policy instruments includes:

"intervention, where necessary, on both the demand and the supply side of the economy, to achieve national objectives"

"nationalisation"

"establishing or extending public enterprise..."

The implications of that policy are—

Labor has clearly stated its intention to achieve even more Government intervention in the economy and a greater diversion of resources to the public sector, further squeezing the private, productive sector. It is a reaffirmation of the socialist objectives of the ALP and the containment of private enterprise under a centrally planned economy of the socialist European type.

The new ALP platform does not indicate which companies or industries it would nationalise. Any business activity could be subject to the ALP's 'Government takeover' policies.

Point of Order

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Is it in order for a member to read his speech as the honourable member is doing now? I thought there was a Standing Order stating that members were not permitted to read speeches.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is out of order for a member to read his speech; but it is completely within the scope of the Standing Orders for a member to refer to notes or to read extracts from documents. If the member is reading his speech I ask him to refrain from doing so.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I am not reading my speech; I am reading extracts from a document which I am prepared to table and I said that at the beginning of my speech.

I note in particular that the Labor Party tends to howl in despair when somebody even talks about its political platform and it uses every trick in the book to prevent its being discussed. I would like to continue to quote from my notes in relation to the Labor Party policy concerning a national newspaper. It reads as follows—

A Labor Government would "initiate further study into the feasibility of fostering the establishment of a newspaper, independent of both Government and existing private interests, conducted by those who produce it".

The implications of that policy are—

Labor intends to use public money to produce a national newspaper without explaining what role it would fill, why it is needed, and who would be responsible for it. Such a national newspaper would, no doubt, become part of the ALP Government's propaganda armoury.

I ask the House to note the policy of the Labor Party in relation to a wealth tax and I quote from the new policy of the ALP as follows—

Labor will "enhance the equity of the tax system by taxing large accumulations of personal capital above a floor that is reviewed regularly and takes into account the special circumstances of farmers small businessmen and aged people, and excludes the normal holdings assembled over a lifetime by persons and family units".

The implications of that particular policy are as follows—

For the first time Labor has introduced into its policy a commitment to a wealth tax. This is not a mere capital gains tax, but a proposal to tax the capital base itself. The qualification to the proposal means nothing and could be ignored by a Labor Government hungry for revenue to fund its socialisation programme. All individual Australians who had acquired funds or land or other property

could be subject to the tax, and it would be levied regardless of the liquidity of the individual. In many cases individuals would have to sell off assets to pay the tax.

I ask the House to pay particular attention to the policy of the Labor Party concerning industrial relations and I quote—

The new ALP Platform provides for the right of workers to "organise in democratic trade unions and to collectively bargain and to exercise the right to strike in the course of such activities immune from any pains and penalties directed against unions and unionists".

An ALP Government would recognise "the rights of unions to regulate their own affairs in a democratic way free from Government and judicial interference . . ."

Labor would abolish the Industrial Relations Bureau.

Unions would be exempted from the provisions of the Trade Practices Act.

The implications are as follows—

Under a Labor Government the trade unions would be virtually above and beyond the law, and a Labor Government would take no action through the processes of the law to protect innocent Australian people from the damaging consequences of union action.

While the ALP has stated its commitment to democratic trade unions, it has denied an ALP Government any mechanism whatsoever to ensure the implementation of that principle.

The right of unionists to appeal to the courts where their rights have been infringed by the union would be denied by a Labor Government. Damaging secondary boycotts would no longer be illegal under Labor because unions would be immune from section 45D of the Trade Practices Act. It is clearly an "anything goes" policy as far as the unions are concerned.

The next quote from the ALP platform concerns political strikes and it reads as follows—

An ALP Government would "recognise that the legitimate role of the trade unions is not limited to legally defined industrial matters".

The implications are as follows—

Labor has clearly endorsed "political strikes" in adopting this plank, and has indicated its contempt for the democratic parliamentary process. Labor does not accept

Parliament as the proper place for voicing its concerns and opinions, but has deferred to the unions in acknowledging that they can strike on any issue at all and force their views on the Australian public. The plank is a direct threat to democracy.

