

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 24th October, 1979

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

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. R. G. Pike due to parliamentary business overseas.

## FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF** (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [4.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In general terms, this Bill seeks to amend the Fisheries Act for the following purposes—

To incorporate certain recommendations made by the Parliamentary South Coast Fisheries Study Committee, which was appointed by the Government to investigate and report on aspects of the fishing industry;

to update penalties provided in the Act;

to modify the extent to which the application of the Act applies to Aborigines;

to provide confidentiality of information supplied by fishermen and fishing companies under existing statutory requirements;

to recast the provisions applying to the automatic cancellation of boat licences; and

to effect changes to other minor procedural matters.

The committee, in its report, recommended that—

- (a) The control over coastal fisheries inlets and river fisheries presently exercised by the Shire of Gnowangerup should not continue and, for the sake of consistency and effectiveness in management, policies should revert to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife; and

- (b) All licences and other authorities issued by the Shire of Gnowangerup should, from a forward date not less than six months in advance of announcement, cease to be effective and be replaced subject to the usual discretion and control of the department.

The shire gained control of these waters in 1938 as a result of amendments to the Fisheries Act and the Local Government Act which allowed local authorities to introduce by-laws in respect of fishing in reserves vested in them. This division of the State into separate control areas has caused considerable disagreement about the management of the Pallinup and Wellstead Estuaries since that time.

The shire has exercised its authority to make by-laws, including the setting up of a licensing system and fishing regimes unconnected with those established under the Fisheries Act. These by-laws, although there is some conformity, vary considerably from the controls exercised by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife with respect to estuarine fishing and have caused considerable embarrassment, particularly to amateur fishermen who have not been aware that there are two separate areas of control, in many ways requiring two separate licences.

Over the years, successive Ministers have held the view that control should be vested in a single body for the better management of the fisheries, the enforcement of the regulations, and the convenience of the public.

The committee also recommended in its report that, for the proper protection of the livelihoods of licensed fishermen, the laws prohibiting the sale of fish by amateurs and the enforcement of those laws should be strengthened by making persons who purchase fish from amateurs liable to prosecution.

The sale of fish by amateurs is a cause of constant irritation to professional fishermen in that it results in the reduction of their income and causes distortion and irregularities in the prices paid for fish caught, especially in the case of local area marketing. The sale of fish by amateurs is illegal under the licensing provisions of the fisheries regulations. However, apprehension of offenders is difficult, as actual transactions have to be sighted before convictions can be obtained. Most of these sales are made with commercial outlets other than processing establishments; and the proposed amendments, whereby an offence is committed by fish shops, restaurants, and the like which purchase fish from persons other than those authorised by the Act to sell them, will strengthen

the control the department will be able to exercise over such transactions.

The committee further recommended, with respect to fish processing, that the present provisions of the Act for the management of the establishment of processing plants be maintained, but that the right of appeal to the Court of Petty Sessions be deleted, except where a question of law is involved. The matter of appeals available under the Act against decisions of the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife to grant or not grant permits to construct or establish a processing establishment has been a cause of concern for some time.

The Fisheries Act at present provides for an appeal to a Court of Petty Sessions by any person aggrieved by an order or decision taken under part IIIB—processing establishments. This means that all manner of appeals proceed to a hearing by a magistrate. The matters raised usually relate more to Government policy than to legal correctness.

Decisions relating to the number and distribution of fish processing establishments are all part of the management process of the fishing industry and, as such, a final judgment on their issue should be made by Government and not a court of law. Wherever questions of law are involved, normal legal processes will be available to aggrieved parties.

On the recommendation of the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee, the opportunity has been taken to update penalties under the Act, which were last comprehensively revised in the mid-1960s. In updating these penalties, consideration has been given to changes in the Consumer Price Index, average male weekly earnings, and the average fish and rock lobster prices. Also, adjustments have been made where necessary to avoid anomalies.

The rock lobster and prawn fisheries are lucrative industries, and temptation is high to engage in breaches of fishing rules. To provide suitable deterrents to those intending to engage in illegal activities by which large profits can be made, adequate penalties are necessary.

The Fisheries Act at present lays down that the provisions of the Act do not apply to Aboriginal inhabitants of the State obtaining fish for food in their accustomed manner. In current interpretation, the term "Aboriginal" covers any person who lives as an Aboriginal and claims to be such and the term "accustomed manner for taking fish" is understood to include using modern fishing nets and equipment.

Difficulty has been experienced by departmental officers in the field, in that urbanised Aborigines, aware of the above and knowing that they are exempt from prohibitions on fishing in closed waters, gear restrictions, and prohibitions on taking under-sized fish, have been exploiting the situation. Departmental officers have not been able to take any action against them when they have been breaching the fishing rules because of the protection given to them by the Act.

It is believed that Aborigines in this situation should be subject to normal fishing rules, even though they remain permitted to take food sufficient for themselves and their families without benefit of licences. The changes proposed to the Act should accomplish this without encroaching on their traditional fishing customs.

Fishermen and fishing companies provide commercial catch and effort statistical returns, research log book data, and fish processing returns, both as required by the Act and on a voluntary basis.

Considerable pressure has been exerted by other agencies from time to time to obtain access to this information and fishermen constantly query the assurance given them that the information provided is private between them and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

The implication of such doubts on the commercial catch and effort statistics could be serious. Fishermen need to be guaranteed confidentiality to ensure accuracy of figures supplied by them. The proposed provisions regarding secrecy of information supplied should give the fishing industry the assurance that it seeks.

The Act currently provides that where a boat has, on three occasions, been involved in offences against the Act, the licence for that boat is automatically cancelled. This provision has acted as a deterrent against owners and skippers who might commit offences under the Act.

However, with the passing of time and the longer the life of the boat, the greater its chances of accumulating convictions. As it has passed from owner to owner, a new owner is subject to the risk of losing his livelihood where he has purchased a boat with two convictions already recorded against it, even though those convictions may have been obtained 15 years ago and he may never have committed an offence himself.

To remedy these anomalies, it is proposed that the period for accumulating these offences be restricted to 10 years. This will mean that after 10 years, the oldest conviction would be forgotten

and forgiven and a new 10-year period would start from the date of the second conviction. It is also proposed that convictions accumulated by a boat shall be transferred to the new hull when a boat is replaced, so that the fisherman committing the offence or offences will continue to have them attached to the boat he currently owns.

Machinery clauses have also been included in the Bill to revise the application of the Fisheries Act to equipment used by research workers, to require processors to purchase marron only from holders of commercial licences, and to add clarity to the section which sets out the general penalty for offences under the Act where no specific penalty has been provided.

For the information of members, I wish to add that amendments to the Local Government Act will be introduced at a later stage to complement this particular legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

### STAR SWAMP

#### *Reservation: Motion*

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate, from the 23rd October, on the following motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton—

That the Members of the Legislative Council support the efforts of citizens of the Trigg, Marmion and Waterman localities to have set aside a reserve of 100 hectares in the area bounded by Beach Road-Marmion Avenue-North Beach Road and Hope Street, as a permanent natural bush and passive recreation/nature study area to ensure that Star Swamp and its surrounding bushland will be protected from degradation and recognising—

- (a) that the Star Swamp bush area is one of the few remaining locations of natural vegetation typical of the Swan coastal plain left in the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) its value for recreational and educational purposes;
- (c) the classification of Star Swamp by the National Trust of W.A. for environmental and historical reasons;
- (d) that Star Swamp is one of the few metropolitan wetlands free of salmonella infection;
- (e) the area is being increasingly used as a refuge for plants, birds and animals which are being displaced from the surrounding housing developments;

(f) the area contains an array of plant communities;

(g) that none of the land in question is privately owned;

urges the Government to reserve the area as requested and facilitate any land transfers and/or exchanges necessary to achieve these purposes.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

### PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), and passed.

### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

#### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF** (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Section 354 of the Criminal Code provides a publisher with a statutory form of privilege against defamation in respect of reports and proceedings which are listed in that section.

Subsection 3 of section 354 provides that it is lawful to publish in good faith for the information of the public, a fair report of the public proceedings of any court of justice, whether such proceedings are preliminary, interlocutory, or final, or of the result of any such proceedings, unless, in the case of proceedings which are not final, the publication has been prohibited by the court, or unless the matter published is blasphemous or obscene.

The reference to "any court of justice" has previously been thought to mean any court of justice wherever it is situated within the Commonwealth of Australia.

In 1977, the State Government, in advance of most other States, moved to extend the statutory privilege attaching to parliamentary and other public reports in this State so that the privilege would also apply to similar reports from elsewhere in Australia. Recently, the Victorian Parliament discovered that the limitations we had removed still applied in Victoria.

The matter was raised at a recent meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys General when it was made clear that only in Western Australia and New South Wales had the privilege been so extended.

The amendments which we made in 1977 to other parts of section 354 made specific reference to other States or Territories of the Commonwealth.

These amendments extended protection to reports of the proceedings of all other Houses of Parliament within the Commonwealth—subsection (1)—and of papers published under the authority of such Houses of Parliament—subsection (2)—and of the reports of public inquiries held under the authority of a Statute of other States or Territories or of the Commonwealth—subsection (4).

However, because these other subsections now specifically refer to places outside Western Australia, some doubt has been cast on the scope of the reference to "any court of justice" in subsection (3).

Although this is largely a matter of interpretation, the Government feels it is desirable to amend subsection (3) of section 354 by inserting a reference to courts of justice of the Commonwealth and other States and Territories of the Commonwealth.

This will then put it beyond doubt that the statutory privilege of the publication in good faith for the information of the public applies to any fair report of the public proceedings of courts of justice situated elsewhere in the Commonwealth.

As I mentioned earlier, this amendment is being made to put a matter of interpretation beyond doubt; and with those remarks I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

### **PERTH AND TATTERSALL'S BOWLING AND RECREATION CLUB (INC.) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [4.58 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill may be described as an enabling Bill to allow the Perth Bowling and Recreation Club and Tattersall's Club to come together and form a new joint club.

This type of Bill has been through the House before, to enable organisations to come together without first disposing of their assets and starting from scratch.

There was the Fremantle Buffalo Club Bill in 1964, the Jennacubbine Sports Council (Incorporated) Act of 1965 and more recently, in

1976, we had the Uniting Church in Australia Bill.

This present Bill may serve to remind us of one of the social changes of this day and age, when a club such as Tattersall's started its life in 1903 and the Perth Bowling Club in 1899 and both have held a separate existence up until the present day.

People's changing social habits now make it necessary for these two clubs to come together in order that they might share common facilities at reduced cost because of the combined membership.

The build-up in the inner-city area has forced many of the residents into the suburbs, and once established, they no longer wish to travel into the city to play bowls, or indeed, even to have a part of club life. Perhaps for those of us who can remember the era of clubs, this combination is tinged with some little sadness at the passing of yet another thread in the whole pattern of the way of life as we knew it.

Sometimes we wonder whether or not such clubs would have continued to thrive without the advent of television, and it could well be in the years to come the need for these clubs will be felt once again as not only retreats, but as places where people can actively participate in physical recreation pursuits.

Both parties to this Bill have come together amicably and I ask members of the House to give the Bill the necessary support in order that the new club will be able to continue on its way with brighter and happier prospects in the future.

During the preparation of the Bill the long title was deemed to be a question of some interpretation. An amendment is being prepared and I now foreshadow that amendment to the long title, and consequential minor amendments within the Bill. They will be placed on the notice paper for tomorrow. I wish to stress that the amendment to the title will be made to put a matter of interpretation beyond doubt.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters.

### **UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.02 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to remove from the Unauthorised Documents Act all references to Royal or other arms, and to provide a more up-to-date penalty for offences committed under the Act.

The Unauthorised Documents Act will henceforth be solely to provide a means of redress against persons who issue material of a documentary nature, without the proper authorisation.

Separate legislation follows to provide the necessary protection against unauthorised use of the Royal, State, or other arms.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

### *Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House).

## **ARMORIAL BEARINGS PROTECTION BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to enact legislation to protect the Royal, State, or other arms from unauthorised reproduction, in any form.

At present only matters of a documentary nature are protected under the provisions of the Unauthorised Documents Act, 1961.

A penalty of \$500 000, the same as that proposed for the Unauthorised Documents Act, has been provided for offences against the Act.

It is sensible that the penalties in the two like Acts should be the same and should be of reasonable magnitude sufficient to deter a person from wantonly ignoring the law.

Approval for reproduction of the Western Australian State coat of arms is controlled by the

Premier's Department, which normally grants authorisation under the following guidelines—

- (a) Permission is not granted to reproduce the arms of any article for commercial sale.
- (b) Use of the arms is not permitted on any article in such a manner which may imply it is produced by Government authority or patronage.
- (c) Should an unusual request, to which favourable consideration may be given, be received, consultation with other States would take place to ensure, as far as practicable, that anomalous situations did not occur.

Recently there has been an example of a very unsatisfactory reproduction, in woven fabric, of the State coat of arms—without the proper authorisation having been given.

