

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 23 September 1987

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

## BILLS: STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

### *As to Rescission*

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan -- Leader of the House) [2.32 pm]: I move --

That consideration of this motion be deferred until the next sitting of the House.

HON G.E. MASTERS (West -- Leader of the Opposition) [2.33 pm]: I direct a question to the Leader of the House because this is becoming a farce. Would the Leader of the House please explain why it is necessary for this motion to be deferred until a later date?

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan -- Leader of the House) [2.34 pm]: I hope to be able to pass at least one or two items of legislation for the consideration of the Assembly before the recess. However, I indicate that this will be the last occasion on which a deferral is sought, and I propose to deal with this motion tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

## ELECTORAL (PROCEDURES) AMENDMENT BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

## JURISDICTION OF COURTS (CROSS-VESTING) BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 16 September.

HON JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.39 pm]: The Opposition will support this Bill, but perhaps after listening to the Attorney General's speech on the Bill, I would like to reverse the order in which he put the Bill to the House. I would like to associate the Opposition with his remarks about Mr Kevin Parker, QC. I wanted to make that comment at the beginning of my speech, because I know how diligent Mr Parker is in pursuing everything that is put in front of him. He is well known to both sides of the House and he has done a remarkable job with this Bill; he has made it look extremely simple. The difficulties and dangers of arranging interstate agreements is self-evident. Each State naturally feels that it should protect its own interests and should not lightly cede to any other State or Federal authority any of its powers. So I congratulate Mr Parker most heartily on behalf of the Opposition for an excellent job.

The Opposition has no criticism of this worthy Bill, and I will merely point to some of its highlights. The most important phrase in the Bill is "for the benefit of litigants", and that is what this Bill is all about. This Bill means that in future litigants will be able to proceed to take action in courts throughout the nation, whether it be a matter of corporate law or family law. It is worth noting that the Chief Justice of each State will be reporting back to the Attorneys General when they next meet in order to report on the progress of these new measures, and this again is a safeguard. Perhaps the real safeguard for anyone who has any doubts at all about this cross-vesting procedure between the Federal and State Supreme Courts and District Courts is that the Bill provides an option whereby after three years, should any State not be satisfied with the then Act, it will have the right to withdraw from the agreement.

This is an important step in the history of law in Australia and I congratulate the Government for bringing forward this measure. This Bill will be for the benefit of litigants and has our support. To say any more would be to gild the lily.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc*

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

*Third Reading*

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

**ACTS AMENDMENT (CORRECTIVE SERVICES) BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 17 September.

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Lower North) [2.45 pm]: The Opposition is not opposed to this legislation. It essentially follows from the amalgamation of the Probation and Parole Service and the Prisons Department announced earlier this year, and basically it changes the title of the permanent head of the new organisation. The Bill amends a variety of Acts which contain reference to a particular title rather than the term "permanent head", which is to take the place of the particular title.

Although not opposing the Bill, we express some concern -- concern which was expressed in the other place -- at the increasing tendency of this Government to change the names of various Government authorities and departments. From time to time it is very hard to know just who is in charge of what because of the significant number of changes in the names of various organisations and statutory authorities, such as Homeswest and Transperth. Here two Government departments are being amalgamated; and in certain legislation the title referred to of the person responsible for administering these Acts is being changed.

Perhaps the Minister for Corrective Services in his reply, if there is to be a reply, will explain why it is necessary continually to go down the path of changing the names of departments and authorities. It must be a very expensive operation when one considers the necessary changes just to letterheads and other stationery, and it creates confusion in the minds of people who have contact with Government departments, because they find that, for instance, what used to be the Public Works Department is now the Building Management Authority, and so on. In this case what were the Prisons Department and the Probation and Parole Service are now to be known as the Department of Corrective Services. Name changes are often seen to be done for no reason, and perhaps the Minister for Corrective Services could explain why we are seeing so many of them coming through.

**HON J.M. BERINSON** (North Central Metropolitan -- Minister for Corrective Services) [2.47 pm]: I do not think this is the occasion to attempt a review of a whole range of Government decisions which have involved changed names for Government departments and authorities, but I am happy to respond to this particular situation, which I think is explained by the circumstances that Hon Norman Moore referred to himself -- the amalgamation of the former Prisons Department and the former probation and parole section of the Crown Law Department. There are good administrative reasons for the amalgamation of the functions of the two organisations, and our decision to amalgamate them in this State followed a review by the Functional Review Committee, which took into account both the merits as such and the practice elsewhere. I think I am correct in saying also that we have been the last State to amalgamate the functions of prisons and probation and parole, and both the interstate experience and the experience even in the early stages of our own amalgamation support the view that an amalgamated department is preferable for the efficient delivery of the services involved. Having moved to the amalgamation, it is self-evident that the old names could not be applied and that it would be inappropriate to retain the name of Prisons Department for services which are non-custodial and community based, as probation and parole are. Similarly, we could not retain the probation and parole title and sensibly cover the custodial functions of the former Prisons Department. This is simply an effort to reflect the changed nature of the new department. It is significantly different in the range of its functions from either of the two amalgamated bodies, and the new title is meant to reflect that. The new title also roughly reflects the terminology adopted in other States, although not in all of them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Minister for Corrective Services), and passed.

**GAMING COMMISSION BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 15 September.

**HON JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan)** [2.54 pm]: It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to see this Bill before the House. Members will have to bear with me as I go through the history until the birth of this Bill. It is not a Bill of one party or as a result of an inspiration by any one person. Its origins were in 1974 when Mr Phillip Adams, QC, was given a Royal Commission to inquire into the effects of gambling in this State. His report became known as the Adams report. At that time there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with the activities of gamblers throughout this State. The authorities considered that Northbridge, in my electorate, was being used as a centre for illegal gambling. We all know of the absolutely terrific job that Mr Phillip Adams did on that inquiry. The only part of his report that was not fruitful was his recommendation that a casino be constructed at Exmouth. There the matter rested. The report was shelved and nothing was done about illegal gambling in this State.

In 1982, a backbench committee headed by me and which included Hon Vic Ferry and Mr Peter Coyne, both now retired, was commissioned by our party to examine the Adams report, to reopen the inquiry, and to make recommendations to the Government of the day. It is now extraordinary for members who have read the Bill to compare it with the recommendations made by that backbench committee. I will read those in a moment. Firstly, I want to correct an incorrect statement that appeared in the Legislative Assembly *Hansard*. I was congratulated for giving evidence to Dr Dan Mossenson's committee, which I never did. I merely passed on the backbench report for which Dr Mossenson was extremely grateful.

There is very little difference between what was recommended by the three reports and the Gaming Commission Bill now before us. I would be less than honest, therefore, if I did not wholeheartedly support the Bill. However, I give the Minister due notice of a couple of small matters that I feel should be looked at in the Committee stage.

The summary of the report seems now to be ancient history. However, the backbenchers who put their hearts into the job found it extremely frustrating to see nothing come of their endeavours. I have learnt, since coming to this place, that if one does his work properly, somebody will come up with a bright new Bill which will encompass everything one has worked for. I welcome the Bill because I believe it will benefit the community at large.

I will not read the 1982 report in full because it was not circulated generally. However, the report stated, in its summary of recommendations --

- (1) A purpose built casino seems to be required in Western Australia.

Many ideas as to how these casinos should be run and by whom, were given to the committee but we feel that this latter issue is a separate one. We advise that one of the most beneficial ways would be for the government or an appointed government agency to draw up specifications, included in which would be a chance for public financial participation, and to call for open tenders on the world market. This has been the procedure followed by the Queensland Government.

- (2) In view of the large geographical area of Western Australia, a purpose built casino (or even two or three casinos) would not satisfy the desire of people who now gamble illegally throughout the State.

To overcome the illegality of this situation, it is recommended that consideration be given to a system of licensing gambling clubs in areas removed from any casino.

It is suggested that gambling clubs be restricted to nominated forms of gambling and an appropriate licence fee be payable.

The illegal gambling clubs are a fact of life within the Perth metropolitan area and in the country areas.

It is not seen as part of this committee's work to decide what should be government policy towards these clubs.

Suffice it to say, that evidence given to us suggested that 6 000 people per week use these places. There was evidence of many more gaming establishments, particularly in our North-West area.

(3) The view was expressed to us, that after country races, games of two-up were played, as it seemed to round off the day in remote areas. We think that this is worthy of consideration.

Recommendation (4) and perhaps the most important one which is germane to this Bill states --

(4) A Gaming Commission should be established forthwith, in order to license and control any gambling establishment authorised by legislation. Evidence tendered to us, indicates that it has to be an entirely separate body from either the Lotteries Commission or T.A.B.

(5) It has been suggested to the committee that gaming houses in the Northbridge area have become traditional attractions to the area, especially catering for ethnic gamblers.

Business promotional interests of Northbridge see gambling places as an integral, acceptable and essential part of the general business activities of the area.

In the event of licensed casinos being established, it recommended that in the interim period consideration be given to licensing approved gambling clubs and that these licences be conditional and renewed annually

I will not refer to item (6) which deals with football pools. Item (7) reads --

Consideration should be given to legalising the use of beer ticket machines, poker cards and chocolate wheels and other forms of fund-raising equipment, rather than allow the Lotteries Commission to issue permits for these activities. This has always been a "grey area" and the time and expense in issuing permits is not warranted.

The last paragraph of item (9) states that --

If the government decides to establish a Gaming Commission, then all matters of discipline, trade practice and dispute, could be referred to that independent authority.

That is a short summary of the recommendations of that committee in 1982. Happily, Dr Mossenson concurred with several of those points and we have before us today a Bill which encompasses all those points. I have no criticism about the late arrival of it because it was necessary to put the casino in place, establish the Casino Control Committee, observe how it worked, and then set up an independent Gaming Commission.

The Bill seeks to establish this independent Gaming Commission and I am wholeheartedly behind it. The Bill contains one or two inconsistencies which I will point out to the Minister. Perhaps if he does not have the answers he may defer the Committee stage until he is able to advise the House of the reasons for these inconsistencies. I know that it is unusual in a second reading debate but I do not want to hold up the passage of the Bill in any way. The Bill is necessary and the sooner the Gaming Commission is put in place the better it will be for the control and ease of gambling in this State.

Clause 6(1) of the Bill states --

Subject to the Minister, it shall be the function of the Commission to carry out the administration of this Act.