A further quote from the ALP platform under the heading "Closed Shop" reads as follows—

Labor will "encourage the membership of registered organisations through the provision of preference to unionists in the taking of leave and . . . in their engagement and promotion and their retention in cases of retrenchment".

The implication is as follows—

Labor has stated its commitment to the insidious closed shop, under which non-unionists are effectively denied the right to work.

In conclusion, there is one rule for unions and another for employers. I ask the House to note the following—

An ALP Government would move immediately to repeal "all penalties for strikes against arbitral decisions of the Commission or a conciliation committee and the prohibition of action by the Commission to insert or register clauses in awards or agreements excluding the rights of workers to resort to industrial action".

The implications are as follows—

This again demonstrates the ALP's eagerness to place unions completely outside the scope of the law. However, the real significance of the policy is that the 1977 platform had been even-handed in that it called for the repeal of penalties for employer "lockouts" as well. The words "and lockouts" were taken out at the 1979 conference, meaning that while unions would be free to engage in strike action without penalty—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am of the opinion that the honourable member is now reading his speech and I ask him to cease doing so.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: Thank you, Sir. The employers would be penalised in regard to this proposition if they retaliated by engaging in a lockout and this new ALP policy was described by a Western Australian delegate as absurd.

I will obey your ruling immediately, Sir, and in conclusion I would like to say it is proper and correct that the decisions of the Federal conference of the ALP which are binding on all Labor members and which are in fact instructions to them should be recorded in *Hansard* so that

members in this place know the blueprint for action imposed on Labor members for the ensuing period.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [8.49 p.m.]: Once again we have been subjected to a sarrago of fact and fantasy by the honourable gentleman who has just resumed his seat.

I hope we will not be subjected to too much of this because if so we will have long debates night after night on the adjournment as we are debating party policy. That would be quite undesirable.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The adjournment motion—

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I point out to the honourable gentleman that I sat completely silent through what I regarded as a not very pleasant speech and one which we could quite well have done without. I hope he shows me the same courtesy because I do not wish to take up the time of the House unduly. However, I want to register my protest at the amount of nonsense we have had to put up with tonight.

I would be pleased if the honourable member could make a speech without reference to other people's documents or without reading out party policy and then, reading from another document, so-called implications as if they were fact. It does not do the debate any good.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are at liberty to review the implications, if they are incorrect, as you know—

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would suggest to the honourable gentleman that if he wishes to debate the Labor Party policy he introduce a substantive motion in the House so that we can listen to his speech, adjourn the debate, and deal with it fully and competently. I certainly do not intend to deal with the whole question now, nor, the next time the adjournment motion is moved, do I want to make the two or three-hour speech which I would probably need to make in order to deal with the kind of nonsense we have had tonight.

It is an interesting trick to read extracts from a platform and then allude to implications which are not always correct, to do one's own interpreting and not the interpretation of the people who wrote the platform, then to make assumptions and moral judgments which condemn the platform by implication.

The Labor Party believes in a great deal more Government interference and control over the economy than the Liberal and Country Parties do. We are a social democratic party; we have been

for a long time, and will remain so. We are a party which believes that unions should have freedom to pursue industrial matters and should have the right to strike. We are after all a party which was founded by the trade unions. We are not a party that is a servant of trade unions, but a party that cuts across the narrow, sectional interests. We are a truly national party. As a matter of fact we are the only truly national party in this country and I am of the opinion—I merely put this forward as an opinion not as an alleged fact—that we are the party which best has the interests of the country at heart. That is why I am a member of this party.

I object to being subjected to continual tirades from the honourable gentleman which suggest that I am some sort of dupe or fool and, more particularly, that I do not believe in individual freedom and liberties; or that I believe in complete anarchy; or that the trade unions are above the law. We do not believe that at all. We do believe the trade union movement is important and that unless more notice is taken of the trade union movement and unless there is more conciliation in this society, confrontation may lead to great social dislocation.