An examination of what action might be taken to prevent production and sale of this item revealed that existing legislation—that is, the Unauthorised Documents Act, 1961—did not provide protection in these circumstances.

This, of course, is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs and hence appropriate authority to take action has been embodied in this Bill.

Members will note that in any proceeding in respect of an offence, the onus of proving that the appropriate authority had been given, lies with the person charged with the offence.

In common with the provisions of the Unauthorised Documents Act, the Bill provides that the consent in writing of the Attorney General is required for any proceedings to be taken for an offence. This is a protection against any frivolous proceedings being instituted.

It is quite possible that one action by an individual could constitute an offence under both the Unauthorised Documents Act and this legislation and the Bill provides that a person shall not be punished for the same offence under both pieces of legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

## **AGRICULTURE AND RELATED RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

**THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South—Minister for Lands) [5.08 p.m.]: I thank members

for their general support of this Bill. Certain matters were raised during the debate. The Leader of the Opposition requested that I distinguish the difference between a feral and a non-feral animal.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I asked the Minister how anyone would know the difference.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The Leader of the Opposition asked how an officer in the field would distinguish the difference. I believe the Hon. Neil McNeill and the Hon. M. McAleer, perhaps, did cover that ground fairly well. Indeed, Miss McAleer had been in touch with the Agriculture Protection Board before she spoke.

It is of interest to note that a feral animal remains a feral animal even after it is placed in captivity.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: So a goat is a goat wherever it is?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, a goat is a goat wherever it is and a wild goat is a feral goat.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How does one distinguish the difference?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The difference, perhaps, is that when the goats breed in captivity, the kids are no longer regarded as feral animals.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: With all due respects, Mr Minister, I was confused when I read the Bill, but I am now becoming even more confused.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: Do not kids go feral?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I suppose they could if they escaped, but they are not regarded as being feral when in captivity.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Are you sure you are not kidding us?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: This is a most serious subject.

Animals found in the wild are feral animals, and can be taken into captivity and enclosed. Those animals are still feral and require certification for their keeping. But, their progeny are not feral and can be treated as domestic animals unless, as Mr George Berry pointed out, they happen to escape. Then, of course, once again they are feral.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I wish I had kept a record of these comments; they would be a best seller.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: If animals are released from captivity, they become feral.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The word "feral" comes from the Latin "fera" which means "wild animal".

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: How will officers in the field determine whether or not the animals are feral?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Fortunately, officers of the board in pastoral areas are generally aware of the district, and have a personal knowledge of the few station owners and other people who actually keep feral animals in captivity. Obviously, those people will be issued with certificates. If a person has more animals than the number for which he has certificates, it would be reasonable to ask from where he got them. However, I think the officers will have some knowledge of the movement of animals about the areas they control.

Members will appreciate that a number of domestic animals become a problem when they establish themselves in the wild. Under the provisions of the Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act, donkeys, kids, pigs, camels, and buffalo found in the feral state can be declared under section 36 of the Act. That section places the animals in various categories, A2, A4, and A6. The various categories refer to the control which can be exercised over the animals.

Category A2 relates to field control of animals, and categories A4 and A6 are concerned with the introduction and keeping of animals. Many of the problems which have occurred have been as a result of the movement of some feral animals from the pastoral area to the Great Southern and coastal areas. In particular, there has been an increased interest in Angora goats. Feral goats are used to cross with the pure-bred buck. The pure-bred goat is very expensive, and it is possible to build up stocks by crossing Angora goats with feral animals. That is the reason people seek permission to keep the feral animals.

For that reason the Agriculture Protection Board has found it necessary to request the amendments in an attempt to lay down conditions under which animals are moved, and the manner in which they are kept. The type of animals which can be kept are also specified.

While perhaps the explanation may seem to be complicated, the proposal will prove to be successful and will help to prevent the problems which have been created in the north similarly happening in southern areas as a result of the escape of feral animals.

To date we do not have a great problem with feral animals in the southern areas, but certainly we could have if large numbers of feral goats are kept under conditions that are not secure.

As I have said before, without doubt if a person does not have certification for an animal which is obviously feral then the animal is feral. I thought perhaps the easiest solution might be to brand feral animals that are kept domestically and then anything not branded would be feral. However, that solution was not acceptable. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that these confined animals should be branded so that the inspectors may identify them more easily.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How would you brand a pig?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: We brand pigs as we brand other animals.

The Bill also contains provisions relating to representatives for the various zone council meetings. Mr Neil McNeill suggested that this provision was worded badly. It has been looked at to see whether it needed amendment, but it is felt that it is fairly explicit. It will in future be permissible for a delegate's deputy himself to appoint a deputy when both the delegate and his deputy are not able to attend a meeting. In this case the deputy would have to seek another deputy to represent him from amongst those deputies who are not required to otherwise deputise.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: The point I made was that it must be done beforehand because you will have to give notice in writing. This could be difficult in some cases.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It will be difficult, but it will be possible for people to organise deputies. This should facilitate the holding of meetings in the more remote areas where it is sometimes difficult to ensure the attendance of sufficient representatives.

Several members have referred to the spraying of chemicals, with particular reference to Geraldton. The regulations previously referred specifically to spraying and we know that, particularly in an opened state, these chemicals when being transported can cause damage by evaporation.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: Certain products are very sensitive to these sprays.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I remember on one occasion I wished to spray a 600-acre crop of lupins with a trace element. The operator had been spraying thistles earlier and the truck travelling up and down had sufficient weed killer

on its tyres to kill the nearby lupins. Such an example makes us realise how sensitive some plants are to chemicals. So we must provide for regulations to control not only the spraying and use of chemicals, but also their transport.

It has been suggested that we should seek replacements for some of these chemicals. A symposium I attended was addressed by a senior research officer of ICI of Great Britain. He told us how much it costs to develop a new spray, and the amount was staggering—indeed some tens of millions of dollars. Exhaustive environmental tests must be carried out before any new chemical is released and while this attitude is quite correct, it certainly hampers the marketing of new products. So while it is very nice to have stringent controls and testing of new chemicals, nevertheless it could mean that we will be using our present chemicals for many years yet. As long as the chemicals are used carefully all is well, but we can run into difficulties in the case of sensitive crops. Now we have tomato crops at Geraldton and vines in the southern area the spraying of chemicals must be closely controlled. I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

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

Clauses 1 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Section 106A added—

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: During the second reading debate I stated by way of interjection that we might have trouble in Carnarvon in regard to spraying. Mr Dans said that the trouble had occurred in Geraldton. We will have to be careful in Carnarvon because the type of spray that affected the tomatoes in Geraldton could also affect the tomato and banana crops in Carnarvon. There have been no difficulties so far in Carnarvon, but we must watch the situation carefully. For this reason the regulations are essential.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

**MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

**THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT** (North-East Metropolitan) [5.26 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to this Bill. As the Minister told us, the proposals contained in the Bill were requested by the Medical Board and they were approved by the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association.

I would like to make the point that I wish when the legislation affecting unionists is before the House, the Government would be as concerned to obtain the approval of unions as it is to obtain approval from the AMA when legislation concerning doctors is being discussed. After all, the AMA is just another union looking after the welfare of its members.

Some of the amendments in the Bill are merely to tidy up various sections. However, I would like to refer briefly to two important changes in the Act. Firstly, registration requirements for medical practitioners are to be amended. This provision is aimed primarily at doctors who have trained overseas and who come to this country to practise.

Secondly, the Bill proposes to repeal and reenact section 21C which deals with the administration of anaesthetic in cases of emergency. Section 21C provides that a doctor cannot administer the anaesthetic or perform an operation if another doctor is available within a five-mile area. This distance is to be extended to 30 kilometres. This appears to be a sensible provision in view of our improved road and transport facilities, and we have no objection to it. We support the Bill.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [5.28 p.m.]: Under the provisions of the parent Act medical degrees awarded by universities in the United Kingdom and in Ireland were not always acceptable as qualification to practise medicine in Australia. After many years when not only the Medical Board, but also the Australian Medical Association, have been very guarded in regard to the registration of medical practitioners this matter has been reconsidered. We know that in the past some people have come to Australia and professed to be registered medical practitioners in other countries of the world, but when inquiries have been made, it has turned out that their qualifications were far from acceptable in this country. Our standards in Australia are second to none and we have tried to keep them that way so that we can assure people of first-class medical service.

The Hon. G. E. Berry interjected.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: A schedule to the parent Act sets out a list of universities the standards of which are acceptable in this country. This schedule is to be expanded, and the AMA and the Medical Board have come to the conclusion that graduates of all universities of the United Kingdom and of Ireland are acceptable to practise in Australia.

Miss Elliott indicated that perhaps the Government should consult unions the same as the Medical Board had consulted the AMA in regard to these amendments. It is not a matter of consultation in that way. Always when amendments to the Medical Act are being considered, the AMA is consulted. The two organisations are very closely allied. It is not something new. Actually it is not the Government, but the Medical Board appointed under the Medical Act, which is involved.

Another of the amendments alters the six-year medical course to a five-year medical course. Under the six-year course it was necessary for graduates to spend 12 months in a recognised teaching hospital before they were registered as a medical practitioner. In the past, this created some problems when the graduates were known as resident medical officers. I know that many years ago these medical officers did reside at the hospital, but for quite a few years now this has not been the case.

When I was Minister I was approached on many occasions by people in various areas in which the hospital did not have a 24-hour-a-day medical service. They were requesting that a resident medical officer be provided at the hospital. It was hard to convince some people that a resident medical officer was not a fully qualified medical practitioner, but was a trainee only, doing his year in a teaching hospital where he was under supervision of a registered medical practitioner.

Eventually we did use some of these resident medical officers in remote areas where the medical practitioners were prepared to supervise the work carried out by them. However, it was a hard job to convince some people that this was the case.

Because of the introduction of the five-year training course in Australia, it is recommended that a medical student might need to do a two-year training period in a hospital instead of only one year which is required at present. This is to be left to the discretion of the Medical Board.

We have another type of medical practitioner in the State; that is, a graduate from another country whose degrees were not considered good



enough to let him loose on the public. In other words, the board was not prepared to register such a person without his first having undertaken a probationary period under supervision. Some of these people who applied for registration were given a provisional certificate to work in some of the northern hospitals under the supervision of fully qualified medical practitioners. After a five-year period they were granted registration by the board.

This system is to be altered and it will be necessary for the Australian Medical Examining Council examination to be passed at the end of the five-year period before the applicant can be registered. However, the present conditionally registered graduates—there are six of them—who are currently undertaking their five-year term, will be exempt from this provision. Under the arrangements made with them, they will be registered after they have completed their five-year term.

Miss Elliott has referred to the amendment dealing with the prescribed distance within which a medical practitioner cannot administer an anaesthetic or perform an operation except in an emergency. The distance has been increased from five miles to 30 kilometres, and in view of modern-day transport this is a wise amendment, because now a person can travel 30 kilometres much quicker than several years ago a person could travel five miles.

I support the Bill.

**THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [5.35 p.m.]: In supporting the Bill I will be very brief. Mr Baxter dealt with one or two points; and the present Leader of the House has a great deal of knowledge about the difficulties experienced in this State in obtaining sufficient doctors to cater for our remote areas.

It would be fitting at this stage for me to remind the House that when our Alcohol and Drug Authority was established it did not have one Australian-trained doctor in its ranks. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, that is still the situation. Our doctors do not like the work and prefer the better type of practice which is available to them. I have been always grateful to overseas doctors and did not like the distinction between certain degrees granted at some universities.

I think it was during the time of the Tonkin Government—between 1971 and 1974—when the Hon. Claude Stubbs travelled overseas and recruited two or three extremely satisfactory doctors for our country areas. The honourable

member can correct me if I am wrong, but as far as I know they are still giving valuable service.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I have recruited another 10 since then for the country areas.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: There we are!

Mr Baxter has reminded us that the situation regarding doctors in Australia is embarrassing. In some States many of them are unemployed because they do not want to go into certain areas. Of course, that is their choice. Nowadays they are looking more and more towards specialising. I am hoping that ere long the Medical Board in this State will encourage graduate students to go into general practice, which is the greatest specialty of them all.

The general practitioner in this State works extremely hard and although he does very well salary and fee-wise, there is this tendency on the part of people to stick with a certain doctor. I consider that these graduates are being misled a little by the glamour attached to open cardiac surgery, and so on, which is carried out in large hospitals.

It seems that more and more graduates are being attracted to the idea of specialising when what the people really want is a general practitioner-type doctor who will keep them healthy instead of being forced to treat them when they are in ill-health. Doctors have lost sight of the fact that it should be a last resort for a person to call a doctor. I have always thought that the Minister should be known as the Minister for Ill-Health rather than the Minister for Health.

Finally, I would like to say that I am grateful to the AMA, the Medical Board, and the Minister for Health and his staff for protecting us from the spurious doctors.

I made some inquiries about one or two cases which had been brought to my attention, and I would like to pass the information on to the House. People with medical degrees from Calcutta were applying to us for registration. However, they were not acceptable, according to the university. They had the title of BA, Calcutta (failed). This is quite common and I threw a fit and laughed when I heard about it. However, those with such a qualification have put in a great deal of work at the university in Calcutta. They must be fairly qualified before they are even accepted for training because the standard demanded of them is extremely high. I doubt whether some of our leaving students would be as highly qualified as are those people with a BA, Calcutta (failed).