The word "shall" means that it is at the Minister's will. That is inconsistent with the wording in subclause (2) which states that "The Minister may give to the Commission" -- in other words it is not obligatory; and further it states "and the Commission shall give" -- that is, it is obligatory on the commission. The same subclause states that "the Commission may make its advice". The wording in this clause is inconsistent. In subclause (4)(a) the words "may be required" are used. This inconsistency of obligation between "shall" and "may" appears in other clauses of the Bill which I will point out as I go along.

On page 20 of the Bill, clause 18(4) states --

On the request of the Commission the Commissioner of Police may cause inquiry or investigations to be made.

Yet on the next page, clause 19 states --

All Departments of the Public Service of the State and all instrumentalities or agencies of the Government established or administered . . . shall comply with all reasonable requests.

My question is very simple: Is the Police Department not a department or an authority and is it exempt? It is left to the commissioner who "may", not "shall", whereas every other instrumentality bound by this Act and other Acts "shall" comply. That is another inconsistency.

On page 31 clause 33(3) states that --

Proceedings for an offence under this Act or any other written law relating to gaming shall not be instituted without the consent of the Commission.

I would like the Minister to clarify whether the Police Department has to seek consent. Under a similar provision in the charities Act, the police can proceed by summons. It is similar to section 23 of the Liquor Act which provides that if the police become aware of an offence or an offence is reported, they may proceed by summons. It clearly states in this Bill that the proceedings for an offence shall not be instituted without the consent of the commission. If the police become aware of an offence they have to report to the commission -- that would be natural -- but it would appear that the commission must give the police consent to go on with the case. That is not proper and it is inconsistent with the earlier provision.

My next query relates to page 43, clause 44 and I seek clarification of the prescribed penalty for cheating of \$10 000, or imprisonment for two years, or both. Is this a maximum penalty or a mandatory penalty? The clause does not state that the maximum penalty for this offence "shall be". That provision needs to be looked at. If the penalty is mandatory, all the cheats should know that if they appear before the courts and are found guilty of an offence this penalty will be imposed. If I have a complaint it is that this provision takes flexibility away from the judiciary which they sometimes need in cases like this.

My next query -- and this is something that could be dear to the Minister's heart -- appears on page 56. In order that coffee lounges and other premises can carry on these gaming activities, it is necessary for them to get the commission's approval for those activities, but I fail to see anywhere in the Bill -- and perhaps this is included in certain local authority Acts or legislation of that nature -- that the Fire Brigades Board is asked whether the premises are suitable. I may be drawing a long bow here, but surely if a fair number of people will be in a place and certain conditions apply to the planning, perhaps it is necessary to say that a permit must be received from the Fire Brigades Board to say that the building is safely constructed and there are sufficient exits.

The last query I have is that when people go to coffee houses and clubs, such as the Hellenic Club --or the Travatori in the old days -- or anything of that nature, they will be allowed to play a game of cards, dominoes, drafts, or what have you, and they will sit down and order their coffee, and that will be the order of the day. However, I think it would be fair -- and the Minister in the other place has agreed to this -- that the owner of that premises should be able to charge a small fee to cover his costs. The owner is providing the cards or the boards, and he is certainly providing the heating and lighting, which are on-expenses, and we cannot expect him to charge \$10 for a cup of coffee; but he should have the right to charge by the hour or by the game, or whatever, for his costs, but with the added caution that the proprietor cannot take any profit out of that game that is being played, which would be a quick way around the provisions of the Bill. I have read the debate in the other place, and I see that the Minister is aware of this, and it should be enforced that proprietors should not be allowed at any time to take any profit away from the game, but they should have the right to be able to at least cover their costs by whatever mechanism is sanctioned by the commission.

I have spoken to many people in the Northbridge area since this Bill was introduced. It was in Northbridge that most of our investigation took place before this Bill was introduced. A lot of misery occurred because of the inflexibility of the Government's legislation in previous days. Perhaps it is not within some people's nature to gather at certain clubs and play games of chance for peanuts, or for the fun of it, and it took a long time to understand that other ethnic groups really enjoy this activity. We went to Northbridge several times and saw people taking part in these activities -- admittedly it looked to us as if they were pensioners, although I am not saying all of them were -- and these people were able to meet

and converse in their own language, and play games that we knew nothing about, and just generally enjoy themselves, and perhaps come out losing 20c for the afternoon, or something like that. A tremendous amount of socialising took place. In those days -- and I witnessed this one day -- if they were caught and if there was money on the table, the legislation was so draconian that those people were arrested, taken down to the police van, hauled off to Central Police Station, finger printed, photographed and released. They appeared in court the next day and were fined something like \$50.

The Statute was a hopeless piece of legislation; it was too draconian for those people who were enjoying themselves. If one has gone around the world one will have gone into coffee lounges in certain parts of the world and seen the same procedure going on, with no problems whatsoever. After we had taken the evidence, we found it difficult to reconcile that this type of activity was not allowed. Some of my colleagues -- whom I respect and admire -- do not like gambling in any form; and that is fair. Previous legislation in this Parliament has used these draconian measures to, as it were, stamp these activities out. However, one will never stamp out games of chance between like people.

The other thing that I still find peculiar -- and no evidence has ever been produced to me for this -- is the absolute fixation on the part of some people that poker machines -- popularly called one armed bandits -- are the downfall of all gamblers. That is a lot of tommyrot. If a person is a compulsive gambler, he will gamble on anything that is offered to him, and to say that a one armed bandit is his downfall does cause me great mirth because what do we have in substitution in this day and age -- we have an electronic bandit, and instead of getting RSI by pulling the lever, one can now get RSI by pressing the buttons; and the same results and the same computations and the same things happen.

Those are the queries I have, and the Minister can deal with them as he wants to, either in the second reading debate or in Committee. In conclusion, I welcome this Bill. I think it is a sensible Bill which has cleaned up a situation which has existed in Western Australia since the 1920s. Certain people did make huge profits from illegal gambling, yet we were using a sledge hammer to crack a nut when some little person went around to play a game of cards or dominoes with his friends in a coffee lounge in the afternoon.

It will be a great relief to all those hard working people who support various causes in this State by organising fairs, fetes and sweeps for good and just causes, because by the time organisers of the schemes used to get through all the paperwork, they had run out of patience. It is pleasing to see in this Bill that that situation is also being eradicated and that one does not need licences and a mass of paperwork to be able to conduct a chook raffle, for example; and many charitable organisations in this State will breathe a sigh of relief because of that.

I commend the Bill to the House and support what the Minister has already done, and if the Minister can answer my questions at his leisure I wish the Bill a speedy passage and an early proclamation.

**HON J.N. CALDWELL (South) [3.19 pm]:** The National Party welcomes this Gaming Commission Bill on behalf of all country people. Country people invariably cannot associate themselves with the games that are customary to their city cousins, and I think the Minister knows only too well that when people are isolated in the vast distances of Australia -- and especially Western Australia; the Minister would understand that from the times that he is away from home -- gaming and betting is a form of relaxation with one's friends, and I think it is a great thing to see this Bill come in its present form.

The Bill legalises social and other forms of gaming under a permit system. It is pleasing to note that the permit system enables clubs to apply for a permit over an extended period. This releases the pressure on clubs having to write once a week for a permit. I applaud this solution to the problem of letter-writing experienced by those people applying for permits.

The Bill provides for the issue of a permit to conduct two-up anywhere in the State outside a radius of 200 kilometres from the Burswood Casino. I am not sure whether the National Party agrees with this. This provision gives the Casino precedence in the area. It may be better to prohibit licences for two-up in the metropolitan area. This is the National Party's only query. Two hundred kilometres is quite a distance nowadays, and it might be better to say, "No two-up within the metropolitan area except at the Burswood Casino."

**HON S.M. PIANTADOSI (North Central Metropolitan) [3.23 pm]:** I support the Bill. I am grateful for and concur with a number of comments made by Hon John Williams, especially relating to ethnic clubs, and some of the proposed changes which will benefit many people from ethnic backgrounds in their gambling habits. Over the last three years there has been a

lot of aggro with a number of clubs and their members. People have been practising a tradition, if you like, of playing games to pass their time and be entertained. Generally the only interest in gambling attached to the games members were playing was possibly the payment of a drink by those unlucky enough to lose a game. On many occasions, after buying a round, members would leave their change on the table instead of putting it away.

I was present during one incident some three years ago at the Italian Club, when police officers came in and saw money on the table, even though it was small change. They did not quite take the players away to the police station, as Hon John Williams mentioned had occurred on other occasions, but virtually told them to stop playing their games.

The players at the Western Australian Italian Club, during the day, comprise about 200 pensioners playing one game or another to pass the time. This is true not only of the Italian Club, but of most ethnic clubs. A visit to Northbridge, and other areas where there are ethnic clubs, would confirm that. This is especially so at night. A visit to one of these clubs is often the only luxury that many pensioners allow themselves. Another point which I hope the Government has considered when proposing these changes is the need of single people living in Northbridge. Very often their only contact with other people centres around these clubs.

The proposed liberalisation of the existing gaming laws is very welcome, and many people will benefit as a result. Many people I spoke to last weekend, when visiting these clubs, welcomed the changes, for which they have been waiting for some time.

Apart from ethnic clubs, the area where the new gaming legislation will have an effect, is on the sporting clubs. I have been associated with a number of sporting clubs. These clubs face many difficulties in an era when the cost of running the clubs continually skyrockets, and the opportunities for sponsorship from traditional resources are diminishing. It is difficult to fund a club, no matter which sport it represents. The issuing of permits to run organised and legal gambling nights will enable many of these clubs to prosper and manage their resources for many years to come.

Many sporting clubs run under-age teams. One club that I am particularly involved with has 11 junior teams which play soccer, starting with the under-6s right through to under-17s, as well as two female teams and a State league reserve soccer team. That is a total of 14 teams. An annual outlay of approximately \$150 000 is needed to run those teams, and it is not always easy to raise funds to run the club properly and give its players every opportunity. The changes proposed in this Bill will greatly benefit those clubs and their members. I fully support the Bill.

I especially welcome the comments made by Hon John Williams. I know that he supports the Bill. He has had a long interest in and has served the Northbridge area for many years, and has an up-to-date knowledge of the problems in that area. I also ask the Government to consider his comments about the small gaming clubs in Northbridge. Many people there lost a lot of money from the experience they had with the Burswood Casino. I hope that, under this Bill, a club will provide a service for those individuals who do not necessarily wish to go to Burswood Island, but who want to participate in a game of chance, and spend some time playing card games or just meeting with friends. I would support Hon John Williams in his comments in respect of the proprietors of such clubs being able to recoup some of the cost of providing this service.