I point out to the Hon. Robert Pike that in my maiden speech I referred to the need for greater conciliation in our society and expressed the hope that the Government and people such as himself would not try to force further confrontation. Of course he prefers to do that because he cannot understand the fears of people who are in great financial difficulty. He always finds it easy, as so many people do, to say that the ills of our society are the fault of only one side; that when the system breaks down the fault lies not with the people who cannot employ, but with the people who are not employed. Such people claim that the trade union movement exercises great power in society, when, of course, the real power in this society is exercised by the owners means of production, distribution, and exchange.

The policy of the Labor Party is the democratic socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange to the extent necessary to prevent exploitation. The honourable gentleman was again guilty of producing selective quotations, but, because of my experience in this House that does not surprise me, because I would expect the honourable gentleman not to give full credit for anything the Labor Party has achieved. As do many of the people he consults, he attempts to project the Labor Party as a sort of left-wing facism, and I object to this; it is nonsense.

Quite often one will find that the people who make accusations in intemperate ways about

other people are often transferring their own real feelings about their opponents. I will not deal in detail with the comments of the honourable gentleman because I cannot remember them all. I should retract that, and say I will not deal in detail with the extracts from a document read out by the honourable gentleman. As I have said, when he can debate issues without reading documents that other people have produced and without clutching his security blanket of notes then the level of debate in this House will rise.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I did not use notes when debating with Lyla Elliott on the last two sitting days. That is a fabrication.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Perhaps the honourable member does not like the adjournment debate. If he does not no doubt he will go on the way he has behaved tonight and then Standing Orders may be amended to deprive us of this debate. I hope this does not happen because I think the adjournment debate can be a very valuable exercise if it is not misused. I know I have been guilty of this myself in the past when I was new and still wet behind the ears. I hope I will not do that again, though sometimes I am tempted. No doubt when we come to the Budget debate I will be able to deal with some of the member's comments quite adequately if I think it worth the trouble to do so.

The honourable gentleman has no understanding of the principles of the Labor Party, he has no understanding of what we are doing, and has no understanding of anything as far as I can see, except his own obsessive preoccupations. I ask the honourable gentleman to be good enough to table the documents from which he read.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 297).

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [8.59 p.m.]: I honestly think that someone in the Liberal Party should talk to Mr Pike, especially after the disgusting exhibition he subjected us to tonight in this Chamber when he denigrated the Labor Party and everything associated with it.

In his speech on the opening night of this Parliament, in front of the very good people who came here, including members of the defence forces, the judiciary, and church groups, he made a similar attack. There has not been one occasion in this Chamber when this gentleman has been on his feet other than to denigrate the Labor Party. He has not made one real contribution to the debate on any issue before this Chamber.

I do not think that is good enough. The honourable member has a Bill before the

Chamber now but that Bill will never be debated. He wanted to get a bit of publicity, but he failed.

I want to make the point that we are here as political opponents. We are members of the Labor Party, and the members of the Liberal Party and the members of the Country Party are on the other side. In the main we are true blue to our respective causes. I am Labor, and at every opportunity—and I think this attitude is justified—I will criticise the Liberal Party and the National Country Party. But, Mr President, there is another sort of political animal in this country; that is, a person who twists from one party to the other. It is not so bad in itself for a person who believes he has joined the wrong party to change to the other side.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are talking about Wheeldon 20 years ago.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If that person confines himself to the philosophy of that party and does not criticise too much or too consistently the party from which he came, that is all right. However, it is typical of right-wing extremists to engage in the type of action we have witnessed tonight. We see some of it in the Liberal Party because the remnants of the Democratic Labor Party are now in the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about Miss Elliott and Mr McKenzie criticising the Victorian upper House?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Pike is one of those right-wing extremists who went from the Labor Party to the Liberal Party, and ever since he has done nothing but criticise the ALP.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Come on—21 years ago!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about Dunstan and Wheeldon of the Labor Party?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In his three sessions he has not made one contribution in which he has not denigrated the ALP. He reminds me of Tony McGillick who was a member of the Communist Party and who is now anti-Labor Party, and of the Martyrs, the Perchysts, and the like. The Liberal Party would be doing this gentleman a good service if its members took Mr Pike under their wing and gave him a few of the facts of political life. I know the Liberal Party members are all embarrassed tonight. They are looking at each other and thinking, "I wish this had never happened".