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are they the doctors who write, "The operation was a success, but the patient died"?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Very likely, as we are told that surgeons bury their failures!

With those few remarks I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

**THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South—Minister for Lands) [5.42 p.m.]: I thank members for their contributions to the debate, especially as I appreciate that some members have a real knowledge of the subject. I particularly thank Mr Baxter, a previous Minister for Health, and Mr John Williams, who has had a great deal of experience with the Alcohol and Drug Authority.

As I am not aware of any points which require a reply, I merely thank members and commend the Bill 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.

**APPROPRIATION BILL  
(CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

*Consideration of Tabled Paper*

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

**THE HON. N. F. MOORE** (Lower North) [5.45 p.m.]: As members would be well aware, I was delighted with the news from the Federal Minister for Post and Telecommunications (Mr Staley) last Thursday when he announced that the Federal Government intends to go ahead with the development of a domestic satellite for Australia. During my Address-in-Reply speech I outlined the benefits that such a system would have for the remote and outback areas of Australia. There is no need for me to elaborate on those benefits at this time. Suffice it to say that a satellite would provide an enormous benefit in the telecommunications field for remote area residents, particularly those living on remote stations as distinct from those living in remote towns.

I was rather disappointed to read the comments of Senator Susan Ryan, the Australian Labor Party's Federal spokesperson on arts and the media, in relation to the domestic satellite. Senator Ryan has adopted a fairly cynical attitude towards the satellite since it became newsworthy. On this occasion, her remarks, in

response to the Minister's announcement, were typically cynical.

In my Address-in-Reply speech, I urged all Australians to "get behind" the satellite. I said it was something which would benefit the whole community, particularly those people in a minority in our community who needed the assistance and support of the more influential lobby groups. I hoped that the ALP and the union movement might see some of the merits in a satellite system for Australia. Therefore I was disappointed when Senator Ryan adopted this rather cynical approach to what the Federal Government intends to do.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think the trade union movement had any opposition.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I can give the Leader of the Opposition a pamphlet which will indicate there is total opposition from the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union. I mentioned that in my Address-in-Reply speech.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I would be interested to see that.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The members of that union said they would be opposed to any domestic satellite. The unions have probably made Senator Ryan's situation slightly difficult in the sense that she found it necessary to go along with the views of the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union on the subject.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is it 1984 for the satellite?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is the anticipated date, yes.

I was also disappointed to read in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* some time ago that the endorsed Labor candidate for Murchison-Eyre expressed reservations about this matter. I would like to relate a story in relation to that. The *Kalgoorlie Miner* printed a Press release on my behalf about my speech on the Address-in-Reply. At the bottom of the Press release, the newspaper gave Mr Neville the opportunity to make comments. Mr Neville is the endorsed Labor candidate for Murchison-Eyre. In his comments, Mr Neville supported my call for a domestic satellite.

I wrote a letter to the Editor of the *Kalgoorlie Miner* saying I was delighted to receive support from Mr Neville, and that I hoped he would talk to the ALP and the unions to convince them that it was a good thing. Unfortunately, he came out about a week later with a letter saying he doubted the feasibility of the domestic satellite. It seems

that in a sense he was "got at" by those who told him what the real story was.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think it is very feasible.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would like the establishment of the domestic satellite not to be a political issue. It is something that will be of enormous benefit to Australia. It will not replace the existing terrestrial system; it will complement it. It has enormous implications in terms of defence, and in terms of the upgrading of telecommunications throughout Australia. It is something that is needed vitally in remote areas.

Opposition to the satellite is based on concern that it will create unemployment. The people who hold this point of view should consider the jobs it will create in relation to the technology involved in the satellite and in the ground stations. That technology is such that an entirely new industry could be developed in Australia. There will be the need for thousands of earth stations, thousands of facsimile transmitting machines, and a whole variety of new electronic machinery to complement the satellite system. I see a whole new sphere of employment developing because of the satellite.

I hope that the Labor Party and the unions look at the satellite from that point of view. As I said before, they should take into account the needs of the people in remote areas.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: What about bringing it forward in time?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not think it is possible to bring it any further forward. In fact, if it is established by 1984 I will be particularly delighted.

I will leave that issue now, and I wish to congratulate the State Government on another matter. That relates to the building of the Leonora hospital. Some \$1.3 million have been allocated for the building of the Leonora hospital, and I am pleased that it is now almost completed. It is a magnificent building. It is a tribute to those who designed it and to those who are building it. The efforts of people like Sadie Canning, who is the matron of the hospital, and the people in the Leonora district led to the decision by the Government to build this hospital. It is a tribute to their efforts.

I now turn to some matters raised by members of the Opposition when they spoke in this debate earlier. It is essential to correct a number of points that have been made by some speakers. They all uttered some rather remarkable statements about the performance of this Government in the sphere of economic management. Those statements, I must

emphasise, serve to reveal why it is that their Federal and State colleagues, when they are on the Treasury benches, invariably and inevitably hinder economic progress.

Mr Dans referred to this present year's fiscal Budget as a "conservative Budget". He referred to it critically. He criticised the new federalist arrangements between the State and Federal Governments.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I noticed all the employment it created, in last night's paper.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Dans placed great emphasis on the assertion that this State was extremely lucky, when he referred to the performance of the Liberal Government during that great era beginning in 1959, when Sir David Brand became the Premier. These assertions—and that is all they are—should not go unchallenged.

At the outset I point out that what Mr Dans terms "conservatism" has been described or defined by acknowledged experts as "the politics of realism". I am quoting Professor Michael Oakshott of the London School of Economics. We can look at conservatism as the politics of realism, just as the ideology to which members opposite subscribe can be described as the "politics of fantasy". Fantasy dominates much of what has been said so far by Opposition speakers.

Members opposite have failed to address themselves to the facts—

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Tell us about the unemployment figures.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will talk about them when I come to them. I have a great deal to say about that topic.

Opposition members have failed to address themselves to the facts, unlike the Western Australian electorate which has addressed itself to the facts and seen the issues clearly. In the last two elections held in this State, both Federal and State, the Western Australian electorate has returned Liberal candidates with overwhelming majorities. The other night Mr Cooley referred to these people as "silly" or "fools".

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: "Poor suckers".

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Let the people of Western Australia know that is what he thinks of them, because they have seen what Liberal Governments can do for the people of this country.

The new federalist arrangements, which Mr Dans found so distasteful, aim at reversing the massive deficit "budgeting"—and I say "budgeting" in inverted commas—of the

Whitlam Labor years. That is budgeting which caused an unprecedented cascade into unemployment such as Australia had not before experienced in the post-war years. During that time it caused the almost total vaporisation of the national currency. A three-year super-spending spree by a centralist Government was the excuse and substitute for proper and responsible management of the nation's economic affairs. Today, some five years later, we hear Mr Cooley referring to those years as some sort of Utopia.

Mr Cooley described 1973 in those terms. I could quote people who would support his point of view. In fact, Alan Reid, in his book *The Whitlam Venture* does that. I will not bore the House with that particular quotation. It goes into a great deal of detail about the achievements of the Whitlam Government, many of which were quite laudable. However, Mr Cooley then forgot about 1974 and 1975, and went on with his usual characteristic tirade against Sir John Kerr.

For Mr Cooley's benefit, and for the benefit of the House, I will quote Alan Reid. At page 160 of *The Whitlam Venture* he said—

By mid-1974 the effects of some 1 675 decisions whose very number suggested that few had in-depth Cabinet consideration were beginning to be felt. The economy was deteriorating. Inflation was mounting. Unemployment was increasing alarmingly, productivity was declining, expansion was slowing, the unions were restive, and Whitlam's critics within the ALP machine, notably Hawke, Egerton and Hartley, were becoming more vocal. With public business confidence faltering, Whitlam switched from his previous stand that inflation was imported or a consequence of actions taken by the previous Liberal-CP administration to blame now excessive wage demands, demands which originally had been encouraged by the attitude of the Whitlam Government in seeking to make the Commonwealth Public Service the pace-setter for industrial standards and by its submissions in national wage cases. Whitlam started to look for scapegoats, a search which intensified as the problems loomed larger and which finally was to produce as the culprits for his Government's shortcomings two Treasurers—Crean and Cairns—his Minister for Minerals and Energy, Rex Connor, his Minister for Labour, Clyde Cameron, and finally Governor-General Kerr whom he and he alone was responsible for having appointed to viceregal eminence.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Mr Reid is politically biased.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: He is hardly biased in our favour.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Come on, now!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: If Mr Cooley reads Mr Reid's personal history, he will find Mr Reid has leaned to his point of view.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Alan Reid has been on everyone's side over the years.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Good on him.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He is a disgrace to journalism.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The years I have just described were a modern manifestation of the Chifley post-war reconstructionist policies which in 1949 the Australian electorate rejected realistically, as it has accepted realistically the point of view of liberalism in this decade.

I remind members opposite that whenever they call for additional spending sprees by the Government they are, in effect, calling for more inflation, more centralist control, and higher personal income tax. The latter, of course, is the greatest disincentive to job creation that one could imagine.

Constantly the Western Australian electorate has endorsed realistic Liberal policies, as we have seen in recent elections. The people have refused to endorse patch-work Government projects to which the Labor Party seems forever attracted. The attitude of the electorate is the acid test of a Government's performance.

Mr Dans referred to "lucky days"—to "luck". This indicates a failure to appreciate the effects of the policies of realism. That is something which the electors of Western Australia have not failed to do. Mr Dans harks back to Donald Horne's phrase, "The Lucky Country". There was no luck involved in the achievement of the standard of living we have in this State. It was not luck; it was forward-thinking and realism. It was forward-thinking and effort put in by those committed to Liberal realism. Our prosperity stems from attitudes and aptitudes, and their application to Government and individual endeavour.

This is the opposite to luck. It is a conscious application of abilities. It never ceases to amaze me that members opposite continually perceive our past achievements—particularly our achievements during the 1960s and 1970s—as some sort of inexplicable gift from an unknown benefactor. That reveals a great deal about their motivations and actions, especially when in Government.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Do you know a Liberal Government refused export licences during its term of office, which had been approved by the Labor Government?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I did not hear Mr Cooley's interjection properly; but the exporting of a Labor Government would be a good thing!

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.33 p.m.*

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Before the tea suspension I was making the point that the progress which has been made in Western Australia during the 1960s and 1970s up to the present time was not a result of luck, but a result of effort on behalf of the citizens of Western Australia. To perceive the progress achieved by Western Australia as anything other than a result of human effort is to take an utterly false view of the situation and to denigrate those who made the effort; yet I suggest that is precisely the attitude Mr Dans tried to put across; that is, that luck was one of the reasons the Western Australian economy developed so rapidly during that period.

I would now like to refer to the attitude of *The West Australian* newspaper to the current year's Budget, and I quote from the editorial of that newspaper on the 14th September—

The State Budget introduced by the Premier, Sir Charles Court, yesterday reflects credit on the State Treasury as well as on the Government.

It reflects a situation in which the Treasury—in a tight financial clamp—has developed a system of day-to-day management to which the Premier has subscribed. The combination has produced four consecutive balanced Budgets—with a fifth if all goes well.

Mr Dans and Mr Cooley, in their speeches on this subject, were critical of balanced Budgets, and obviously they do not agree with the Editor of *The West Australian*. The editorial continued—

However, the full impact of the Budget will not be known till the capital works programme is explained next week. That is the area in which State Governments are able to demonstrate a commitment to fostering employment and the economic impetus that results.

When the details of the works programme were revealed, the Editor of *The West Australian* said on the 19th September—

The State Government has been able to inject about \$25 million into its 1979/80 works programme at a time when there is a desperate need for funds. It has been able to

do so because of sound housekeeping in the past and earnings from investment in the short-term money market.

I repeat: "investment in the short-term money market". This is a concept which Mr Davies seems to have some difficulty in appreciating or understanding at the present time. The editorial continues—

In the loans programme the State has chanced its arm as best it can. There are small increases in spending over most of the board in an effort to enhance employment opportunities.

Further on it states—

Though the investment funds straddle the financial years, the State is now in a position where it has transferred as much as it can to finance employment giving work.

Western Australia deserves credit for the way in which it has handled its financial affairs since it relinquished its ties with the Grants Commission. Prudence has been shown in the Consolidated Revenue Budget, the main area there being the containment of departmental spending.

I noticed that Opposition members did not refer to that editorial when they were speaking about the Budget. I noticed also that members opposite failed to appreciate that although unemployment remains at levels which are too high, total employment within Western Australia has actually risen.

Western Australia has maintained its traditional role as a State for job expansion. Our job growth figures are the highest of all the States of the Commonwealth, regardless of which official figures anyone cares to refer to. I would like to deal with some figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication *The Labour Force—Australia* which sets out the increases in the work forces in all States of Australia.