**HON MARK NEVILL (South East) [3.30 pm]:** This Bill will be welcomed by the great majority of people in Western Australia. As previous speakers have said, it is based on the Mossenson report which I thought was one of the best reports I have seen tabled in Parliament because it was very readable, its recommendations made a lot of sense, and it gave a succinct account of the matters it discussed.

The Government has been quite progressive in a lot of the gaming legislation it has introduced in recent years. Legislation for two-up in Kalgoorlie was introduced early in our term, and despite being a member for the area, I have never been to the two-up game on the Broad Arrow Road, although I have been to the two-up at the Kalgoorlie Race Club. There was also legislation relating to soccer pools and the casino.

This Bill makes a number of welcome changes. It will allow social gambling, which is widespread both here in Perth and in Kalgoorlie, particularly among the ethnic clubs. Gambling will be permitted as long as there is no take by the house and it is undertaken between individuals. The other main change is to deregulate the requirement for permits for

minor raffles. The Bill will take minor raffles and bingo from the Lotteries Commission and put them under the wing of the Gaming Commission. Lotto, standard lotteries, and Instant Lotteries will remain with the Lotteries Commission.

In looking at the provisions in the Bill covering that particular change I notice there is no limit on the size of private raffles. I think clause 109 covers that aspect. I would be interested to know whether art unions will be allowed under this legislation. When the Standing Committee on Government Agencies was looking at the Lotteries Commission it was clear from the evidence given that the commission was totally opposed to the running of art unions, despite the fact there is no evidence to suggest that running lotteries and art unions together would impact heavily on lotteries. This is done in Queensland and lotteries are quite successful there. I would prefer to see art unions run by the proposed Gaming Commission. I presume that is possible as there is no limit on private raffles.

In relation to some of the general accountability issues, the Gaming Commission will be subject to the Ombudsman and to the Financial Administration and Audit Act. Hon John Williams mentioned clause 6(2) and said he had some difficulty with it. I do not have any difficulty with that clause, but it is an unusual clause which says --

The Minister may give to the Commission directions of a general character as to the exercise of its function, and the Commission shall give effect to such a direction, but where such a direction does not accord with recommendations of the Commission the Commission may make its advice to the Minister known to the public.

The fact that the commission can make its advice to the Minister known to the public is a particularly good provision in a gaming Bill of this sort. However, there is potential for conflict when there is a policy difference. Members may recall the Hydro-Electric Commission of Tasmania which had a similar power and used it to white-ant a particular Minister by publicly stating the commission's policy which differed from that of the Minister.

Clause 17(5) requires members to disclose their pecuniary interests. However, the commission has power to set up subcommittees whose members are not required under this clause to disclose their pecuniary interests. I think they should be required to do that.

The Bill brings the legislation into line with community standards and it will gain widespread support in the community.

**HON GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan -- Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.35 pm]: I thank members for their comments and for their support of this important piece of legislation. Hon John Williams hit the nail on the head when he said this Bill has not arisen from the pursuits of any one person but reflects a whole host of things. Certainly these sensible arrangements which are being put forward for consideration are truly a reflection of our community and its wishes in relation to gaming. It is pleasing to see the support that the Bill has attracted.

I will deal with a couple of queries which were raised. Hon John Williams raised a number of points, some of which are a bit technical, so I will delay the Committee stage and get the answers for him. He sought information as to whether the owner of premises which may be used for gaming would be able to offset some incidental charges such as electricity. That is the case; it can be done. The owner of a small premises is not being asked to carry any cost. Hon John Caldwell referred to the restriction on the playing of two-up within a 200-kilometre radius of Perth. We are locked into that because of the agreement between the State and the casino which gives the casino a 15-year exclusive right to two-up. There is no reason, however, why that cannot be pursued with the casino, and perhaps there would be some sympathy for a change. It is something we can take up with the Minister.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## WATER AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 22 September.

**HON W.N. STRETCH** (Lower Central) [3.38 pm]: As was pointed out in the Assembly, this is a small Bill which really only increases the size of the board of the Water Authority from nine members to 11. There were certain difficulties in the Assembly when it was



pointed out that the provision of a quorum for the board had not been adjusted accordingly. My colleague, Hon Andrew Mensaros, pointed out to the Government there was a need for this to be covered in the legislation. The Government has taken up that sound suggestion and members will note that in the Bill before us the quorum will be six members. It was argued previously that it was quite possible to find out what a quorum was by referring to the Interpretation Act.

The member for Floreat pointed out in the other place that this was a clumsy way of dealing with a very simple procedure. It is a simplified way of legislating, and one which we should all take note of to make sure that it is enshrined in all future legislation. It was pointed out in the other place and I point it out to members in this House that the object of all legislation, as in all law, should be clarity and simplicity. The average person reading legislation which comes from this Parliament should be able to understand it without having to refer to the Interpretation Act as a last resort. Certainly, people should not need legal representation to determine the simple facts from a flurry of words and phrases.

It is worth pointing out that the amalgamation of the departments into the new Water Authority is a huge task when one considers the number of contributing bodies involved. It was commenced by the member for Floreat many years ago, and to this Government's credit it has continued with the movement towards the total amalgamation of these functions.

With so much work still to be done on the amalgamation, it is strange that we end up with a flimsy one-page Bill which simply increases the membership of a board from nine to 11. The task is so large and, as we are constantly told, the legislative process is so long and expensive that surely when such legislative changes are made they should be worthwhile. It is common sense that in future we should not have one-page Bills introduced into the Parliament when there is so much more to be done. If we are to deal with one-page Bills it will be doomsday before the whole authority is amalgamated. It is a fair bet that before then, a budding Sir Humphrey who is trying to get his name or his Minister's name into the history books, will decide that it will be a good idea to break up the authority into its component functions and we will start the same procedure again. When we legislate we should deal with worthwhile legislation and not deal with it in a piecemeal way.

If the truth were known it would be that this Bill has been introduced to placate certain union factions who wanted further representation on the board. This is a pressure a Labor Government will always be under and one through which we must suffer. In future we must ask that the Government substitutes leadership for peacemaking and makes decisions that are in the interests of the people of Western Australia, rather than in the interests of a certain selective few. It is a strategy which we have become used to -- a decision does not have to be correct, but it has to look correct and that the union leaders must be happy and that the people will go along with it. We have seen this in the increase in the Ministry, both State and Federal.

With the amendments made to this legislation in the Assembly, I believe that it is now sound. I am puzzled by the Minister's second reading speech and perhaps she may elaborate on the fact that it appears that the two new members shall be appointed from "outside". I do not know what the term "outside" means. My understanding is that there will be two union representatives added to the board, one from a "white" collar union and the other from a "blue" collar union. While we are all outsiders if we are not on the board, if members refer to the Minister's Press release of Tuesday, 30 June, the indication was that one of the additional representatives would be a member of the public, which one would take to be a consumer. It is probably a pedantic point, but in the minds of the public there are consumers and members of the board, and of the members of boards there are unionists and management. The Minister indicated in the Press release that there would be a consumer-type representative. His statement is slightly misleading, and I wonder if the Minister in this place would elaborate on the Government's intention where these members will come from.

I indicate the Opposition's support of this small piece of legislation and we wish it well. We hope that future legislation brought into this place will be more significant and will move towards the changes which we supported when the Water Authority Bill was debated in 1984. We went a long way then, and there is at least four or five times as much as that to be considered -- some matters go back 50 years -- and we will not deal with this issue by dealing with one-page Bills.

**HON KAY HALLAHAN** (South East Metropolitan -- Minister for Community Services) [3.44 pm]: I welcome the Opposition's support for the Bill, but I cannot help wondering

whether Hon Bill Stretch is not on the side of Sir Humphrey if he wants the Government to bring in weighty legislation on every occasion when the situation can be addressed by a one-page Bill. I would have thought that the people concerned about Sir Humphrey would have welcomed a one-page Bill.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm*

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Human resources management is not a minor issue, if that is what Hon Bill Stretch was alluding to in his comments. The question is whether or not an organisation is successful and efficient. When one is considering enormous amalgamations in respect of which Government members and Opposition members appear to be in agreement, then human resources management becomes a major issue in the success of that agreement.

However, I welcome the view of the Opposition that the legislation is sound, and in response to the honourable member's inquiry about the two positions, my understanding -- and I think it is clear in the second reading speech -- is that there is at present one elected person who represents the authority's employees. The proposal is to expand that to two positions; one will be elected by the salaried staff and the other by the wages employees.

In order to maintain the balance between official and elected members and the members appointed from the outside community, it was proposed to increase by one the representation from the community. That outside position in my view would not be restricted, but would be a representative of consumers, or somebody with known expertise whom the board might like to coopt and have the benefit of his advice. That position is quite open, but it is outside the authority both in terms of administration and staff. That is my understanding of the Bill, which I believe is an accurate one. I am pleased that members are in accord with the wisdom of passing this small amendment, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), and passed.

## APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

### *Consideration of Tabled Paper*

Debate resumed from 22 September.

HON GARRY KELLY (South Metropolitan) [4.05 pm]: Before the debate was adjourned last evening I had mentioned that there were something like 33 outlets for firearms in the metropolitan area. In that number I have included firearms sections of the K Mart retail chain. It is with some pleasure that I inform members that today I rang to find which K Mart stores sold firearms; and I was informed that now none of the K Mart chain sells firearms, and 10 out of 14 sell only ammunition. I am not saying that the list is exhaustive -- there may be more -- but I took it from the current edition of the yellow pages. It shows something like 23 retail outlets for guns in the Perth metropolitan area.

For the information of members, I seek leave to incorporate the list of retailers in *Hansard*.

*The material in appendix A was incorporated by leave of the House.*

*(see p 4085.)*

The thrust of my remarks, while talking about the need for gun control, is that most States have gun laws of one type or another. Some States have more stringent laws than others. The need then arises to address the question of uniformity of gun laws. In the early days of federation, when there was little movement between States, it did not matter whether different States had different laws on a whole range of human activities. Gun control was a domestic matter which did not make much difference. But with modern communications and transport, the ability to move guns across State borders has meant that the question of gun

laws not being as tight as they might be in different States must be addressed. Under section 92 of the Constitution, a State cannot prevent guns from being imported.

On the question of uniformity, I would like to commend Gordon Hill, the State Minister for Police and Emergency Services, on his initiative in putting the question of uniform gun control laws on the agenda of the Police Ministers' Council.

Hon Graham Edwards: It is a very important move.

Hon P.G. Pental: He had to do something.

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

Hon Graham Edwards: The only people who have not replied are the people in Queensland.

Hon GARRY KELLY: And Tasmania. Tasmania replied, but not appropriately. I take the point, though. Gordon Hill actually placed this matter on the agenda before the events of this year involving the deaths of a number of people.