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I do not need to be patronised by the honourable member.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I know the leopard cannot change his spots, but a snake in the grass

can change very quickly. There are many snakes in the grass in the political sphere; they have twisted from one party to the other. Although I have no respect for them, I do not mind people twisting from one party to another party, but when they do twist they should not constantly criticise the party to which they belonged previously in the manner Mr Pike has.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I am attacking your philosophy, not your personality.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Pike is only a quasi-Liberal who jumped onto the bandwagon because the Liberal Party was popular. If it suited his purpose, Mr Pike would join the ALP. He would do this if the prize were a seat in this Chamber. Mr Pike will go whichever way the wind blows, but at least he ought to be politically honest. He should take a grip on himself, and he should not continually denigrate his political opponents as he does. Other members on the Government side do not practise it because they are Liberals to the heart. Mr Pike is not; he is a person who has twisted, and like other so-called Labor members I have mentioned, he wishes to create as much dissension and trouble as he can. It does him no credit.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Come on—21 years ago!

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [9.05 p.m.]: I want to make one comment. Quite frankly I am appalled at the way the debate has been carried on tonight. I do not think that we have a Standing Order to deal with the situation, but it seems to me that we have witnessed an abuse of the adjournment debate. I always believed that the only matter to be debated on the adjournment motion was a matter of urgency or something of great consequence to the House. That does not appear to me to be the case tonight. It does the House no credit for members to continue in this manner. Although there is no way I can see to apply the Standing Orders in this case, I suggest that if similar debates occur again, the Standing Orders Committee should look at the matter seriously to see what can be done. I am ashamed of the way the debate has been conducted.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [9.06 p.m.]: I want to rise and to join quietly with Mr Masters in his remarks, and to just correct a few things that have been said. It may be that Labor Party members talk to people about their attitudes and the way they should perform and vote in this place, but I would like to say to Mr Cooley that every member of the Liberal Party votes as a Liberal.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: But he said you were a true blue so you have no problems.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He has said also in previous debates that I am one of the people he can get along with, so I may have some rapport with him and my gentle chastisements may be accepted by members on the other side of the House.

It is unfair to attack Mr Pike and to say that he has not contributed to other debates. I have to agree that his abiding concern is the difference in philosophies of the two parties, but I have heard—and I am sure members opposite have heard—Mr Pike join in other debates and make contributions to them.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: He has not said anything at all on the Skeleton Weed (Eradication Fund) Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, the honourable member said very little on that himself. I heard Mr Cooley's comments about right-wing extremists, twisting, and so on. I hope that I had something to do in re-orientating—if I may call it that—Mr Pike's ideas on what should be done and what should not be done in the political world. I think, together with the Leader of the House, I have had some influence—although very little I may add—on Mr Pike's change of direction. I do not blame anyone who is big enough to admit that he should change direction.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I said that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: However, for one member to call another member in this House a snake in the grass does not do us any justice at all.

I think it would have been better had this debate not taken place, but I believe I should support Mr Pike because he has the right to stand up to express his views. The Liberal Party does not deny people their rights; we do not tell them what they should say in Caucus. I hope that I have corrected the assumptions made on this matter.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I rise on a point of order, sir.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: When Mr Cooley spoke he did not call me a snake in the grass. He couched his comments in such a way that he did not use those words. Had he done so I would have risen on a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

THE HON. F. E. McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [9.09 p.m.]: Mr President, I do not want to join in the debate because I think we have heard enough already. However, I would like to ensure that Mr Pike will table the document from which he quoted.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It has been tabled already.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Linc

175. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

Further to my question 159 on Wednesday, the 22nd August, 1979, would the Minister advise—

- (1) Why tenders which involved a total expenditure in excess of \$2 million were not called?
- (2) Was the lowest quote obtained accepted?
- (3) How many quotes for each bus were—
 - (a) sought; and
 - (b) received?
- (4) Would the Minister advise of the names of the prospective suppliers contacted and the individual prices submitted by each supplier?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) There are four possible suppliers of Linc buses. Each of the buses available had different characteristics which were well known to the trust.