Between November, 1974, and February this year the number of persons employed in Western Australia rose from 470 500 to 529 600, and by May this year 533 200 people were in employment. These rises represent increases of 12.6 per cent or 59 100 jobs, and 13.3 per cent or 62 700 jobs during the respective periods.

I also remind members of the Opposition that the Premier's reference to 100 000 new jobs was made in the 1977 policy speech of the Liberal Party, and I will quote from it to emphasise this point. The policy speech states—

The last wave of development gave wage and salary earners another 200 000 job openings during the past 17 years.

The next wave can be expected to create at least another 100 000 jobs during the next 7 years.

In fact, the Premier was referring to the period 1977 to 1984. Opposition members have made a great deal of noise about the fact that we have not achieved the 100 000 jobs yet. They should read some of the current newspaper attitudes towards the development which will take place in the near future. I suggest we will achieve that objective without much trouble.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How can he make a prediction over seven years when he does not know whether he will be in Government in 1984?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do not bank on disaster.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would now like to give the figures for the other States, using the same criteria as for the figures for Western Australia. In the same two periods New South Wales was able to show an increase of only 0.7 per cent and 0.6 per cent respectively; South Australia, 1.9 per cent and 0.8 per cent respectively; and Tasmania, 1.0 per cent and 3.4 per cent respectively. On the other hand, Victoria and Queensland, the other two States which do not have Labor Governments, had growths in their work forces of 5.4 and 6.0 per cent, and 7.8 and 9.7 per cent respectively.

It is quite obvious to anybody with any common sense that a correlation exists between the growth in the work force and the political party in power in the various States. In fact, the correlation is hardly astounding in view of my earlier comments contrasting realism and fantasy.

If members of the Opposition persist in tagging this level of performance, with such great growth in our work force even though unemployment is too high, as conservatism, luck, or a failure to call upon the Federal and State Governments to increase spending and expand the deficit, which would bring on another wave of inflation, then I have no worries whatsoever about the outcome of the forthcoming State election. In fact, I am quite confident about the result of that election if they persist in that attitude. Our work force has increased by the percentages I mentioned within the context of four balanced Budgets, a fact which appears to have escaped the attention of the Opposition.

We should also look at potential future developments in Western Australia and the jobs which will follow from them. I refer to the

massive investments which will take place on the North-West Shelf, in the Wagerup and Worsley alumina projects, and the equally significant development projects in my province at Yeelirrie, Agnew, and Teutonic Bore. The first of the projects, the North-West Shelf, will employ a work force of some 6 000 at peak construction time. Yeelirrie will have a permanent work force of some 800 employees. Teutonic Bore will employ some 200 workers during construction, and Agnew Mining, which has been operating for a few years now, is currently employing about 250 people. The combined work forces of the two alumina projects, at Wagerup and Worsley, are expected to be 3 500 workers. When we add all these together, we have an increase in employment of something like 10 000 people in the developmental projects planned for Western Australia.

We should not look at these 10 000 jobs in isolation. The scale of capital expenditure involved is such that the multiplier and backward linkage effect into the sectors of transportation, ancillary services, maintenance, and other supply and support sectors will result in a wave of expansion similar to that achieved during the 1960s and the early 1970s. Such community-wide benefit is precisely what was achieved in the 1960s and 1970s, and we can confidently look forward to achieving the same results in the very near future.

We should not overlook the contrast between the lack of progress in the Labor States and the job expansion in the Liberal-Country Party States which has resulted in a significant migratory shift or internal migration within Australia. In fact, Western Australia and Queensland have become what could be termed the magnet States of Australia. Job seekers from all over Australia have flocked in their thousands to Western Australia and Queensland away from the Labor States with their hindering and reactionary policies which have stifled development. The people in Queensland and Western Australia have demonstrated through the ballot box that they appreciate the sorts of developmental projects being carried out in their States.

Western Australia in particular has become a State into which other Australians, as well as migrants from overseas, flock in large numbers. This internal migration phenomenon has had a dual impact on our economy. Whilst it has tended to expand our work-force population, it has resulted also in unemployment levels being lifted so that they are higher than otherwise would be the case. I would suggest that in fact we are importing some of our unemployment.

However, when speaking about unemployment it is necessary that we fully understand the impact and importance of internal migration within Australia.

I suggest that the Labor Party, with its opposition to foreign investment and its inherent attraction to socialism—an attraction which opposes real job creation—should ask fundamental questions about its commitment to the future of Western Australia, and its commitment to assisting the State to progress in the next decade in the same way as it has progressed in the last two decades.

I suggest the Labor Party also examine its commitment to the people it purports to represent.

Why, for instance, do we hear so little from the Opposition about jobs which will not be created as a result of its uranium policy? Why do Western Australian members of the ALP concur with a Labor uranium policy which was, I believe, introduced at their Perth conference in 1977 by Mr Dunstan—a man who no longer occupies any public position—and Mr Clyde Holding, a former Leader of the Opposition in Victoria? Neither of those gentlemen is concerned at all with the employment prospects of Western Australia; nor are they concerned with the prospects of those people from within their own States who have come here seeking the type of work we are prepared to offer.

Labor Party delegates to ALP conferences since then have been tellingly silent on the matter of the jobs that will be created as a result of uranium mining, even though Mr Hawke now has had second thoughts and sees the practicality of uranium mining.

I was interested to read an article which appeared in last Wednesday's copy of *The Australian* on the front page under the heading, "Wran's Minister blocks hunt for new ore". I quote from that article as follows—

Uranium exploration in NSW has been banned by the Minister for Mineral Resources and Development, Mr Mulock.

More than 20 companies which applied for prospecting licences for group seven minerals (uranium and its ores) have received letters from the under-secretary of the department advising them of the refusal.

Mr Mulock made the decision personally and without consulting the State Cabinet.

The Premier, Mr Wran, was advised yesterday of his action.

According to Mr Mulock, there was no point in allowing exploration which could not lead to mining.

Further on in the article, the economist for *The Australian* (Mr Des Keegan) wrote the following—

The mining industry in Labor States has been forced to adopt subterfuge in its exploration for uranium.

Exploration sources said yesterday miners would continue to seek uranium, but would not specify the mineral in applications for exploration licences.

They pointed out that exploration licences were sought "for all minerals found" in normal applications.

One mining leader said: "Those who don't heed history are doomed to repeat it."

The NSW move is depressingly like the Roxby Downs mess in South Australia and the subsequent dismissal of the Labor Government.

Why do we find ourselves without Labor Party support when we confront the extremist environmental groups within our society—groups which believe everything nature does is good and everything man does is bad?

The Labor Party will continue to occupy the benches, it occupies now in this State for as long as it continues to support trendy causes—causes which have no resemblance to the needs of the working men and women of Australia and, in particular, of Western Australia.

I was interested to read in *The Bulletin* of the 17th April an article under the heading, "A Setback for Labor Party 'trendies'". The article was written by Alan Reid, and it emphasises the trendiness which has crept into the Labor Party. I quote as follows—

RON THOMPSON, an ALP stalwart for more than 40 years, ex-Minister for Police, Community Welfare and Tourism in a Tonkin Labor government, was in October, 1977, his party's leader in WA's Legislative Council. Then, after a hassle over the party's support of homosexuality and prostitution, he walked out of it, denouncing it for its "trendies".

Further on, the article states—

Former Federal ALP minister and MHR for Fremantle, Kim Beazley, a respected figure nationally as well as in WA, told a party conference: "When I first joined the ALP in WA it was dominated by the most responsible elements of the trade union

movement and the cream of the working class. Unfortunately there has been a tendency lately for the party to be infested by middle-class perverts who treat the party as a spiritual spittoon."

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who said that last sentence?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That was said by Kim Beazley. I think his comments created some controversy within the party at the time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I bet that is the understatement of the century.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Labor Party's flirtation with the trendies is emphasised by its recent endorsement of candidates for the next State election. I refer to people such as Neil Bartholomaeus, who would be in that category.

I turn now to look at another area in which we do not receive support from the Labor Party. Why do we not get the support of the Labor Party when we confront the union bureaucrats—close associates of Labor members—when they call strikes for any and every excuse? The recent controversy in the Pilbara over the public assembly laws is an example of this.

A telling article appeared in *The Bulletin* of the 16th October. Its author was Peter Samuel, and he outlined the laws of the various States of Australia. He emphasised the States of New South Wales, South Australia, and Western Australia. I would suggest members of the Opposition have a look at that article to see where we stand in relation to other States. It is my opinion that the Opposition's stand in respect of this matter is most disturbing.

Also, the attitude of the Opposition during the recent Hamersley dispute was most disturbing. That dispute caused the loss of \$85 million in revenue and cash flow to the company, and the loss of \$7 million in wages to workers. The Labor Party was strangely silent, and the running was made by the TLC. Even when the dispute was eventually solved after 10 weeks, and the workers were sold down the drain by the TLC, the Labor Party maintained its silence.

Therefore, the failure of the Labor Party is twofold. It has failed to support realistic and progressive economic policies, and it has failed to appreciate and to support good and orderly government.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: We haven't seen any of that.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: How in those circumstances can members opposite rise in this Chamber and speak of unemployment and

underemployment? I have quoted several examples of where the Opposition does not give its support in an endeavour to avoid jobs being lost. The attitude of members opposite is letting down all Western Australians—not just those who are employed, but also those who are not employed, to say nothing of the other Australians who would come here for the sorts of jobs the State would be able to provide if support was forthcoming from members opposite.

It is worth while pondering upon the possible future debilitating effects that continuation of such attitudes is likely to have upon the economy of Western Australia.

I want now to turn to an area which, although directly related to the matter of maintaining employment and creating jobs, is related to it from another perspective. It is now widely recognised that had the mineral boom and the economic boom of the 1960s and 1970s in Western Australia not produced a great deal of wealth, Australia would have been confronted with a severe problem in respect of its balance of trade and foreign payments.

Western Australia's massive involvement in mining in that sense was timely—not lucky—for by the middle 1960s Australia had commenced to lose ground internationally in that its share of international trade was declining. Therefore, the links forged with the reconstructed Japanese economy were an essential ingredient. Liberal Governments appreciated the relationship between having mineral exporting economies such as Western Australia's and the need for a market such as that which existed in Japan at the time.

They realised that a greater increase in trade with our trading partners than had previously been the case was necessary.

I mention this because Western Australia is now faced with similar opportunities in East Asia and South-East Asia. First of all, in the East Asian region we find three very dynamic countries are emerging in a manner not too dissimilar from the way Japan developed about a decade and a half earlier. I refer to the economies of Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong. At the present time those countries have an industrial capacity which is about on a par with that of the United States during the mid-1940s.

In addition to the East Asian area, massive developments in the ASEAN countries—Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and the Philippines—promise to bring this loose economic union into the forefront of economic development in the near future.



Therefore, Western Australia is confronted by two regional economic blocs which offer opportunities to this State on a scale comparable with that which Japan offered during the 1960s. We could stand aside, as we could have done in the 1960s—but fortunately did not—and not take a great deal of notice of the potential markets which exist to our north. However, we should remember that these countries are no longer destitute and poor, as was suggested in some of our school-day reading.

They are, in fact, flourishing economies, and their populations are growing rapidly. The old reference to “rice bowl economies” no longer applies.

One can cite many authorities who support this claim. I would like to mention one, Dr Clive Edwards, of the Australian National University. In an article entitled, “Recent economic developments in Asia: Their significance for Australia”, Dr Edwards said—

Moreover, Australia will seriously misjudge Asian sentiments if it continues to assume that these countries will remain poor, struggling day to day to meet basic subsistence needs, so that the main contact between Australia and Asia, centres on Australia providing ever increasing amounts of food aid to Asia. This conclusion ignores the reality of current developments in Asia.

I should point out that the current tragic circumstances in Kampuchea and South Vietnam where food shortages and widespread famine exist—man-made famines, not natural disasters—are exceptions to, rather than examples of, the rule. Dr Edwards continues—

Most of the countries of East and South East Asia have experienced a decade of very rapid output growth.

That quotation was written some three years ago. Since then much has occurred. These economies are now experiencing growth rates in the vicinity of 10 per cent per annum, and the populations of the countries are growing rapidly.

The ASEAN States have embarked upon the road to rapid, self-sustained growth. Since the 1950s, these countries have sent young people throughout the world to study commerce, engineering, the sciences, and a whole variety of disciplines which will be of value to their countries as their economies begin to grow.

The point also should be made that the political arrangements within these countries is such that economic progress is being fervently and actively encouraged. It makes one wonder what fate the

ideas and attitudes of the Opposition would have in such countries.

By the year 2000—only two decades away—Australia's population is unlikely to exceed 20 million. Japan's population will be over 130 million. Taiwan—an island half the size of Tasmania—will have a population of about 22 million, and South Korea, some 51 million. Together, these three nations of what I would call the East Asian bloc will have a combined population in excess of 200 million. ASEAN's total population will exceed this number. So, by the year 2000, we are looking at a population of over 500 million people to the north of Australia. The ramifications of this are quite obvious: An enormous market for Australia's produce.