Most States have reasonable gun control laws, but some States are lax in this matter, and that includes Queensland and Tasmania. I would like to refer to last Saturday's *The West Australian*.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Will you have an inquiry here?

Hon GARRY KELLY: There was a front page story, a feature by Cyril Ayris, and an editorial on the subject. I will read from those articles for the benefit of those members who have not read them and to refresh the memories of those members who have, because the information contained in them bears consideration.

Cyril Ayris went across to Tasmania and on Monday of last week he decided to buy a rifle so went into a gun shop. The rifle he bought was a 0.223 calibre semiautomatic rifle. The newspaper makes the comment that purchasing the rifle was as easy as buying a bag of lollies -- they simply walked into a shop called Gun Sales and Service and told the manager they wanted to buy a gun. They added the description "something military". They then asked whether they needed a licence for it, and the reply was, "No, no licences here." They handed over \$840 and, as part of the deal, the manager of the shop threw in three boxes of Chinese ammunition, on the house.

They made no attempt to conceal the gun. They caught the ferry back to Victoria, and apparently someone tipped off the Victorian police because they were waiting when the ferry docked. Had that not been the case, they would have had no trouble getting the weapon onto the mainland.

Some of the attitudes expressed in Tasmania are frightening. In the News Extra page of the same edition of that newspaper the synopsis in bold type reads --

Debate on the need for tighter gun laws has been fired by recent massacres.

Free access to firearms in Queensland was a factor in the Schwab murder rampage in Australia's North. And as a result the Queensland Government is moving for licensing laws in the next session of Parliament.

But a team from *The West Australian* discovered this week that guns are even more a part of life in Tasmania. And the Tasmanians intend to keep it that way.

They are some of the comments on page 15 of last Saturday's *The West Australian*, and I suggest that those members who have not read it should do so. The article reads in part --

Tasmanians love their guns. They enjoy talking about them and they live easily with them.

A permit is needed to own a handgun in Tasmania, but it is open slather on all bolt-action and semi-automatic weapons . . .

You simply walk into the shop, pick your gun and hand over your money.

There is no restriction on the calibre. I heard of several people who own anti-tank guns. And there is no legal requirement to store a rifle safely.

I thought antitank guns, bazookas, machine-guns, or anti-aircraft guns were the reserve of the more way-out fringes in the United States, but this is happening virtually on our own back doorstep. The article continues --

Children can buy any calibre weapon on reaching the age of 16 -- but it is illegal for them to buy fireworks until they are 18.

I suppose that is a means of getting one's priorities right.

Hon P.G. Pendar: What is the preoccupation with Tasmania when the crime rate is so high and police morale has been destroyed by your Government?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

Hon GARRY KELLY: Tasmanians regard licensing laws on the mainland as a bad joke. I started this part of my speech by pointing out the need for uniformity of gun laws. It says in this same article --

Any attempt at uniformity would have to be on the understanding that the mainland States would be prepared to come at least halfway towards meeting Tasmania.

That would mean a severe watering down of the gun laws in this State and I do not think we could tolerate that at the moment.

The editorial in *The West Australian* on the same day, Saturday 19 September, was entitled "Death for sale" and read as follows --

The case for uniform gun controls throughout Australia could hardly be more overwhelming.

The ridiculous ease with which a news team from *The West Australian* was able to buy a dangerous weapon and ammunition in Tasmania should have removed any doubt about the urgent need for action.

It will be of some comfort to the public that the police found out about the team's purchase and intercepted them in Melbourne. Experienced criminals, however, may not have run into the same problems.

In these times of increased interstate mobility the shortcomings of controls in one State can have a fatal impact in another part of the country. The tragic deaths of five people in northern Australia earlier this year, at the hands of a demented West German tourist who bought high-powered weapons off the shelf in Queensland, was graphic proof of that.

Only by tight control of the availability and use of firearms can the risk of more unnecessary death and bloodshed be averted.

I think most Western Australians who are reasonably sensible and who are not fanatical members of the gun lobby would be quite proud of the gun laws enacted in this State. I have here a report commissioned in 1981 by none other than Mr Bill Hassell, who was Minister for Police at the time. Despite the stringency of gun laws in this State, the size of the State's arsenal of privately owned weapons would cause surprise. In fact, the report was prepared by Mr Oliver Dixon and I will read a section of it as it is quite illuminating. He said members of Parliament would be quite surprised. The report reads in part --

It is worthwhile to stress the number of firearms which already exist in Western Australia, and it may well come as something of a surprise to members of Parliament and the public to realise just how many firearms exist in our State even though it has the strictest firearm control in Australia.

This report was prepared in 1981, so the figures I am about to quote are out of date but they are indicative. The report continues --

As at the 30th June, 1981 there were in this State 96,062 registered firearm owners and these individuals possess no fewer than 186,866 firearms. Unfortunately, I am of the view this is not the whole story; no one can do more than hazard a guess at the number of unregistered firearms which exist, but I asked the question of a very wide section of the shooting community and no one estimated the total of unregistered firearms at less than 30 per cent of those registered, and indeed most opinions suggested the number of unregistered firearms could well equal 50 per cent of those registered.

So we are probably looking at 280 000 firearms in Western Australia. We are fairly strict on licensing requirements with rifles, and it is almost impossible to get hand guns. However, hand gun figures are a cause for concern. The report continues --

It is also a matter for some concern to note the number of handguns registered in this State; these number no fewer than 8,692. Of this total 1,981 handguns are held on corporate licences, that is by such institutions as banks, security services and the like.

So there were something like 6 800 hand guns in other than corporate hands. That is a lot of hand guns floating around in the community.

I said last night that I question the need for private ownership of firearms at all. We, as a society, must ask ourselves before an insurmountable problem arises whether the private citizen, in the words of the United States Constitution, has the right to "keep and bear arms".

Hon W.N. Stretch: What about the farmers?

Hon GARRY KELLY: The member should wait until I have gone a bit further, and I will mention that.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Keep going and about all I will do is shoot through.

Hon GARRY KELLY: To take up Hon W.N. Stretch's point, the situation in rural areas is somewhat different from that in urban areas -- and by urban areas I mean cities and large country towns as well.

Perhaps there is a case for ownership of guns for those who derive their livelihood from the use of firearms, such as professional shooters or people in rural pursuits who can prove they need access to weapons. In 1981 something like 28 000 guns were in use, and many of them were not owned by rural producers or people involved in rural pursuits. Where are these guns and to what use are they being put?

A number of reasons are given for the ownership of guns; for instance, amateur hunters go out shooting wild boar or whatever -- also road signs, tanks and property in general. As far as these hunters are concerned, Oscar Wilde summed them up as the unspeakable in pursuit of the uneatable. Apart from the damage to fauna and property, these amateurs also do damage to themselves, if we take into account the number of times guns are discharged in the back of utilities, or by people climbing through fences, or people getting in and out of vehicles. The reasons are too numerous to list.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: We should educate society.

Hon GARRY KELLY: Some people are beyond that. However, another reason for ownership of guns or access to guns is perhaps for use within licensed gun clubs. If this were a valid reason, and if we sided with that line of thought, then the guns should be stored in an arsenal at the gun club and not taken home. The reasons for that are obvious, as I mentioned last night, with children in the homes or even the possibility of arguments breaking out, and tragedies arising.

An Opposition member: In Switzerland everyone has a gun.

Hon GARRY KELLY: I take the point, but Switzerland has a citizen army which is trained to use weapons. The use of weapons is part of their culture. The same situation applies in Israel which is a nation that has been at war for the best part of 40 years; and a part of their culture is to be armed. The member cannot translate the experience of Switzerland into countries like Australia or the United States. I suggest the United States' situation is a recipe for mayhem. The Swiss situation is a unique one which works but cannot be translated into the Australian situation.

As far as gun clubs are concerned, I draw members' attention to the three massacres which have occurred this year: involving Josef Schwab, Julian Knight -- the alleged killer in the Hoddle Street massacre -- and Ryan in the Hungerford killings in Britain. All these people were members of rifle or shooting clubs. The clubs were devastatingly effective in training these people to be accurate shots, but the training is no guarantee that people will not go off the rails and start taking pot-shots at the general population.

Another argument for owning guns is for protection, but we have proven that having guns does not increase security; in fact the ownership of guns detracts from security. A summary from Richard Harding's book *Firearms and Violence in Australian Life*, published in 1980, at the end of a chapter "Motives for Owning Firearms", reads --

Australian gun-owners have a variety of motives for possessing firearms. It is open to question whether protection is an acceptable motive, and it is dubious whether gun ownership would normally be effective for such a purpose. There seems to be an

issue here in relation to which licensing authorities have yet to take a considered and coherent attitude.

I understand the attitude of the Commissioner of Police in this State is that owning a gun for protection is not a valid reason. Hon E.J. Charlton stole my thunder on that point.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: What if the Premier were to invite you to present trophies at the Queen's Cup Rifle Shoot? They might use you as a target.

Hon GARRY KELLY: That would be a reason for taking the guns from them. I see that gun clubs have a reason for people to be members and to use firearms, but I put a proviso on that: guns should be kept in an arsenal maintained by the club.

I refer again to the Tasmanian experience where Dr Bob Brown, an Independent of the House of Assembly in Tasmania, intends to introduce legislation in the form of a private member's Bill -- and I suggest it has not much chance of being passed -- to tighten up the gun laws. The Police Minister of Tasmania said on the weekend that Tasmania will not be railroaded into adopting uniform laws but will go its own way. This may be an argument for casting Tasmania adrift from the mainland. If Tasmania goes its own way and their gun laws are lax, this situation makes the job that much harder on the mainland for those States where gun laws are tight. The mainland authorities' jobs will be virtually impossible to carry out.

Dr Brown's Bill will contain the following points: All firearms to be registered; all gun owners to pass a strict licensing test; gun clubs to be responsible for issuing firearms licences; and gun licences to be effectively restricted to farms, security personnel, police and gun clubs -- which keeps the rural lobby happy. A rather novel approach, the next point is: All guns to be stored at police stations or gun clubs unless there is a good reason to store them in a home. I am sure that is a procedure we should consider introducing into Western Australia, if we do agree citizens should own guns. Dr Brown's Bill will also include a strict registration system introduced so that the police will know whether there are weapons in any house; and the creation of an offence of possessing a firearm with intent to commit a crime.

All these points will probably cause discussion in the Tasmanian Parliament but the chances of the Bill becoming law are quite remote.