One supplier was not interested and the vehicle of another was not acceptable.

Prices were obtained from the remaining two and the selection made.

- (2) Yes.
- (3) See answer to (1). Prices were obtained on a per bus basis.
- (4) No. This is private information between suppliers and the trust.

LAND

City of Perth Endowment Lands

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the Hon. John Williams in respect of question 176, I wish to advise that I have further examined the terminology of the question. I am prepared to allow part (1) of the question to be asked of the Minister, but I consider that the remaining parts seek an expression of opinion on a question of law and are inadmissible.

176. The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is it a fact that interest accruing from the City of Perth Endowment Lands fund is being paid into General Revenue for purposes other than spending in the endowment lands?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", is this legal under the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act, 1920-1978?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes", when did Parliament sanction the use of this money elsewhere by amendment to the Act, or was it done by the Minister in the form of regulation?
- (4) If the action of the Perth City Council in directing the interest of this fund is *ultra vires* to the Act, will the Minister instruct the council to repay moneys thus misused up to date back to the endowment lands fund?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The Town Clerk has advised this is so.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Linc

177. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

Further to my question 162 on Wednesday, the 22nd August, 1979, would the Minister explain what is meant by the term "equipment cost"?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

"Equipment cost" means the cost of the buses.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Salaried Staff

178. The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Are all salaried staff at Parliament House members of the Public Service?
- (2) If not—
 - (a) what Statute does govern their employment; and
 - (b) are all appointments, promotions, and other staff matters in the House determined by various standing committees?
- (3) If the answer to (2)(b) is "Yes", to what form of neutral body can applicants for appointment or promotion appeal?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf (for the Hon. G. C. MacKINNON) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) These questions concerning the salaried staff of Parliament House should properly be directed to the presiding officer.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Children: Injuries and Deaths

179. The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Further to my questions 128 on the 14th August, 1979, and 169 on the 23rd August, 1979, concerning the number of children injured or killed as a result of conflict with motor vehicles, and in view of the Minister's answer to question 169, will he now provide me with the figures only related to those accidents in which the children were pedestrians or cyclists?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf (for the Hon. G. C. MacKINNON) replied:

The following figures represent those accidents in which children were involved as pedestrians or cyclists—

Aged 4 years and under	Injured	Killed
1976	47	4
1977	60	5
1978	40	8

Aged 5-16 years	Injured
1976	374
1977	352
1978	332

Aged 5-14 years	Killed
1976	7
1977	11
1978	13

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Art Gallery: Employees

180. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Further to the Minister's reply to my question 174 of the 23rd August, 1979, as I have no further questions immediately in mind regarding the employment of persons at the Art Gallery of Western Australia, and since it is assumed that the Minister has no cause to be secretive on this matter, the answer to question 174 is again requested?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

As the honourable member has indicated he has no further questions in mind regarding staffing arrangements at the Art Gallery of Western Australia, a consolidated reply will now be prepared and forwarded to him by correspondence.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Linc

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) I draw the attention of the Minister to part (4) of question 175. I asked the Minister to advise the names of prospective suppliers contacted, and the prices submitted by each supplier. If it is not competent for the Minister to advise me of the prices, surely he can advise me the names of the suppliers?
- (2) If the Minister cannot advise the names, why not?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) I have no notice of the question and, indeed, I have not a copy of the answer to the previous question. If the member wishes to place the question on the notice paper I will endeavour to

obtain a reply for him. I think the reply I gave to his question on notice is fairly self-explanatory. It did state there were four manufacturers, and that two were not suitable.