It is interesting to ponder the relevance of Labor's economic prohibitionism and anti-developmentalism in this context. Its prohibition of development, of commercial contacts, and of economic growth is a matter of concern not only because of the unemployment which results, but also because of the opportunities which are inevitably lost.

It should not be forgotten that the countries of South America are keen to emulate Australia's achievements as a supplier of resources. Therefore, we cannot afford the debilitating prohibitionism as espoused by the Labor Party. Until members opposite consider their corporate stand on matters such as these, in a perspective which is both realistic and objectively assessed, our economic future is not secure.

In the past, Australia was confronted with economies to its north which were only in their very early stages of development. Today, the situation has changed completely. These countries have increased populations and the people living in those countries are receiving increased incomes; the magnitude of their demand is high, and is growing.

Members opposite—as suggested in the speeches we have already heard in this debate—constantly look to Government to provide a patchwork of Government-financed projects to overcome the problem of unemployment.

To conclude, I should like to quote from the booklet “IPA Review” where it puts in very clear terms the fallacy of this argument. The article quotes a statement by Sydney economist, Roger Randerson, in the January, 1979, edition of *Forecast* in which he states—

Wage increases beyond productivity do not directly cause inflation. They cause unemployment. Governments cause inflation,

chiefly by their spending and Budget Deficits. Governments cannot hand anything to anyone without first taking it from someone else. What Governments take must always exceed what they hand out, because a lot sticks with the bureaucracy employed to carry out the redistribution. Such transfers divert resources from the productive to the non-productive and from the more productive to the less productive. When Government expenditures are on (a) huge scale . . . we can be sure that the nation's production, capital provision for the future and general standard of living are lower than they otherwise would be.

That covers quite clearly the impact of this demand by the Labor Party to increase Government expenditure on a whole multitude of what we can perhaps refer to as projects which are not of a permanent nature.

The ideas, philosophy, and attitudes of the present Liberal Governments, both Federal and State, are such that a whole new wave of development will occur and with it, a rapid decline in the number of unemployed.

**THE HON. NEIL McNEILL** (Lower West) [8.05 p.m.]: The motion before the Chair is that the tabled paper be noted. I think it is appropriate I remind the House of the wording of the motion, because this is virtually a Budget debate, and the Budget papers are worthy of being noted. I say that with all the significance I can attach to the statement.

I know that many opponents and critics of the Government can blithely say that it is not difficult for a Government, operating under the system, and with the "hand-outs" which pass between Federal and State Governments, to maintain a fairly stable financial situation within Western Australia. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am sure all members are fully aware of the tribulations and difficulties facing any public authority today, particularly the Government.

I make no apology for putting emphasis on the fact that, once again, the Government has been able to bring down a balanced Budget, because that obviously has been a difficult task. However, not only has the Government been able to bring down a balanced Budget for the current year's operations, but also it has managed to provide for an enormous variety of Government works. When I use the word "works" I am referring not only to capital expenditure, but also to the whole function of government.

The Budget provides for significant increases in the allocation of funds for an immense variety of

public undertakings. From time to time throughout the debate, members have acknowledged some of these undertakings, which appear in the document "Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure". I am one of those members whose province will benefit from increased allocations this year. These increases have been made at a most difficult time; I am sure every member recognises the financial and monetary restraints placed on the Government.

The Budget also provides support for some of those matters which are very near and dear to the hearts of members of Parliament. I refer particularly to unemployment. Members of the Opposition constantly give the impression they have a monopoly on sympathy, understanding, and consideration when it comes to the unemployed. Of course, this is not the case. In this context, I should like to quote the Loan Estimates speech of the Premier in another place where, at page 4 of his printed speech, he made the following statement—

Despite strong opposition from the Premiers, the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer would not budge in their attitude, for reasons related to the size of the Commonwealth deficit and the difficulties they foresaw in raising any greater sum on the domestic capital market. Although I acknowledged the tightness of the market, I considered that we should aim at raising an increased amount and pressed this point of view strongly.

My concern, and that of all other Premiers, was for the impact the cut would have on our works program and, as a consequence, on employment. In our case, we faced an overall reduction of 6 per cent in funds available to finance works this year which, in real terms, meant a reduction of about 15 per cent in the physical volume of work which could be undertaken.

This Government has done all in its power to alleviate unemployment and the obdurate attitude of the Commonwealth was a bitter blow. It could only have the effect of worsening an already difficult unemployment problem.

On page 6 of his printed speech, following an outline of the works programme, the Premier stated as follows—

It is a very real achievement to be able to present a program of planned expenditure which is \$39.1 million or 8.8 per cent higher than the outlay in 1978/79 when the Commonwealth Government has so severely

cut our Loan Council allocation and capital specific purpose funds for the year.

Although this increase is barely sufficient to maintain the same physical volume of work throughout the year, every endeavour has been made in shaping the budget to give maximum stimulation to employment.

I use those quotes for the particular purpose of emphasising the difficult financial situation which faces Western Australia and, no doubt, all other States and of emphasising the concern felt by the Premier and the Government about the unemployment situation. Of late, members of the Opposition have been reluctant to go on the hustings to express their great concern about the unemployment problem, and this is understandable when one examines the trends of today and compares them with what occurred previously. The unemployment problem these days is a very different problem from that which we faced in the bad old days, when there was real unemployment. The unemployment of yesteryear was essentially amongst the breadwinners and it ran at an enormously high level.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is moving into that area now in the Eastern States.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I do not know that I could agree with Mr Dans on that; I certainly hope it is not the case.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The weekend newspapers reported that fact.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: In those days, women and young people were not considered to be part of the work force. Thus, the people who were unemployed were people who had lost their jobs. They were the breadwinners and this was a tremendous disaster; it was a catastrophe.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: This is a new dimension.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: It was a dehumanising situation for all people and one we would not wish to happen again. We have unemployment which might be more properly regarded as the inability to gain employment, because a great many of these people have never been employed. Many have not had the opportunity to work; they have not gained jobs. There has been a slackening off in job availability.

I am sure this applies in trade union circles and Labor Party circles; I am sure it applies generally. There is a genuine concern for the unemployed because of this situation. It is not so much that people have lost their jobs; but that a great number of young people have never been in the work force. There are a great many women now

joining the ranks of people looking for jobs, and these too are considered to be part of the work force who are not gainfully employed.

This has caused a number of things to happen. If I recall correctly Mr Cooley said in a previous debate in the House on this general subject that people were selfish; they were becoming greedy. They are more or less the words he used. Some people were behaving a little selfishly because they were in the happy position of having jobs and being in receipt of good money, and they were making darned certain that no-one else shared their good fortune. While they continued to press for increases in salaries and wages, they continued to keep other people out of employment.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I did not say it quite like that.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Unfortunately, a selfish attitude has crept into our society, which I suppose is understandable. It is human nature for people to look after what they have and to be less concerned about those who have not had the opportunity to gain employment. Perhaps that is a sad commentary on society, but I believe it to be true.

I have made close-hand observations of people involved in trades and they have said that to me. A tradesman in the building industry actually told me there was any amount of work to go around, but it was held by fewer and fewer people. That is a sad situation.

That is one aspect of the unemployment situation which ought to be more fully understood. Perhaps it is already understood, but perhaps there is insufficient public recognition given to it. It is important we have the understanding that the unemployment we are mainly talking about involves people wishing to join the work force, whether or not they be people who have not previously worked—women folk, or school leavers.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Do you have figures to prove that? I wonder if you know what you are saying. Are you sure of your facts, or is it just your impression?

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am expressing my belief. I will quote some figures and statistics fairly shortly which will give an illustration of what I am saying. I will not say they will prove it; but I am here to express my point of view. In saying that, I add that I do not claim that all the people who are unemployed fall into those categories. I have knowledge of people who are unemployed and who do not come into those categories. The figures of unemployed are swollen in such a way as to be quite different from that to

which so many of us became accustomed in our younger days.

Having made those opening comments and having referred in general terms to the Government's concern about unemployment, I have to admit I have a very great concern about the unemployment situation within my own province, especially as it relates to the Rockingham and Kwinana areas. The situation in these areas is as critical as, if not more critical than, it is in a great many other areas in the State. It affects a very considerable number of young people.

The most recent figures available to me, which I believe have come from the Commonwealth Employment Service office in Kwinana and which would be correct up to the last couple of months for those people unemployed under the age of twenty-five years, indicate that the number of unemployed for the Rockingham area is 829—a very significant figure—and the number for the Kwinana area is 658. To satisfy Mr Hetherington, I say that not all those would fall into the category of people who have not previously been employed.

A further concern is that within the next few months these numbers will be boosted by our school leavers. Figures I have obtained very recently from the Rockingham High School indicate there are 200 students in year 10, 78 in year 11, and 78 in year 12. A number of the year 12 students will, of course, go on to higher education at universities and so on, but we will still be left with a considerable number of young people who will be seeking employment.

What is to be done about this problem? Essentially, I suppose while there is a great responsibility on State Governments to provide job-creating situations and the stimulus to provide job opportunities, the employment problem is a Commonwealth responsibility. I wonder about the effectiveness of the various schemes in operation. It worries me considerably because, even with a recently announced scheme of which I have only sketchy details, I wonder about its effectiveness.

It is a programme for people in the younger age groups which I would term as a supplementary scheme to the school process. When this scheme was announced, I am sure a great many people had doubts as to the effectiveness of the school programmes themselves because we found the Government thought it necessary to introduce a scheme to complete the normal school educating programmes. I am sure this was the reaction of a great many people who thought that perhaps the school system had fallen down. Surely it has if it

has not been able to equip these young people to enable them to secure employment in those areas which would normally be open to them. There seems to be something inadequate in the school system and I am firmly of the belief that there must be something inadequate in the education programme which does not sufficiently equip these young people to satisfactorily and successfully front up to jobs. The situation is apparently so critical as to involve some highly sophisticated and expensive training programmes to cater for the 17 to 20-year-olds.

Once again, this is a somewhat new situation and one we have not necessarily had to face during more difficult periods in our history. There is one aspect, which might be a minor aspect, which relates to my own province and that is the Community Youth Support Scheme. This scheme has been operating in many parts of the State without a great deal of glamour. To an enormous extent it relies on voluntary effort and voluntary patronage by local groups and businessmen. By its very nature, the scheme experienced and still experiences some administrative problems in various locations. In some areas it operates with a considerable degree of success, and Rockingham is one of them.

Recently I obtained figures relating to the operation of the Community Youth Support Scheme in Rockingham. The local committee comprises local volunteers and it has a very dedicated lady project officer who is prepared to go to tremendous lengths to improve her understanding of this problem, to the extent that she gained recent experience of overseas training programmes in order that she might better equip these young people to face up to these great social and unemployment problems.

I shall quote figures for the period January, 1979, to September, 1979, inclusive. The average weekly individual attendance is 46. One might say that is not many when we are speaking about the unemployment problem and when we consider that in this district there are over 800 unemployed people under 25 years of age. The average monthly sessional attendance is 514, and the total sessional attendance is 4 642. I point out that there are two sessions; one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

Those figures may appear somewhat insignificant, and may appear to be doing anything but coming to grips with this great problem. Nevertheless, this scheme is serving, and has served, an extremely valuable purpose in that locality. It has equipped a number of young people to better face up to seeking a job. Many of us find it incredible that these young people should be so ill-equipped in this day and age as to

be unable to maintain a fair standard in job applications.

That is the experience of that centre. I am rather heartened by the fact that while other schemes in the State are having difficulties—in fact, one or two have closed down, partly as a consequence of administrative and financial restrictions exercised at the Federal level—this scheme in Rockingham is meeting with a fair amount of success. It will certainly be worth while if the scheme continues.

The Rockingham group is currently taking an adventurous line and is trying to extend its activities so as to move into the commercial arena. It is placing itself more in the public eye and is attempting to establish itself in the Rockingham village centre. I support its intentions. I believe it will benefit from establishing itself closer to the commercial people in Rockingham.

More particularly, it will place them in a situation where they will be subject to public scrutiny. It would be in virtually a commercial atmosphere or job situation which the participants eventually hope to fill. The expansion would then lead to a more suited situation, especially for the young female whose problem is so much greater.

The Hon. Norman Moore made some very appropriate references to the overall employment situation. I will perhaps cover a little of the same ground, but I am dealing essentially with the unemployment of the under-25 group. It is worth while noting that everything is not bad and that in fact some improvements and opportunities are being made available to young people under the various apprenticeship schemes.

Members of this House would be aware of the changes over the years and the numbers of young people offering themselves for this training. I can remember in the 1950s and into the 1960s that there was work to be done in Western Australia and throughout Australia. There were opportunities for people to drive bulldozers and trucks, jobs which did not require a certain skill. It was considered to be good money in those days, so young people favoured this sort of employment which did not require training.

It was disturbing to a great many of the more mature adults in the community who were brought up in the belief that one had to be well trained or had to serve an apprenticeship. So many people felt that they would be at a disadvantage if they put themselves through apprenticeships when in fact they could drive trucks, bulldozers, etc., and earn good money. This was perhaps one of the contributors to some

of the difficult employment situations in later years.