Returning to the point of whether the need to own firearms should be questioned, I suggest a national inquiry into the desirability of private ownership of firearms and their commercial availability in Australia. I said last night that firearm ownership is not the problem despite recent events. The problem is not of the endemic proportions as in the United States.

The terms of reference of such an inquiry should address these questions --

- (1) Why do people wish to own guns?
- (2) Are those reasons both necessary and sufficient to allow continued private ownership of firearms within the Australian community?
- (3) If private ownership is to be permitted --
  - (a) under what conditions should this be allowed;
  - (b) what types of weapons should be available for purchase;
  - (c) what is the most appropriate arrangement for the retailing of firearms; and
  - (d) how many and what type of weapons should be imported into Australia?

The questions are basic, but I am concerned with the Tasmanian situation where a person may buy a bazooka, or an anti-tank gun. Why would a private person want a weapon of that destructive capacity?

I repeat that despite the tragedies of this year, I believe the extent of gun ownership in this country has not reached the endemic proportion that it has in the United States.

We have an opportunity as a nation to make sure that a crisis of the proportions that exists in the US never comes about. It behoves Australia now to grasp the opportunity and sit down and decide whether we want to become a gun-owning nation at all, and if we do, under what conditions. Those conditions should apply uniformly across the country. We have a chance now to stop firearms becoming a real problem in the community. If we do not tackle the situation now, we could have a problem of insurmountable proportions. It will be a structural problem because the number of guns in private ownership will be almost impossible to control. People will become attached to them.

In relation to the importation of firearms, I understand that 300 weapons a week of various sorts are imported for general sale. That has to be addressed, and it should be part of the terms of reference of any national inquiry.

I support the motion.

**HON DOUG WENN** (South West) [4.32 pm]: I compliment Hon Garry Kelly on the speech he just made and support his remarks very sincerely.

The parts of the Budget I wish to address today relate to my electorate of South West Province. I applaud the State Government's commitment to the continued economic growth and development of the south west. I would like to compliment one person in particular, Hon Julian Grill. Cabinet saw fit in 1986 to establish a Ministry for The South West, and that duty fell to Hon Julian Grill who, to my mind, has done a tremendous job since taking up that position.

**Hon J.N. Caldwell**: He had a bit of trouble with the Midland saleyard.

**Hon DOUG WENN**: That has nothing to do with the south west. It has to do with the member who sits over the back and continually rants and raves about it.

**Hon P.G. Pental**: Uncovering the dirty linen!

**Hon DOUG WENN**: Hello! Mr Pental is awake again.

Julian Grill is available at all times to people in his electorate, and he travels quite extensively throughout the electorate. Through his determination, and working with Dr Manea of the South West Development Authority, he has created a system that is working well in the region, contrary to the belief of some. That needs to be encouraged as much as possible.

There are substantial commitments to my electorate within the Budget, particularly in the areas of health, education, transport, and community facilities. In the health field, there is the final allocation of money to complete the Augusta District Hospital, extensions to which were recently opened by the Minister for Health. They are certainly worthy of the township of Augusta and the people involved. Money has been allocated to build a new community health centre in south Bunbury. That centre is well used and much appreciated by people in the vicinity.

In education, \$120 000 has been allocated to building stage 1 of the \$7.9 million Bunbury Institute of Advanced Education. Every member of this House knows the State Government took the initiative to develop the institute. It did so without Commonwealth funds, and it certainly needs to be congratulated on that score. Mr Grill, in conjunction with the Minister for Education, is deserving of praise for the way that their determination has brought about the establishment of the institute.

Construction of the new \$3.5 million high school at Australind is well underway and it will open soon. That is a great asset to the people of Australind because that area has a fast-growing population. It will continue to grow, as will the need for a building such as the high school. The sum of \$1.2 million has been allocated to continue improvements at the Busselton High School. They are well underway, and as Busselton's population grows so will the number of youths and the education needs in the area. Again the Government is to be complimented.

I mentioned the South West Development Authority earlier, and it is still going strongly with Dr Manea at the helm. It has made a great input to the way in which the south west has progressed. Some of the major SWDA projects include development works to set up the Leschenault coastal park. In the eyes of most people in the area that will be a great asset for tourism, and it is a piece of land which will be used by many, particularly those who see at some time in their lives that there is a world outside this city and beyond Armadale. Preliminary work is going on to redevelop the Bunbury central area to incorporate the former Westrail marshalling yards. There is also work to be done on the Bunbury outer harbour and the north shore area.

I was born and raised in Bunbury, and my family has been involved there for well over 140 years, being among the first settlers to arrive there. I believe my great-great-grandfather was one of the first six settlers to establish in that district. My grandfather's brother, who unfortunately passed away recently, was one of the people with whom it was a great pleasure to talk about the history of Bunbury. He told me that the people of Bunbury had been trying

since 1926 to shift that railway marshalling yard from the central area. It took until 1983, when this Government took the initiative and went ahead with it. The new marshalling yards at Picton are a good asset for Westrail, and the system is working well. I said this in my maiden speech, but I repeat that the new railway station is being accepted by the people of Bunbury and is being well used, and that will continue.

The South West Development Authority has many other areas to cover including Collie, Boyup Brook, and Manjimup. A figure of \$75 000 has been provided under a family package for emergency crisis care for children in the south west region. I take this opportunity to thank the Ministers for the work they have done in this region. The family package included in the Budget is available to any person who wishes to avail himself of it. I suggest that interested persons read the initiatives put forward by the Government. In particular, I thank Hon Kay Hallahan and her staff for the great effort they have made to formulate this package.

A project that was originally put forward by the South West Development Authority has been included in this Budget. I refer to the project which will provide care and assistance for children in their own homes in the event of parent illnesses or hospitalisation. Too often the lives of children are disturbed because either their mother or father is admitted to hospital because of serious illness and the children are lumbered onto aunts, uncles, or grandparents. It can be very disturbing for the children, but under this scheme they will be provided with security and will still be subject to family life.

I am sure that members of the National Party are happy to see the provision of funds in the Budget for the Department of Agriculture to begin a soil sampling programme for chemical residues at Bunbury to boost protection for the local meat export industry. Members are aware of the problems that occurred recently and are continuing in that industry. It will take some time to eradicate the problem because it has been with us for a long time.

One of the major transport initiatives in the region is the allocation of an amount of \$3.6 million to the Australind bypass. This will be an asset to the area because of the redevelopment in the region. I have seen members of the Opposition in my province recently using the coast road. They have been in the area collecting signatures against the introduction of the ID card. I do not know how they are going, but I really do not care. The road system will be completed in 1989, and it will result in a direct route to the heart of Bunbury or if one desires, he can continue through to Busselton.

Work on the *Australind* train service which operates between Perth and Bunbury will continue and an amount of \$10.7 million has been allocated in this year's Budget for that project. This also will result in an asset, but there is still some doubt about the timetable. I am sure that all members who are fathers know that one of the problems with a new baby is the teething problem and this applies to this project. However, as occurs with the baby, the problem will be ironed out.

Housing in the region will be boosted by the construction --

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon D.J. Wordsworth): Order!

Hon DOUG WENN: If Hon Phil Pandal wants to see the figures, they are available. I am sure he will be very surprised.

The construction of 87 units in the 1987-88 financial year will provide a boost to the housing industry in the region. Thirty-four units will be erected in Bunbury, seven in Margaret River, two in Busselton and the remainder will be erected in Mandurah, Manjimup, Donnybrook, and Pemberton. In addition to that, four residences will be built in Bunbury under the Aboriginal housing programme. An additional eight homes will be built in the south west by the Government Employees Housing Authority.

An amount of \$3.6 million will be directed into the Bunbury regional office of the Department of Agriculture. The building will be completed from that allocation this financial year.

Bunbury, together with the surrounding districts, is growing fast and the Budget has provided for the extension of support to small business in the country area. Information and advisory centres will be set up in the country areas in cooperation with the Small Business Development Corporation. In Bunbury the corporation is run by Laurie Fitzgerald, who is a personal friend of mine. He is a true advocate for the position and he believes strongly in small business and in the area. He has provided a great deal of assistance to many people



who wish to establish small businesses in the area. We must realise that all too often people go into the area of small business without understanding the ramifications. First, they must establish what they want to do and they must understand leasing arrangements. If they do not do this, it becomes a burden on them.

As a result of this Budget the Government remains committed to the development and economic prosperity of the south west region.

All members are aware that a Cabinet meeting was held in Busselton on Monday. I record my sincere thanks to the Premier, the members of Cabinet, and their staff for the work which obviously goes into conducting these meetings. A number of projects for the area were outlined at that meeting, and I have been involved in a couple of those projects over recent months. The committee promoting one of the projects is excellent, and I would be telling an untruth if I said I was not disappointed that funds were not forthcoming from the Government for the overall maintenance of what is classified as one of the true historical tourist attractions in the south west -- the timber jetty.

I take into account the reasons the Treasurer gave about why those funds would not be immediately forthcoming. Members are aware of the by-election campaign in the South West Province, and Opposition members are finding it difficult to speak to the electorate about State issues. We are hearing only two issues from the Opposition. One is the ID card and the other is pork-barrelling. I work very hard for my area and I take part in raising funds for projects such as the timber jetty. I wonder whether the Opposition's candidate has an ulterior motive. On the same day I read articles in *The West Australian* and the *Busselton-Margaret Times*. The article in the *Busselton-Margaret Times* read as follows --

These moves and the commitment by the Busselton Shire to restore the jetty have been praised by South West province candidate --

I will not mention any names. The articles continues --

The jetty is the lifeline of Busselton and the people clearly recognise this --

On the same day in *The West Australian* the candidate, a Busselton shire councillor said --

... it seemed to have been put together "in a hell of a hurry" ... the Government's pork-barrelling for the by-election, --

In one paper the Opposition candidate said that it would be great if the project could be undertaken, but in another paper which is not widely read in the area he said that the Government is pork-barrelling and is buying votes. From that understanding, why go along with the Treasurer's words that we wait until after the by-election and reconsider the matter? I am waiting for the day that the Opposition addresses local and State issues instead of Federal issues. Obviously, this Government is working too well because the Opposition cannot find anything wrong with what it is doing.

Hon G.E. Masters: Tell us whether you support the ID card.

Hon DOUG WENN: I do.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon D.J. Wordsworth): Order!

Hon G.E. Masters interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Wordsworth): Order! The Leader of the Opposition is continually interjecting.

Hon DOUG WENN: The Premier of the day was sympathetic to a grant for the Busselton Shire Council to repair the jetty, but a favourable announcement now would be dismissed as vote-buying. I must go back and start again. I feel like a cricketer batting on 99.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is setting a very bad example.

Hon DOUG WENN: I will start again. I worked all day on this story.

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: Because the Leader of the Opposition was talking and not listening, I will start again so that I get the story down to you, Sir, and you will not have to read it later in *Hansard*. I feel like a cricketer who is standing out there batting on 99 with another

member at the other end. We are fighting for the same cause but he runs me in for an ulterior motive. That is how I feel in regard to the Busselton jetty.

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: That is one of my grizzles. The Government saw fit to establish a new Busselton fire station. The population is increasing incredibly all the time and the new fire station will give the fire fighters a true home where they can work in comfort and with efficiency.

The senior high schools in Bunbury and Busselton are expected to be the first metropolitan country high schools to have their administrations computerised.

My second grizzle concerns yesterday's *South Western Times*, where a large article appeared in regard to the Telecom technical cutbacks. A number of people, including politicians, have been working for three or four weeks to establish a proper argument against a report prepared for Telecom. Last week a report was prepared for the Premier to take to Mr Hawke. Many of the Telecom workers have an involvement in the community; those people could be lost to the community, and some are close friends of mine. I was part of that committee which prepared the case for the Premier to take to the Prime Minister. The article says --

The committee, headed by Mitchell MLA David Smith, has challenged claims in the report that the relocation would produce benefits.

Being a fair newspaper, it then asked the Leader of the Opposition if he would make a comment. I could not believe it when I saw part of that comment, which reads --

"Mr Hawke has given a stay of execution till after next month's South West Province by-election," he said.

I did not believe it!

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: Let me tell members why I did not believe it. The committee comprises, firstly, David Smith, who is chairman.

Hon P.G. Pandal: That is the first problem.

Hon DOUG WENN: The next is Geoff Prosser, the Federal Liberal member for that area. The third is Councillor Bob McCormack.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Another cousin of mine, but I am lumbered with you.

Hon Graham Edwards: They are both lumbered with you.

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: I am being driven to drink! The third, Councillor Bob McCormack, was a nominee for the Liberal Party in the forthcoming by-election. The other members are Mr Ralph Stone, President of the Chamber of Commerce, and Mr Peter Morris, who was asked to write up the document for the Premier. Are members on the other side so badly disarrayed that their leader must make a statement like that when the committee contains three staunch members of the Liberal Party?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon DOUG WENN: I will finish on a nice point.

Hon P.G. Pandal: When will you start your speech?

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: I have lost my place on this.

Several members interjected.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Tell us about your granddad again.

Hon DOUG WENN: My granddad was a great bloke.

Hon P.G. Pandal: He was, too.

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: In last week's *Daily News* there appeared an article about a plan put up by the Opposition health spokesman, John Bradshaw. It is a great plan; I agree with it, and I hope that this Government, being as versatile as it is, can go with it as well. The article reads --

Young unemployed migrants should be encouraged to work as voluntary interpreters in WA hospitals.

That's the plan of Opposition health spokesman John Bradshaw, who says language difficulties often lead to a great deal of suffering.

The young people could deal specifically with the needs of non-English speaking patients, he said.

I agree with that completely. It is a great idea and I hope that this Government will see it as such and run with it.

I want to pay homage to all the councillors throughout my electorate. They have to put up with a lot of unnecessary flak from local people. I always come back to the argument that if one is not happy with one's local councillor -- the same as with one's local member of Parliament, State or Federal -- one can always put up, chase the votes and get in. I thank the councillors sincerely for the work they have done, particularly those councillors who have given me and the committee great support over the timber jetty. We will not drop it; we will be in there fighting. I put it up as my No 1 priority in Busselton and I am determined to see funds come from somewhere to restore that timber jetty.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Barry House will join you in the fight and the two of you will succeed.

Several members interjected.

Hon DOUG WENN: Regarding a comment made by Hon Phil Pandal in regard to the Margaret River Hospital, contrary to a statement by the member for Vasse, there was a commitment in the Budget to continue negotiations, and this Government is fully committed to rebuilding the hospital at Margaret River.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Central) [4.59 pm]: I hope my comments will receive the acclaim of members on all sides of the House, as they usually do. I start by commenting on the allocations towards the State's contribution to the bicentennial. Although a few different figures have been allocated over the last few months, the Budget papers provide for an allocation of something over \$2 million towards the bicentennial. My comments concern the bicentennial celebrations proposed for next year as well as some of the activities going on at the moment.

I think they are an exorbitant waste of taxpayers' money. The bicentenary was supposed to be a time when Australians could record in one way or another an historic happening, and I fully support that. But the way in which the Federal Government -- in this case with the support of the State Government -- has gone about some of its initiatives is an absolutely horrendous waste of taxpayers' money.

[Questions taken.]

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The people of Australia will be involved in the bicentennial celebration even if they do not participate in it because it will be their money being expended and they all have the right to understand what money is being spent on this exercise and where it is being spent. It is estimated that \$276 million will be expended on the bicentennial, and this is a waste of taxpayers' money at a time when the Australian economy is on its knees and going backwards at \$1 million a day. It is absolute mismanagement for the Government to spend this money on the celebrations and try to pull the wool over the eyes of the people by saying, "Here is a great opportunity for the people of Australia to come together." The catchcry is "living together", but \$276 million is to be expended while at the same time the Government is to introduce the Australia Card, which will do nothing more than divide the nation. The Federal Government is to spend \$276 million to bring Australians together, while it is to introduce the ID card which will drag Australians apart; and the number of people on the side of spending the money will be disproportionately small compared with the number of those who do not support the introduction of the Australia Card.

I have here a list of events that will be put on to help spend this \$276 million. We are to have a mallee root throwing competition. How is that going to bring the people of Australia

together? The biggest maypole ever is to be erected in the Barossa Valley. I have about 20 pages of various events that are to be held, but I will not go through them all as many of them have come to notice of members from a reading of the newspapers.

Hon T.G. Butler: Ask them what they thought about the 150th anniversary celebrations. They wouldn't agree with you.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: We are talking about a celebration of 200 years, which is not what it should be because it is not 200 years since action was taken to make us a nation; that did not occur until 1901. We have only been a nation for a few years, not 200 years.

The Federal Government is spending \$6 million on a public relations exercise to gear people up to make them believe that we should have a party. The expenditure of all this money would be acceptable if it went on something that would be put in place and we could see for years ahead and be of benefit to the people for years ahead. Spending \$6 million like this is like spending money promoting a huge \$276 million party, and usually all we have left after a big party is a hangover. In this case the hangover will be the expense incurred. Remember, the Federal Government has no money of its own; Governments spend the money of taxpayers.

The celebration has got completely out of hand. It started off on the wrong foot when the Fraser Government appointed that chap to head the celebrations.

Hon P.G. Pandal: And your party appointed him, too.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Yes, the Government of the day put him there. We then had the exercise of his receiving a \$500 000 pay out when he left. The thing has blundered along ever since.

Some people say that the money is being directed to worthwhile causes. In some cases I could not agree more, but why do it in the name of the bicentennial? Why not make these funds available to people who genuinely need assistance? These days we see all sorts of people being harassed by economic difficulties while many people are receiving handouts without contributing anything for them. This happens when other people -- and this has always gone on -- can be found with good reasons for receiving assistance but not receiving any. It is time all Australians started to think about the amount of money the Federal Government is spending on this exercise, remembering that the State Government is cooperating with the Federal Government. The celebrations are totally out of control and will provide no real benefits.

An example of how this money is being given away is the \$50 000 grant for a 19-strong team to climb Mt Everest. How on earth will that celebrate 200 years of Australian history? The great majority of Australians would not give two hoots for so many of these activities.

Hon P.G. Pandal: There is probably a Bob Hawke biography in Japanese.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: They might be more interested in it than we would be. Another event on which money is being spent is a tour that will take place around the nation; it is called "the biggest show of them all". The information on the tour says that people will see the spectacular sight of a travelling exhibition which will be difficult to forget. There will be a line of vehicles over four kilometres long, including giant semi-trailers, caravans, a 25-tonne crane, motor bikes, cars, flat-bed trucks, and trailers. It seems that this show is to visit 34 sites across the nation and cover 20 000 kilometres. This is to celebrate the bicentennial. This is to happen at a time when we have people who do not have reticulated water supplies. The \$276 million could just about have been used to overcome the water supply problems of people right across the nation. We would have had something there for years to come; it would have created development and a better life for many Australians. I hear some members behind me mumbling, but they have never been out to see where many of these people are producing export produce on which a lot of the rest of Australia is living. They do not want to know about that.

I turn now to my hardy annual of the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation. Just today we in the National Party had discussions with the director of RAFCOR, John Groves. The National Party wants to work closely with RAFCOR to change some of its directions of the last few years. Obviously when an organisation is set up it need not be that we should always follow the original path set for it. Conditions change, priorities change, funding allocations change; therefore we need to have our fingers on the pulse to see how things are developing.

I am very concerned about some of the outstanding loans made by RAFCOR, where in excess of \$100 million is outstanding. Loans worth many millions of dollars have been made to farmer clients who have had difficulty in servicing those loans. Obviously one of the major reasons is the drought. We should remember that farmers do not rely only on the price of their goods as retailers do or as salaried people rely on their salaries each week; farmers rely on the weather and other factors. Over the past two or three years we have seen unbelievable fluctuations in commodity prices and we have experienced periods of drought. The area from which my colleague, Hon J.N. Caldwell, comes is known as the bluegrass country of Western Australia. It is suffering from a lack of rain.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: It is known as brown-grass country.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I believe that some areas of the great southern will be declared drought areas shortly. We, as members of Parliament, should be requesting the Minister for Agriculture and the Government to begin to put into place actions to prevent farmers from suffering as they have suffered in years gone by. Decisions have been made too late and half of the next year has passed before grants are made to assist farmers most in need. RAFCOR allocates funds only as a last resort. It therefore does not require the security required by the commercial finance companies. Changes have to be made, therefore, to the rules for establishing equity and viability. The bottom line has to be people's ability to pay. That is a very difficult proposition when one understands that no-one can project what the incomes of these people will be, even with the weather factor taken out of the consideration. Who would have believed that wool prices would have increased at the rate they have increased in the last 12 months or, a few years ago, that wheat prices would be as low as they are today? It is not possible to predict what the incomes from those commodities will be.

I sound a note of warning: We, as responsible members of Parliament, should be taken notice of when we put forward ideas and propositions to the Government and to RAFCOR. Only about 40 per cent of applications to RAFCOR are successful. Many people do not receive assistance. I believe that people do not even apply for assistance because they have been in the clutches of RAFCOR previously and that has had a pretty severe effect on their other financial activities.