We have now seen a move back and, in my opinion, a very good move back to the apprenticeship system. It is basically very good training for young people. I will quote some figures because we are prone to hear so much of what is dismal and bad. These figures will indicate the increased number of people serving apprenticeships. In 1973-74 there were 10 884 registrations; in 1974 there were 10 622; in 1975, 10 718—I am quoting figures as at the 31st December—and in 1976, 11 134. These figures illustrate the upward trend which is very commendable. The figure for July, 1979 was 13 366, an increase of over 30 per cent over the years.

The Government is often challenged by the Opposition for not measuring up to its policy statement, that it has not met its promises, and that it is not doing anything for unemployment. The counter argument is that Western Australia has in fact done very well even whilst there is certainly an unhealthy unemployment situation. The promises made by the Government have been met and I want to demonstrate this by quoting the figures for the labour force in Western Australia.

These figures will perhaps present some good news and bad news to the Opposition. The good news starts in the year 1973. The total labour force in Western Australia was 494 100. The number employed was 483 900, leaving an unemployment figure of some 10 200. Of course members of the Opposition will take heart from that because it was the last year of the Tonkin Government. In the following year, it was good news for the Opposition because the figure dropped and the total labour force was 488 700 with a total employed of 470 500 and 3 700 unemployed. That is what happened when the Court Government was elected. Before there is too much joy there for members of the Opposition I will remind them that in 1974 when the Tonkin Government lost office it was as a result of the Budget from the previous year.

I am not making an idle claim there because it will be recalled by all members that the circumstances of 1973 contributed very greatly to the defeat of the Tonkin Government and not the least of them was the last Budget. From 1974 onwards there was a great improvement. In 1975 the figure for the total work force increased to 519 000. For 1976 it was 526 000. Of course there has been an increase in the population, but I will refer to that later. In 1977 the figure was 531 000 and in June, 1979 the total labour force was 566 800.

I will refer now to the numbers of people employed in those years. They were: 1974, 470 500; in 1975, 496 400; in 1976, 506 000, and in 1977, 504 700. For the year to June, 1979, the figure was 529 800. From those figures members will be aware that there has been a very considerable increase in the work force. There has been an increase of 72 700. Obviously there has been some job creation because there are 72 700 more people in the work force.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Of course, because there are more people in the State.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Mr Cooley has joined the discussion because obviously his interest has been sparked. I will not leave anything out. I will now give the percentage of unemployed, and I am sure he will get some joy out of this.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: More appropriately much sadness out of unemployment.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: The Labor Party has a curious way of expressing that sadness because its members continually hark on it in such a way that they criticise the Government and say that it is the Government's fault. I am sure they have reasons for doing this. It is simply to use it as some sort of political stick with which to beat the Government. They are not really concerned about the unemployment situation. It is a political matter with which they can embarrass the Government.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Whose fault is it?

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I will repeat: the work force has grown by 72 700 on the 1973 figure—or by 14.7 per cent. As Mr Cooley agrees, there would have to be an increase. However, with all the claims and arguments about the unemployment situation one could understand if there has been confusion in their thinking that the unemployment figures have gone down and that there are fewer people employed. However, the figure has gone up and the total work force has increased by 72 700. This is almost 73 000 in a matter of six years. This figure will add some weight to my remarks.

In 1977 the Premier claimed that there was a potential for job increases of up to 100 000 by the year 1984. So if we have achieved some 73 000 jobs in the last six years then the total figure does not seem to be beyond the bounds of possibility.

I will now quote the unemployment figures. For 1974, the figure was 3.7 per cent; for 1975, 4.5 per cent; for 1976, 3.8 per cent; for 1977, 5 per cent; and for 1979, 6.5 per cent.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is 40 000 people.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: That is very disturbing, and I am sure it suits Mr Cooley that I should quote these figures.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: But in 1974 the Premier said he could cure the situation State by State. It has been six years, and unemployment has risen from 7 000 to 40 000.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: These figures can be checked by any member who wishes to undertake the work I have undertaken. They were obtained from the *Western Australian Year Book* for 1979. The figures published are for 1974-1977. The population over the age of 15 years increased by 71 500, and the work force has increased by almost the same number.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you see us getting back to full employment at all?

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I can see why Mr Dans wants to change the subject.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not changing the subject.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am sure Mr Dans will not mind if I finalise the comments I am making on this subject.

One aspect of the unemployment situation does not seem to be given enough attention in the media. Sometimes comparisons are made between the situation in Western Australia and those in other States. Early this evening Mr Moore made some comparisons, but I would like to refer to another area which I have not heard mentioned before. I obtained my figures from the report of the Bureau of Statistics and also from the *Labour Force of Australia*, Bulletin 3203, for June, 1979. I will refer to a table headed, "Civilian population aged 15 years and over of employment status States and Territories, June, 1979". The figures for the various States of Australia are set out and then there are tables for the number employed, the number looking for work, the number looking for part-time work, and the total labour force.

The figure given here for Western Australia is comparable with the figure I have quoted earlier; that is, 529 800 people employed, 31 300 looking for full-time work, and 5 700 looking for part-time work, making a total of 37 000-odd looking for work. The figure for the labour force is 566 800—the figure I quoted earlier—and the particular item I want to mention is the employment rate. We have referred to the 6.5 per cent unemployment rate, but it is the participation rate to which I want to draw attention; that is, the percentage of the population actually in the work force. It is rather interesting to look at this percentage State by State. The figures are as follows—

	Per cent
New South Wales	59.4
Victoria	61.2
Queensland	59.4
South Australia	61.6
Western Australia	62.6
Tasmania	59.5
Northern Territory	70.2
Australian Capital Territory	69.0

I must point out that the Tasmanian figure is under investigation, and the figures for the Territories may not be quite comparable.

It is interesting to compare the participation rate of Western Australia with that of, say, New South Wales. This comparison indicates that New South Wales has 3.2 per cent less employment participation by its population. Victoria has 1.4 per cent less participation, Queensland 3.2 per cent, South Australia 1 per cent, and Tasmania—and I repeat that this figure is under investigation—1.1 per cent less.

In order to obtain a strict comparison of the unemployment percentage rate between the States, if we are to compare our figures with New South Wales we should deduct the 3.2 per cent difference. So, for argument's sake, that would be 3.2 per cent deducted from 6.5 per cent which would give us a 3.3 per cent unemployment rate.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Rafferty's rules!

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: It is not Rafferty's rules.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It may be that 3 per cent more of the population is under 18 years of age.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Obviously I am getting onto a tender area.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A while ago I asked you a question. I said that statistics prove nothing, and I asked what you are going to do about unemployment. Nothing is happening about unemployment in Australia, no matter what Government is in power.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: All sorts of reasons will be advanced as to why my calculations are incorrect.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: All the statistics in the world will not help the unemployed.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Opposition members may claim that there must be a higher participation rate for a variety of reasons.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not going to challenge your figures; they are quite correct. However, what is happening in Australia is an acceptance of unemployment in every State. That is the problem—the acceptance of unemployment.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Of course, that is where I came into the debate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I heard you, and I agree with you.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Unfortunately there is too ready an acceptance by too many people of the unemployment situation. I repeat: The unemployment scene today is vastly different from the one with which Mr Dans, Mr Cooley, and I were brought up.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The unfortunate part is that people are getting older each day and each year and they are still not employed.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: The points I am making have some relevance, and the relevance is not necessarily to the disadvantage of Western Australia, nor is it to the discredit of the record of this Government which has attempted to bring about an atmosphere of greater job creation. I will not duck the question that Mr Dans put to me. I am prepared to make an observation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know you will not duck it, but I am saying that that is the frightening point.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Does Mr Dans foresee a situation of full employment?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No, I do not.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am sure that Mr Dans does not believe we can ever reach a nil unemployment figure. I think we should be looking to the figure on which Mr Albert Monck used to work. He believed that it was impossible to operate on a figure of less than 2.5 per cent unemployment. So the question is: Do I believe we can return to a situation of 2.5 per cent unemployment? I have very grave doubts about it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with you.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I have these doubts because of the matters to which I have referred. The unemployed people in this State are a vastly different group of people from those on whom these statistics were first based in the 1920s, 1930s, and the 1940s. And so the figures of those days are not strictly relevant to the unemployment situation we face today.

Irrespective of the type of Government involved, I very much doubt that we can ever return to an unemployment situation of 2.5 per cent.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It worries me that neither of the major political parties even talks about full employment any more.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am sure one of the reasons for that is that back in the 1930s and 1940s we had a fairly stable work force throughout the country and the statistics had a greater reliability. Today the work force is more flexible, with new people coming in and joining it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They are looking for jobs no longer there in certain areas. Unfortunately those people will get older and the social problems and stresses on the community will grow. Family life will change.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Having made those observations, I have achieved what I set out to achieve tonight. In this House we are very prone to engage in debate on the unemployment situation and although there are many cross-Chamber interjections, there has not seemed to be an opportunity for a considered and objective discussion on the whole question. I thought I could serve some useful purpose by attempting to do that. I do not claim that I have necessarily given a correct analysis or the correct reasons.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You have tried.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: A claim frequently made and just as frequently countered is that the employment situation in Western Australia continues to improve. We have had an increase in the labour force, an increase not reflected in all the other States as well we know. In fact, in some States the labour force has decreased. The employment situation in Western Australia continues to improve, notwithstanding a continual increase in our population by migration and other means. That is another aspect which has some bearing on the participation rate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with your figures.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: That also is to our credit.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not arguing that is happening, but at the same time we are increasing the unemployment rate.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: That is right, because the more people who are employed the greater the opportunity for the rate increasing. In all other respects it would be a great disadvantage to Western Australia if we did not have that population increase.

Let us look back to the 1940s and 1950s and remember what Western Australia wanted to happen at that time. We were the great Cinderella State—we have not heard that term used for 10 years. I repeat that we are presently in a bad situation, but it is one which can improve if we can create an atmosphere in which all the

school leavers and the job seekers are gainfully and fully employed. Let us hope at least we can get down to a realistic figure of about 2.5 per cent unemployment. I believe most people would regard that as approaching a full employment situation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Utopia!

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: I am hopeful that we can achieve that position in the foreseeable future. The important thing is that the people entering the work force are developing the attitude that there can be jobs for them. We know just how devastating and depressing it is for young people to go on month after month without finding a job. I support the motion.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [9.00 p.m.]: This evening I have tried to analyse why I even want to speak in this debate, because what I am going to say will not change the effect of the vote; it will not get a story in the newspaper; and I am not speaking to a gallery from Kalamunda. I think the reason I wish to stand and speak is that we have one member of the Press in the gallery who might hear and heed because what I am going to say, to me, is of great concern and sadness.

I refer to the twisting of the truth through the media, to the playing on racial polarisation to gain votes from unsophisticated people, for the purposes of election fodder. I refer members to an article which appeared in *The National Times* for the week ending the 27th October, 1979, under the heading, "The white welfare officer who won't go away". If a person reading that article has a heart and a brain which can analyse, but knows nothing of the subject other than what he is reading in the newspaper, he will come away with several emotions. His first emotion will be, "a man has been unjustly treated". The second emotion will tell him we have a Police Force in Western Australia which is brutal and unfeeling and that we have a Government in Western Australia which is totally unfeeling to the needs of Aboriginal people and of its own officers. They are the emotions one would feel reading that article for the first time without knowing any of the facts.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Would you recommend they read John Singleton in *The Bulletin* instead?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I have read John Singleton's article; it is written in a humorous vein.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Black humour!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: There was far more truth underlying his comments than in the



newspaper article to which I have referred, yet the newspaper article was more professionally written; it was more compassionate in its style, and it covered a lot of truth. When I say "covered" I mean that it did not allow the truth to come out.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: It buries it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The reason I appeal to the Press is in the hope it will bring back the balance which should be contained in truthfull journalism, where both sides of an argument are presented. Heaven's above, politicians from any party on their own can give enough to the Press for criticism without the need for the Press to invent what it does, and without covering up what it did to show up the other side.

I intend to mention a few paragraphs in this article to show members how a Press can be biased. Referring to Mr Stan Davey, the article states—

... the enforced transfer away from the region of a white welfare officer for what, it has been claimed, are political reasons.

If this were a Government which in fact did indulge in blatant political postings, Mr Stan Davey would have gone a long time ago. In 1970, Mr Stan Davey approached the member for Kimberley (Mr Alan Ridge) and me when we were campaigning and said, "I appreciate what you fellows are doing for Aborigines, but you are in the wrong party; therefore, I will get them to work against you." I told him that was not a good way to teach democracy to unsophisticated people.

It was for this reason we were not canvassing the Aboriginal enrolment. If people stopped us and asked us to help them, we would help them get on the roll. However, we were not going to canvass unsophisticated people and enrol them for the very reason we did not believe we could adopt a non-partisan approach to the Aboriginal, and could not train him in democracy in an unbiased way. It needed to be done by somebody with a non-partisan approach.

The article used the word "enforced". Everybody in this State knows that all departments—not only the Department for Community Welfare—endeavour to shift their officers out of the tropics after they have spent a reasonable time there. Yet here the reporter used the emotive word "enforced".