Hon J.M. Brown: In what way?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Simply because, when people are allocated loans and there is a downturn in world prices, they find they cannot manoeuvre their financial operations without obtaining consent from RAFCOR first. I am not criticising RAFCOR.

Hon J.M. Brown: But you spoke about RAFCOR being a secondary lender.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: It is a lender of last resort. However, that does not mean that, just because it is at the end of the line, it will not wait until its criteria for lending have been satisfied. It can call for crop liens.

I have been telling RAFCOR for the last couple of years that more of its people should talk to farmers so that both parties are better informed about how to tackle their problems. I was pleased to hear John Groves say that that system is successful. I believe it is the simplest and best means of enabling people to become better informed.

The other matter I wish to raise relates also to the rural industry and arose partially as a result of the trip of the all-party delegation to the United States. The subsidisation that has occurred in both the United States and the EEC would not be tolerated by the Australian taxpayer. I also believe that Australian farmers would not want it. That does not mean that Governments in Australia do not have a responsibility to do something about its occurring in other countries. They have to take whatever action is available to them to make life and the economies of rural people in this country a little better. I emphasise that, by "rural people", I am not referring only to farmers. All people living in country communities in this country are rural people. I believe that Governments and the media have committed a terrible wrong by making comments and by putting in place policies that have driven our people apart. Farmers have been driven apart from the people working in service industries and from people living in the metropolitan areas. We have a tremendous job to do to make people across this nation understand that we all depend on each other. We have to take action now if we are to help people in the rural communities to survive.

The rest of Australia is very dependent on the rural industries for its export income. We have high interest rates because our balance of payments is in a terrible state and our deficit is so high. It is imperative that we encourage export trade. We are all aware that Australian

farmers have planted less wheat this year to protect their crops. The harvest will be down by two million tonnes. When that is multiplied by \$145 or \$150 of what the nation receives, it means we will lose a lot of money by March next year. As I said, we have to do our best to encourage farmers to plant their crops next year so that the Wheat Board has something to sell on international markets.

It is certainly not a myth that our farmers have been portrayed overseas as the most efficient farmers. If people did not believe it before, they can take our word for it; following the trip I have just completed as a member of the delegation, there is no doubt that Australian farmers, particularly the grain farmers, are the most efficient in the world. On average they grow only half the crop an acre of their United States counterparts but their profitability is almost double. Again, they have no subsidisation to back them up.

The Government must take action in two or three areas with regard to the economic factors involved. The first from the State point of view is transport.

Hon J.M. Brown: Do you think we should put in the report?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Yes, I am sure we shall submit a report and we shall all be united and agree with the recommendations put forward, and I do not want to pre-empt that report. It is absolutely imperative that action be taken in the transport field not only from the point of view of Westrail but also at the wharves with the loading and unloading procedures. Australian wheat growers are paying an extra \$7 to \$12 a tonne because of some of the work practices and the activities involved in off-loading from the railway system onto ships. That is a deplorable situation. Australia is not competitive or efficient in that area compared with the rest of the world. I call on this Government to take some action.

I accept that the Government has made some very hard decisions as far as Westrail is concerned and it has my support for what has been done. The problem is that Westrail has indicated it needs two or three years to reach the ultimate position. If the Government of the day is prepared to allow Westrail another two or three years to become as efficient as it could be, the taxpayers must pick up the difference. It is as simple as that. If changes can be made -- and everyone is agreed that they can, including Westrail -- the taxpayers must pick up that difference just as they do with Transperth and in other areas in the metropolitan area.

Why should people in the non-metropolitan area have to pay full price for their transport system at the same time that they are contributing through the State fuel levy to the money going into the transport trust fund? By the way, that transport system is a profitable operation for Westrail and the Government. It is not on and it is in fact thieving from those people to have a regulation stating that they shall pay so much for an operation making money for the Government but on the other hand, another industry which is going backwards and needs propping up, can use the rural industry even though that industry is going broke, families are being split up, and people are leaving their properties and going into bankruptcy to wind up its operations. I feel very strongly that the Government should not allow Westrail two or three years to get its act together; but if it chooses to it must also ensure that taxpayers pick up the difference. Alternatively, it could make the hard decision and go along with that decision.

My other area of concern is chemicals in agriculture. Obviously I cannot mention that subject without commenting on some of the ridiculous statements that have been made by many people blaming farmers for using chemicals, which they have not in fact used. We have heard that DDT is a problem chemical but to date not one of the problems which has arisen has involved that chemical. In many cases the farmers have not used the chemicals at all, they have been used by other people. I do not know whether the people who used certain chemicals were right or wrong but they were given the okay by the Health Department and the chemical manufacturers. There is a definite trend towards reducing the cost of chemicals to the Australian farmer.

Another item as far as import costs are concerned is fuel; there is no question that in Australia the fuel used in agriculture, mining, forestry or fishing should not be subject to excise duty. That is commonsense. Why should the Governments of Australia reap income from fuel being used to produce an export commodity? It is ludicrous. Over the years we have allowed all Governments to use fuel as a taxing measure and at the same time they have put out of business people producing a export commodity which will help the country to balance its books.

Finally, my last point with regard to allowing the producing people of this nation to be competitive is that interest rates must fall. We cannot continue with interest rates higher than those paid by our competitors. Of late, a reduction has occurred in the interest rates but they have a long way to go to match those of the United States, the EEC and the other countries against whom Australian farmers compete.

I reiterate that in the three areas I have mentioned -- the bicentennial where taxpayers' money has been wasted, RAFCOR, and the rural scene -- money does not have to be granted but it has to be redirected to allow those genuine, honest, hardworking people who want to achieve something, not only for themselves and their families but also for the nation, to do so.

HON TOM HELM (North) [5.38 pm]: I rise to congratulate both the Federal and State Governments for the Budgets they have brought down. I know that I am joined by members of the Opposition in congratulating the Government because I have heard no member in this House condemn the Government for its latest Budget. The Leader of the Opposition quoted from a newspaper printed 12 000 miles away, in Fortress Wapping. That newspaper is owned by a good Australian, Rupert Murdoch. That is the only argument we have heard so far which attempts to put down the Budget and says it was the wrong thing to do.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation and it is difficult to hear the member addressing the Chair.

Hon TOM HELM: While I join others in congratulating the Government, some recognition should be given to the price paid by ordinary working people and particularly by those in the Pilbara. Of course, I refer to the two-tier wage system promoted and agreed to through the Federal Government, the ACTU and employer organisations to a large extent. I would like to bring to the attention of the House the amount of work necessary to comply with that agreement, and the determination and understanding of working people. The four per cent implemented as part of the two-tier wage agreement meant that each of these working people took a part in increasing productivity for the enterprise for which they work.

I would like to explain the problems that people experienced through doing that, particularly in the Pilbara. Although the State and Federal union movement leaders were quite clear about their commitment to the two-tier wage system and the implications of receiving the four per cent wage increase, those understandings and agreements had to go downstairs to the shop stewards, the men who actually work on the workshop floor. The shop steward has to explain the agreements and the deals, and he is the one who takes the flak when people's standards of living decline. Members of the Opposition have been quite vocal in saying how living standards are at least standing still, and in some cases they say they are going down, but they do not really demonstrate that. It is generally accepted that we as a nation need to work together in a more combined sense to understand the economic problems that we face and do something about them.

Shop stewards take an active role on the job on a 24 hour a day basis, and they could really do with some recognition, rather than being blamed when anything goes wrong. I heard mention today that the dispute had been settled at Woodside Petroleum, which was said to involve irresponsible or greedy unions. When people make that sort of statement, they obviously do not understand what they are talking about, because those same unions are the ones that they were praising not so long ago when Hamersley Iron and Mt Newman Mining signed the four per cent, second-tier wage agreement, saving the company at least twice as much as it would cost it in increased wage costs.

The situation we have now is that people are quick to condemn but will very rarely give praise where it is due. I believe that is because those people do not understand that the shop steward is the person who is actually in the workplace, and because of his experience and the advice of his conveners, he is the one who is able to advise his work mates about any issue one cares to name, such as marriage guidance, financial management, sport, health, safety and welfare. The shop steward is one's mate, and he may be one's neighbour as well, and one is automatically able to put trust in the shop steward because he is the one who is going to suffer also by any change in work conditions.

I should mention that the dispute at Woodside Petroleum happened in spite of advice from the State union officials that the strike should not take place. That advice was not listened to, so the dispute took place, but it has been settled now.

It is necessary to recognise the push of this Labor Government, and to pay recognition to the work of Hon Peter Dowding in the public sector and particularly the work that his office has done across-the-board in trying to advise and assist shop stewards and conveners about how to put across to the union movement the need for restraint in the economy, which is a revolutionary outlook to the nation's economy. I will come back to the union situation in a moment.

I have to take exception to the objections to the bicentennial celebrations. If we do not celebrate our bicentenary in the way we plan to do, we will be the only western nation that has not done so.

As part of the bicentennial celebrations, I would like to mention the four kilometre long road train. We in the north west would be glad to see it because we do not get to see things like that. I also need to mention the north west games, which are going to take place as part of the celebrations in all the towns of the north west, from Carnarvon up to Kununurra. The people of those towns will be brought together to celebrate and to compete in the spirit of sportsmanship, for which Australians are famous. Just because we live 1 000 miles away from Perth does not mean that we cannot take part in the celebrations. I have never heard anyone in the north west complain about the money that is being spent on the bicentennial celebrations.

Returning to the situation of unions, not only do we have the negative people who choose to attack shop stewards and conveners; we also have only a limited amount of money available to give those people the training they so badly need. I believe we have been pretty reluctant to provide the means whereby those people can have the training they need in order to do their jobs. If they did not do their jobs efficiently and effectively, we would all be in a real mess.

I have just read a report which indicates that Hon Norman Moore was a member of the mission that went to Sweden, West Germany and the United Kingdom. I do not really praise the country where I was born all that much --

Hon Max Evans interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: Yes; that is an interesting thing. The Conservative Party has recognised the need to train the work force to understand the training concept, which is something that we all need to do. In Sweden that has been done for years. So we see a surprising recognition of the need to train shop stewards and conveners in the workplace.

An article was written in *The West Australian* on Thursday, 17 September, which really prompted me to say what I have said. It says --

Australian trade unions are offering to take wider responsibility for improvements in both productivity and growth, according to a Swedish labour-market expert.

We have sent members over to Sweden, and I understand Hon Norman Moore is full of praise at Peter Dowding's initiative in sending him there.

Hon N.F. Moore: I hope he might send me on another visit.