The reason Mr Stan Davey is appreciated by Government members, regardless of political colour, is that his sincerity for the welfare of Aborigines is beyond question. He is a man who has spent a great deal of time amongst the

Aborigines and he is quite sincere in what he is trying to do for them. Certainly, he has political bias; that is a human failing. However, his attitude towards the Aborigines and his desire to assist them are quite sincere.

The article continues, referring to Fitzroy Crossing, as follows—

The town at that time was a nest of filth. Hundreds of Aborigines had been turned off the pastoral properties in the Kimberley region because the owners had been forced to pay award rates of pay.

That more or less implies that the pastoralists are the ones at fault. In all humanity, there are "good" and "bad" people and, like all humanity, there are "good" pastoralists and "bad" pastoralists, just as there are "good" Aboriginal stockmen and "bad" Aboriginal stockmen. It was not just the pastoralists who caused the swelling of the fringe dwellers around towns; it was sometimes caused by the irresponsible acts of Aboriginal stockmen who could not accept their new-found responsibilities.

Under the award, an Aboriginal stockman today clears \$106 a week after everything, including \$26 for his rations and keep, has been taken out. If he has any other dependants he must pay from that \$106 an amount of \$10 a week for rations for an adult, and \$5 for any child. When the Aboriginal stockmen received the award rates of pay, some of them could not accept the responsibility of paying the extra amount, and the people for whom they were responsible had to leave the stations.

The article states that the town was a "nest of filth". Anyone who has gone to Fitzroy Crossing lately will see the situation has not changed very much. The trees still look as though they are growing out of nests of empty cans, because they are totally surrounded by cans!

The article continues—

There was drunkenness and fights; the town was in chaos.

Stan Davey accepted the challenge and moved into Fitzroy Crossing in 1975.

If that is the measure of success, Mr Stan Davey had not succeeded in that respect because there is still drunkenness and a great many fights at Fitzroy Crossing.

The article goes on to say—

But in the process of improving the living conditions of the Aborigines in the Kimberley, Davey created some bitter enemies among the white population in the region. According to Davey's supporters this

hatred culminated in a decision, passed on verbally a month ago, to transfer him to Kalgoorlie.

What a terrible thing for any reporter to say; what a shocking situation to report. There is nobody in the Kimberley region, black or white, who lacks such compassion that he would accuse the Government of shifting Mr Davey because he dared help the Aboriginal.

The article goes on to say—

The West Australian Government has denied this, saying that the transfer and the procedures that accompanied it were normal Public Service practice.

Mr Ray Young said he would not disclose the discussions the senior officers had had with him; I go along with that, as I am sure do all members opposite. However, it certainly showed there was no directive to senior officers to get rid of Mr Davey.

I might add that Mr Davey previously had received a warning for turning out anti-Government literature. Any public servant would get into strife for that offence. He was warned to stop producing the literature, and he did.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: And the Government still went on and reported him to the Public Service Board because of it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Naturally; things like that must go on one's record.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Not naturally, because it did not go through the department. The department had already dealt with it. In fact, his superior did not even know what had happened.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: It did go through the department.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Once again it shows how different views create debate. It is strange that any Government officer thinks he has the right to produce anti-Government literature and distribute it amongst the people he is supposed to represent.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He was reprimanded for that.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: And rightly so. However, I am not here to criticise Mr Davey; I am here to criticise the bias in the Press, which does not present the other view.

The article goes on to say—

In 1978 a new police sergeant, Malcolm Cole, was appointed to Fitzroy Crossing. The trouble began almost immediately, and Cole and Davey became locked into a running battle.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Do not tell me you are going to support Cole!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Once again we hear from the Opposition a completely biased point of view. No word has been said about the Aboriginal who was charged with aggravated assault, who tried to break and enter Mrs Cole's house and who, as it later transpired, was a Kadaitcha man who made threats against Mrs Cole and her children. He was not arrested by Sergeant Cole, but by another officer.

One of the bad things in this article is the report of a comment made by Mr John Harman in another place. The article states as follows—

According to Western Australia's Opposition spokesman on Community Welfare, John Harman, speaking in the State Parliament earlier this month, it was alleged "that after the arrival of Sergeant Cole there was an increase in brutality directed against Aborigines. In fact some 20 to 24 cases were reported . . .

"There is trouble at Fitzroy Crossing. There is evidence of increased police activity, racial tension and brutality."

When two senior police officers went to Fitzroy Crossing to investigate these claims they found that everything was hearsay. There was no evidence of brutality that would allow any charge to be laid.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Why did they recommend Cole should be transferred?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It was not for any reason expressed by Mr John Harman but because of the threats made against Sergeant Cole's family. No evidence was brought forward which would sustain a charge against this police officer, yet a member of this State Parliament stated categorically there had been an increase in police brutality!

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: The senior officers recommended he be transferred because of his behaviour towards the Aborigines.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The article continues—

The allegations reached such a pitch in May that the Commissioner of Police, Owen Leitch, sent two senior officers, one from Perth and one from Broome, to investigate.

The officers were told of harassment, wrongful arrests and of specific instances when police punched and kicked Aborigines. Ultimately a decision was made that Cole should be transferred and another sergeant

appointed to the town. But this did not happen.

What the article did not state—and this is the important thing—was that no evidence was produced which could lead to a charge against Sergeant Cole; everything was hearsay. Yet if one reads that newspaper without knowing the facts, it would appear as though Sergeant Cole were guilty.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You have one rule for Sergeant Cole and another for Stan Davey.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is not the case; the article states that it did not happen. Mrs Vaughan should be interested to learn Sergeant Cole was to be posted for the reason I just gave to the House; namely, the risk to this man and his family because of the threats levelled against them. The inspector and the other senior officer sent to the town considered for the sake of Sergeant Cole's safety, and the welfare of the town, he should be shifted. In fact, Commissioner Leitch gazetted this intention to shift Sergeant Cole and also to call for another person to replace him.

During this debate, I intend to tell members why that decision was changed. It was changed at the request of the community—black and white—in Fitzroy Crossing.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Two black, and all the rest were white.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is incorrect. It is that sort of nonsense which Opposition members carry on with. They are quite content to twist the truth. I will give evidence of this later.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Your truth!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I quote further—

Leitch went to Fitzroy Crossing and a public meeting was called.

That is a little twisted. Mr Leitch did not go to Fitzroy Crossing and a public meeting was called. Commissioner Leitch was asked would he attend a public meeting in Fitzroy Crossing during his normal visit to the Kimberley, and he agreed to that. When he reached Derby, he received a phone call and somebody said, "We are calling a meeting at 2.30 tomorrow in the courthouse in Fitzroy Crossing. Will you be there?" He said, "Yes."

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Support your local sheriff!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is a funny thing; everything I have said tonight is supported by evidence to indicate that it is the truth. That cannot be said for some of the interjections we have heard here tonight. If the interjections can

be proved, I challenge the Opposition to tell me what I have said that is not the truth.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I will. I am just waiting.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I dare members of the Opposition to say that outside the House, because I would slap a writ against them. They cannot do that, because I am telling the truth, and they know damn well I am.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Well, you can tell me I am telling a lie outside the House, and see what happens.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The quote continues—

The invitations to attend apparently went to whites only, although a few Aborigines were present for a while.

Again according to Harman, at one stage during the meeting a member of the National Aboriginal Advisory Committee rose to speak and Leitch said: "You must be high-up to have a classy wristwatch like that."

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Why don't you have a go at John Singleton's article in *The Bulletin*?

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: You can have a go at that.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You are very selective about the reporters you don't like.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It puts the people of Fitzroy Crossing in a bad light, because it was the people of Fitzroy Crossing who organised this meeting. The invitation did not go to the whites only. It went to the whole community, and it was placed in the newspaper. There was advice to the effect that there was to be a public meeting.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is quite wrong.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is funny that one of the Opposition members is saying that is quite wrong. I dare that person to step outside this House and say that I have presented incorrect information to this House. She cannot do it for the simple reason that I could charge her; as she knows damn well. For heaven's sake! What I am saying is correct, and I have evidence of it.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: What bluster!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Not bluster at all. Try it. If we look at this again, we find that when Mr Leitch arrived for the meeting, he found that Sergeant Cole, the other policeman, and Mrs Cole were about to attend the meeting. He said, "I don't want you at this meeting, because I don't want any comments about you to be stilted at all. I want to hear from the people—Aborigines and

non-Aborigines—what they have to say about you and what they think.” He asked his officers not to attend the meeting so that he could hear any evidence that may be presented against them.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: How could he do that when he was just a guest at the meeting?

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: He happened to be their superior officer.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You are trying to tell us he was just a guest at the meeting, but now he is saying who can attend the meeting and who cannot.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I did not mention the word “guest” at all. It is funny how the Opposition wants to twist words. If members go back through *Hansard*, they will find I never said he was a guest. I said he was invited to attend the meeting.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: What is a guest if it is not somebody who is invited to attend?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: At that meeting he was available to answer questions, and he could also ask questions if he so wished. Before going into the meeting, he advised his police officers not to attend, for reasons I have just explained.

Inside the meeting, Commissioner Leitch listened to statements made by people, and he listened also to a request to retain Sergeant Cole at Fitzroy Crossing. When he received that request, he confirmed that 15 Aboriginal people were present—one of them was Joe Lanigan, who is the councillor and the spokesman for the Bayula community. He found that everybody at the meeting, Aboriginal and white, wanted Sergeant Cole to remain. That was with the exception of one person at the meeting. One person did not want Sergeant Cole to remain. That person was Mr Philip Vincent.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: There were many people outside who did not want him to remain.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I wonder why they were not there. I wonder why the people who did not want Mr Cole to stay in Fitzroy Crossing did not turn up.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: They were at home, injured.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is rather strange that we come to the situation where all the people, bar one, wanted Sergeant Cole to remain. When we look at the one person, we find he was the Aboriginal Legal Service officer. He stood up and said that the reason the community welfare officers were not present was that they did not receive enough time; they did not know

about the meeting in time. It was then that the Aboriginal councillor from the Bayula community said, by interjection, “That’s not right. The community welfare officers told us about this meeting last week. Besides, it was in the paper.”

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Who called the public meeting?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The newspaper goes on to say—

The Kimberley Aborigines responded by lodging complaints against the Fitzroy Crossing police and against the Davey transfer with the Commissioner for Community Relations.

Is not that a strange thing for the Kimberley Aborigines to do? All the Aborigines at the meeting voted that Sergeant Cole should stay; and all the others were invited. If they had something to say, surely they would have attended the meeting and said it; but, no, that did not happen.

I wonder who prepared that complaint? I will bet my bottom dollar it was not an Aboriginal. I will bet my bottom dollar it was a white man.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You can bet your bottom dollar it wasn’t an Aboriginal who called the meeting, too.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: One Lorna Lippman—

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Who called the public meeting?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The people of Fitzroy Crossing.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Are they going to call one for Mr Davey?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not understand Mr McKenzie’s question.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: They called one for Sergeant Cole. Will they call one for Mr Davey.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Apparently the Opposition is confused. This meeting was called to discuss not just one man; it was to discuss what was polarising the community in Fitzroy Crossing. There was a problem, so the community called a meeting. Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: “Polarising” is a misnomer.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I am dealing with the complaint supposedly lodged by the Kimberley Aborigines. When the Commissioner for Community Relations sent his agent, Lorna Lippman, she arrived with orders which are similar to summonses. They were signed by the

commissioner, but they were filled in in a different handwriting. The orders were like ordinary, compulsory summonses. Once they are handed to a person and the person does not attend a hearing, he is subject to a fine. One cannot have summonses like that. Heavens above; a summons has to be typed out and perused by a justice of the peace, and then the justice of the peace signs it. However, in this situation the commissioner did not even know what he was signing. That does not sound very democratic to me.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Which commissioner?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I am speaking of the Commissioner for Community Relations. It seems strange that the people who are anti-Government arranged for a complaint to go to the Commissioner for Community Relations, who happens to be an ex-ALP member of the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: An ex-Minister.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is right.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Al the Pal.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: We go even further. When the policeman was told to attend a hearing, he was not told by Lorna Lippman.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who is Lorna Lippman?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: She is the agent of the Commissioner for Community Relations. The order was not delivered by her; it was delivered by Bob Hawke's son. Bob Hawke is the President of the ALP.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What significance has that?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: His son turns up and presents an order. He is not an agent—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What has that got to do with it?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It has a lot to do with it. The son of Bob Hawke happens to be doing some journalistic work for Aboriginal community groups in that area. I wonder whether there would be some bias in his writing. Is it not a funny situation? It goes around and around. There seemed to be all ALP people concerned in the plot. The Aborigines at the meeting—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: How many Aborigines were at the meeting?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Fifteen.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: How many Aborigines live in Fitzroy Crossing?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Heavens above; it depends on the time of the year.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: One thousand five hundred?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The number does reach 1 500, certainly.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: One per cent of the Aborigines! How many white people attended the meeting?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not know how many white people attended the meeting. I was not interested in that aspect. I do know that 15 Aborigines attended the meeting.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Under what law is the commissioner operating? There is a Government in Canberra. It must be legal.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The newspaper report continues to indicate that when Mrs Lippman went to Fitzroy Crossing, she received 100 per cent support for Stan Davey amongst the Aborigines. She received tremendous support from the Aboriginal people for Stan Davey; that is true—

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: But not 100 per cent—not by a long shot.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is what I am saying. That figure is incorrect, because I have personally received complaints from Aborigines against Stan Davey. It is only an academic question; even so, it is slanted journalism.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: How much support did Sergeant Cole get from the Aborigines?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The report continues—

Improving the literacy of the Aborigines would seem to be laudable work. But not to some of the whites in the north-west.