Hon TOM HELM: Sweden used to be like Australia. They did not have sheep, but they had some agriculture and steel manufacturing.

The article continues --

"This is extremely important for Australia with its structure very much based on raw materials and depending on commodity markets," he said.

"Sweden's economy would not be where it is today without the very strong co-operation of unions and the commitment to productivity, growth and the fair distribution of that growth."

The man who said that was Mr Allan Larsson, who is recognised as being an expert on the Swedish labour market. We have the proof positive now --

Hon N.F. Moore: Sweden's economy has very serious problems.

Hon TOM HELM: So has ours. I will not pursue that argument; but what has happened in Sweden and the United Kingdom under Maggie Thatcher is that there has been recognition by Governments and employers of the importance of getting together and talking problems out. It is important to understand these problems in order to do something about them.



Hon N.F. Moore: It is a question of who ultimately gets control.

Hon TOM HELM: I thought that when people worked together they did not have control over each other. The member may laugh, but the people in the Pilbara do not see it as being funny. People with overseas backgrounds are used to trade union people hitting bosses over the head with cudgels, and receiving the same treatment back. Now those same people are demonstrating that we must work together as a team. Whether we are in trouble or not is irrelevant because we need to recognise the work of shop stewards and the importance of training them to understand that. To do that, and to allow them to play a responsible part, the employers need also to take a responsible part. The Government has spent money to send people overseas -- parliamentarians, union shop stewards and so on -- to look at the international scene and yet when one comes back here, one finds that the Government is doing one thing and the unions are doing another thing on behalf of their members, but the employers are not doing very much at all.

If the employers are doing anything, it is not demonstrated in the newspapers or anywhere else. We have to develop that part of the partnership. We must have a tripartite partnership; two parts of it are effective while the other is not. That is no good; it is not part of the partnership. It will be interesting to hear whether members of the Opposition appreciate what is going on. I honestly do not think they understand what is happening; it is not their fault but, at the same time, when one is invited to take a look at something other than what we do in this country, one finds that there are some lessons to be learnt. The results of these lessons should be put into place and not just kept to ourselves.

Hon N.F. Moore: Read my comments in that document.

Hon TOM HELM: The member was not opposed to it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM HELM: The next time there is an opportunity to have a go at the trade union movement, I think it would do as well to take a backward step in order to think for a while. While we are not bashing the unions, let us have a look at what they are doing and support them. If they are not supported, those shop stewards and conveners on the shop floor who are feeling the pressure will not be able to continue to explain the whole process of partnership and the whole enterprise of working together. If we do not do that, we will go back to what we had before -- that is, employers and employees hitting one another at every opportunity.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon John Williams.

*House adjourned at 5.55 pm*

---

APPENDIX A

PERTH GUN AND AMMUNITION RETAILERS

Alexander, Roy & Sons  
44 Eighth Avenue  
Maylands

Bob Hadaway  
Collectable Firearms  
46 Buxton Road  
Wembley Downs

Centrefire Distributors  
24 Denny Avenue  
Duncraig

Coastal Guns & Sports  
296 Canning Highway  
Como

Crackel for Tackle  
509 Wellington Street  
Perth

Crackel for Tackle  
511 Great Northern Highway

Gun Mart  
201 Great Eastern Highway  
Midland

Tony Yozzi Sports  
460 William Street  
Perth

May Williams & Co  
20 Rokeby Road  
Subiaco

WA Guns & Ammunition  
1936 Albany Highway  
Maddington

West Coast Pistol & Revolver Co  
167 Gildercliff Road  
Scarborough

Daly's Sports Centre  
60 Adelaide Street  
Fremantle

K.J. Davis  
Chailey Place  
Balga

Graeme Harris Guns Pty Ltd  
201 Great Eastern Highway

Max Williams & Co  
20 Rokeby Road  
Subiaco

Neil Harris  
49 Southgate Road  
Langford

Perth Gun Exchange  
12 Wells Road  
Bellevue

Rileys Sports & Tackle  
18 Market Street  
Fremantle

The Gun Store  
2C Basinghall Street  
East Victoria Park

Wanneroo Rifleman  
Shop 17 Wanneroo S/Centre  
Wanneroo

Wellington Surplus Stores  
321 Wellington Street  
Perth

Wesfire  
9 Debenham Way  
Hillarys

Wesport Agencies  
335 Churchill Avenue  
Subiaco

# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE REAL ESTATE AGENTS

## *Regulatory Body*

324. Hon P.G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What is the correct title of the body which licences and regulates the activity of estate agents?
- (2) Who are its members?
- (3) Will the Minister please list their dates of appointments and when such appointments expire?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) The Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board.

(2) and (3)

Chairman	Term of Appointment
D.C Miller	4.11.86 - 3.11.88
Members	
D.D. Newman - a person experienced in commercial practice	21.5.87 - 20.5.89
R.D. Warren - a solicitor	4.11.86 - 3.11.88
D.M. Hutchinson - a licensed agent nominated by REIWA	21.5.87 - 20.5.89
J.K. Quinlan - a licensed agent elected for appointment by licensed agents	23.1.85 - 22.1.89

## ROTTNEST ISLAND

### *Cottages: Naming*

327. Hon P.G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Tourism:

What progress has been made in naming cottages at Rottmest Island after pioneer women?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

A research study is being undertaken by board member, Ms Pat Barblett, into the lives of Western Australian pioneer women. Once the study is completed, names will be submitted to the board for approval.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### AUSTRALIA CARD

#### *Support: Minister*

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

I am sure the Minister will recall her leader in the Legislative Council, the Attorney General, reaffirming only a few days ago his full support for Premier Burke's and Mr Hawke's commitment to the introduction of the Australia Card. In view of the massive public demonstration today, does she give full and unqualified support to her Premier and to the Prime Minister in their commitment to the introduction of the Australia Card?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

As I understand it, the issue the member is raising is one of federal responsibility and is certainly not one under my portfolio responsibilities.

**AUSTRALIA CARD**

*Support: Minister*

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

Is the Minister prepared to say yes or no to the question? Does she or does she not support the Australia Card?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I have just answered the honourable member's question quite adequately, in my opinion.

**AUSTRALIA CARD**

*Support: Minister*

175. Hon G.E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Does the Minister give full and unqualified support to his Premier, Brian Burke, and the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, in their commitment to the introduction of the Australia Card?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I always give full and unqualified support to my Premier and, despite the fact that it is not within my area of responsibility, I support the ID card, unlike the Opposition members who seem to vacillate and wax and wane from pillar to post over issues until they ascertain whether people support or do not support them. This is a prime example of that, and it is no wonder our country has suffered so much under their unfortunate but long reign.

Hon P.G. Pandal: So you support the ID card?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I just said I did.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

**AUSTRALIA CARD**

*Support: Labor Party Members*

176. Hon G.E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

I thank the Minister for his frankness. Getting an honest answer from one Minister at least is perhaps reassuring.

Hon Kay Hallahan: There was nothing dishonest about my answer.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I ask the Minister for Sport and Recreation whether, to his knowledge, any other State Labor member of Parliament does not support the introduction of the Australia Card.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That question is out of order.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Why is that?

The PRESIDENT: Because it is not a question that properly comes within the ministerial responsibilities of any Minister in this House. The Leader of the Opposition has been here long enough to know that.

**COMMUNITY SERVICES**

*Emmaus Women's Refuge: Investigation*

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

(1) Who is conducting the inquiry into allegations of impropriety by certain persons at the Emmaus collective?

(2) When is it expected this inquiry will be completed?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) A senior member of the Department for Community Services is conducting the inquiry.

(2) We expect to have the report later today, or certainly by the end of this week.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

*Emmaus Women's Refuge: Investigation*

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

When that report is presented to the Minister, will she make it public?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I did answer the Leader of the Opposition on this matter, and said that I would be waiting until I saw the report. Since he asked that question I have given the matter a good deal of consideration. My view is that it would not be appropriate to make that report public. It is an internal matter looking at the relationship between the department and a non-Government agency. However, I would be prepared to offer whatever is needed in the way of reassurance about whatever action is required as a result of that inquiry, which of course will not be clear to any of us until we get the report.

## AUSTRALIA CARD

*Adoptions Information*

179. Hon P.G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

(1) Is it correct that information contained in records held under the Adoptions Act will need to be conveyed to the Commonwealth for inclusion in the databank for the ID card?

(2) If so, will the Minister prevent its being transmitted to the Commonwealth?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) and (2) I am not aware of that requirement.

## EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

*Clifton Park: Budget Allocation*

180. Hon N.F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

Some notice of this question has been given by telephone to the office of the Minister for Education.

(1) Is the capital works allocation of \$1.233 million for a new primary school at Clifton Park to be used to build a replacement school for the Canning Vale Primary School?

(2) If not, where is the Clifton Park Primary School to be built?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) No.

(2) A new school is under construction in Lucy Victoria Drive, Clifton Park.

## DOG AMENDMENT BILL

*Regulations*

181. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Today the Minister tabled regulations under the Dog Act. Does that mean that the Dog Act as passed by this House fairly recently will now be enforceable? While the public were aware of the various clauses in the Bill when it was being debated, I think they have now relaxed and think it will never be enforced.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not sure whether that question comes within the ministerial responsibility of the Minister for Sport and Recreation, and therefore I am not sure whether it is a proper question. It is a requirement that regulations be tabled in both Houses of the Parliament and it is not necessarily a fact, therefore, that the Minister who tables them is the Minister responsible. However, if the Minister feels inclined to provide the information sought, I am happy for him to do so.

Hon Graham Edwards: I think the question should be directed to the Minister responsible for the Dog Act.

**AUSTRALIA CARD**

*Adoptions Information*

182. Hon P.G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

(1) Will the Minister urgently investigate the information required for the ID card under the Adoptions Act of Western Australia?

(2) Will she ensure that this information is not conveyed to the Commonwealth Government?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) and (2) I guess the Department of Community Services will comply with the laws of the land, whatever they are at the time they are prescribed.

**AUSTRALIA CARD**

*Adoptions Information*

183. Hon P.G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

(1) Is the Minister aware that she has the authority to refuse to hand that information to the Commonwealth?

(2) If she is so aware, will she take action to ensure that the information is not transmitted to the Commonwealth?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1) and (2) I have to say that I made it quite clear that I was unaware of whatever it was the member asked me in his very first question; and that is, where the situation exists -- in spite of his wanting to probe, and probe, and probe. I will certainly look at the interests of the people who are affected by information on that register, as I have done ever since I have been in the position I now hold. That protection of people's information will continue.

Hon P.G. Pendal: That is all we wanted to know.

---