That is absolutely despicable. It is absolutely despicable rubbish. I have been in the Kimberley for 16 years, and on and off, my colleague, Mr Tozer, has been there a lot longer than that. I can assure members that I have come across many racists of all colours in my time, but I have not come across one person in the Kimberley in those 16 years who would want to withhold education from Aboriginal people. Yet that is the inference in this report in *The National Times*.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who wrote that article?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: A man by the name of Philip Chubb.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He would be a local reporter, would he not?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not know. The report continues—

Stan Davey's work in educating the Aborigines has been looked upon as subversive, dangerously radical.

Some of it may have been; I do not know.

I would not agree that Stan Davey, as an officer, should produce anti-Government material. I would expect him to present a non-partisan view, to teach the people about democracy. If the people are receiving unfair treatment, he should use the democratic process to make the treatment fair; but that is not so, according to the story.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: How long has Mr Davey been in Fitzroy Crossing?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Many years. I do not know.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He went there in 1974.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: January, 1975.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He would have been appointed there for a specific period.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is a long period in the tropics for any Government officer.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He has had a fairly long stay there.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He has been there longer than any Government officer should be required to stay there.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The next part of the newspaper article deals with the so-called "dirty tricks" election. As I have told this House before, there were faults on both sides. Senior members of the party and day-to-day workers for the party become enthusiastic, and they do some things of which not one of us would be proud; so I will not criticise some of the things said in the article. I will merely say that the article is one-sided.

It goes on to say that the result of the election was a surprise after the Court of Disputed Returns hearing. In fact, it was not a surprise result. It might have been a surprise to Mr Philip Chubb who obviously writes with ALP bias; but it certainly was not a surprise result for the people of Kimberley. The majority of people thought Mr Alan Ridge would win the election and the majority of people voted for him.

The newspaper article goes on to say—

The bitterness generated by the campaign has survived the years, with many Liberal supporters blaming Stan Davey for the whole episode.

Certainly a great deal of bitterness still exists there. However, I do not believe we blamed Stan Davey for the whole episode, and I live in the

Kimberley. To continue with the newspaper article—

It has been alleged frequently and openly that he conspired to enrol Aboriginal voters.

That is true. We knew that; but from the way it is written it looks as though that is a great crime. To continue—

The fact that he was on holiday in New Zealand at the time has not altered the view his enemies have taken of the role he played in the election.

This stuns me. I am not aware of these accusations, but Mr Chubb seems to be able to write about them.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You read *The National Times*. You know it is written for an audience, don't you? Surely you make checks and balances when you read a newspaper article.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is what I am asking the journalist to do.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Journalists write for an audience.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is a great pity that unsophisticated people reading that would come away with hatred in their hearts.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I hope you are going to go through John Singleton's article and tell us how biased he is.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Perhaps you could do that.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The reason I have touched on this matter is that for the sake of the State and for the sake of those areas in which large numbers of Aboriginal people reside, we must look at giving unbiased help. I know that is very hard for politicians and for their supporters to do.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You are certainly not doing it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not only hard for politicians; but it is hard also for anybody.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: We have to train Aborigines to understand the democratic process. When one goes into the Kimberley at the moment one finds the majority of Aboriginal people are being told that the Liberals have no feeling for them, that they will not do anything for them, that they are trying to deny them land rights, that they are trying to deny them the vote and the use of the how-to-vote card.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who tells them this?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is being printed in the papers. Here is one called *The Kimberley Land Council Newsletter* which we find is

produced by some rather good writers. They are certainly not all Aboriginal people. We then find they are members or supporters of the ALP and they are telling the people these things. However, they are not telling the people—and this is most important—that of the 14 cattle stations now under Aboriginal ownership in the north, 13 were purchased and granted to them by Liberal Governments. One was purchased under an ALP Government.

What the Aboriginal people are not told is that it is this Government which started the Aboriginal police aid scheme which makes life a little easier for people living in Aboriginal communities. This Government started also the experimental Aboriginal justices of the peace scheme. It was a Liberal Government also which brought in the secondary grant scheme for Aborigines which is in fact a racist scheme, but it is biased towards Aborigines. It was a Liberal Government also which brought in the triple fare scheme for Aboriginal students when Caucasians could get one fare only. That has now been equalised. It was a Liberal Government also which built the majority of Aboriginal community schemes in the north.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Liberal Governments are responsible for 100 per cent of the village schemes.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The Liberal Government built 55 housing units, plus a hospital and school for the Aboriginal people in Fitzroy Crossing. A Liberal Government has also put into operation two other village schemes in the Fitzroy district. However, if one listens to ALP supporters and reads this article, one would think the Liberals had no hearts. Possibly the Liberals have no brains, because they have put money into so many projects without blowing their own trumpets. We have not been blowing our own trumpets. We have been quietly getting on with the job, but all we have been getting is criticism.

Alan Ridge, in his ministerial position, organised the supply of materials worth many thousands of dollars to an Aboriginal group. The ALP supporters said he gave the Aborigines only peanuts, but promised them a million dollars.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Which ALP supporters said that?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I cannot recall the name at the moment but the article was in the *Kimberley Land Council Newsletter*.

My appeal has been to journalists, rather than to members of this House, to give both sides of the story and to give balance, because

unsophisticated people read half-truths and will believe them to be full truths. That is the danger. We need more truth in balanced journalism.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

## **BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

## **FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [9.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purposes of this Bill were outlined in some detail by the Treasurer when presenting the Budget for this year.

The Bill results from a study undertaken by the Government over a period of some two years into fire brigade funding arrangements. This study revealed a number of inequities.

The current funding arrangement calls on insurance companies to meet 75 per cent of fire brigade operating costs, with the balance being met equally by the State Government and local government.

This arrangement has applied throughout the State and has thereby placed an unequal burden on those areas which are not serviced by a permanent fire brigade.

The Bill provides for two funding schemes. One will cover those areas provided with permanent fire brigade services and the other will cover the rest of the State.

In areas served by permanent brigades, the current basis will continue, but with some modifications.

Certain classes of self-insurance operated by the State Government and by the State Housing Commission have not been required to make a contribution towards the upkeep of fire services. In future they will make a contribution.

This will reduce the impost on private persons who have been prudent enough to insure their properties.

The cost of volunteer services which operate in many parts of Western Australia and provide a magnificent contribution to the community, will be met entirely by the State Government.

The arrangement will directly benefit the owners of property in these areas, as their insurance premiums will no longer carry a special loading for the upkeep of fire services.

The Bill now before this House provides for amendments required to give effect to the decisions which I have explained.

In order that the new funding basis can be introduced, it is necessary to set up machinery so that those parts of the State served by permanent brigades may be defined. The Bill also specifies the new basis for contributions in the permanent brigade areas and the rest of the State.

In the past, many criticisms have been directed at the method of funding which has applied.

The proposals now presented will do much to rectify the position and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie.

## INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

**THE HON. D. W. COOLEY** (North-East Metropolitan) [9.40 p.m.]: The Opposition opposes this Bill in all its parts at this stage, because it is designed to remove the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission over awards involving academic staff in tertiary institutions. It removes also the jurisdiction of the commission to deal with conditions of work for employees in this establishment. It takes away also the jurisdiction of the commission to determine matters in relation to the employment of people at Parliament House and Government House.

I believe we are wasting time debating this Bill, because there is not one word contained in it—if you Sir, will permit me to say so—which is not contained in the Industrial Arbitration Bill which has been introduced in the other place and which will be the subject of debate next Tuesday. That legislation will ultimately come before this House. Recognising the fact that this place is now a "party" House I know the Bill which has been introduced in another place will pass through that

Chamber and will pass through this Chamber, also.

Everything contained in the Bill before us now is contained also in the industrial legislation which has been introduced in the other place. Therefore, I cannot see the reason for this Bill being before us tonight. The same effect will be achieved by the amendments contained in the Industrial Arbitration Bill which will be debated in the course of the next few weeks as the amendments contained in the Bill before us at the present time. However, because the Bill is here, we are obliged to oppose it.

We are obliged to oppose the Bill, because people who would normally be covered by the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission are protesting vehemently about the actions of the Government. I am referring to the people who are affected by this legislation, the academic staff of the tertiary institutions.

In order to gauge public opinion it is appropriate to look at advertisements which appear in the newspapers. The advertisement to which I am about to refer is directed at this Government which has always indicated in the past that it believes in unionism, the industrial commission, and the process of industrial relations.

However, the Claremont Teachers College, the Nedlands CAE, the Churchlands CAE, and the Mt. Lawley CAE have seen fit to publish this advertisement in the newspaper. It reads, in part, as follows—

Teachers college staff have always played by the rules . . . Working conditions of college lecturers are vital to the quality of education that reaches your children.

**LAST MONTH** the Government introduced legislation to bar college lecturers from the Commission which sets those conditions.

College lecturers want their working conditions to be decided by the Industrial Commission. *We want to play by the rules.*

Why doesn't the Government?

It seems quite illogical that here we have a situation which is governed by certain rules which must be unbiased according to the views expressed by the Government in the past; but on this occasion we have a game, but we do not have an umpire. The people who are paying the wages are the people who are determining the conditions of work of those affected. It does not seem quite right that these people should not be covered by the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission.



It may be said, "Yes, but this has been before the Industrial Appeal Court, and the court has said the commission does not have jurisdiction." That is quite true, but I think the reverse ought to be the case. The Government ought to be legislating to give the Industrial Commission jurisdiction to issue awards for these people. Where else can those people go? The Government said they have their salary rate set by a Commonwealth determination, which is quite true. They get it under the Commonwealth Remuneration Tribunals Act. The wages of the academic staffs in Western Australia, and the wages of the staffs of a number of other institutions are determined in this manner. However, that is all that is determined. The Commonwealth organisation does not determine the conditions under which those people should work.

I noted a report in an industrial law review which indicated that when the unions sought registration through the Industrial Commission there was no challenge, but the challenge came when they went to the Industrial Commission and requested that an award be issued. The challenge went to the Industrial Appeal Court, and the court upheld it.

There could be another reason for the Government putting this Bill through now. In the judgment it became obvious that policemen, firemen, and prison officers were in doubt as far as the jurisdiction of the commission over their situations was concerned. But that can be rectified easily, as was indicated when an industrial arbitration Bill was introduced in another place. It is provided in that Bill that policemen, firemen, and prison officers will be covered by the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission. It makes a mockery of the Government's policy in respect of the unions and the Industrial Commission when it will not allow the commission to have this jurisdiction over academic staff in tertiary institutions.

The point I intended to make in respect of the Commonwealth Remuneration Tribunal determinations is that it is not uncommon in respect of industrial matters for there to be a determination of values in the Commonwealth sphere. In many instances when matters come before the Industrial Commission here, the cases are based on comparable conditions which apply in the Commonwealth. Many awards are determined in that manner, and so it could be with regard to the awards covering the academic staff associations.

I will agree there could be some justification for senior officers who are covered by our present

Salaries and Allowances Tribunal not to be covered by the Industrial Commission. I refer to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transport Trust, the Commissioner of Railways, and the Clerk of this House and the other place, and other high-ranking public servants.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I do not think the Industrial Commission covers the Clerks in this House.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The salary of the Clerk of the Legislative Council is determined by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I do not think so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think the member will find it is so. Those people in the high salary range are required to do jobs outside the normal jobs covered by awards. They are exceptions and they do not normally have that sort of cover. But, I cannot understand why workers employed in Parliament House are not covered by a normal award, or are denied normal award coverage under the Industrial Commission. That has not been explained. Whilst those people have reasonable jobs, from my observation they work under difficult conditions at times. If we sit until 3.00 a.m. or 4.00 a.m. a number of them are required to work on with us. I think they should be remunerated, despite the fact there are times when they are not so busy. However, that is the case with all industries.

For example, one sometimes sees shop assistants standing around doing nothing, while at other times they are extremely busy. People employed at Parliament House are entitled to an award coverage.

The Minister stated that certain things would be done, but he gave no reasons at all. The people he referred to will not be workers within the meaning of the Act. However, they are all workers, and they are entitled to some sort of industrial protection despite the fact that they may work at Parliament House or Government House.

I might say, with all due respect to the Joint House Committee, that it does not set a very good example to the outside community to have people working in this place who are not entitled to an award coverage the same as applies to other workers. It does not mean they would become out-and-out militants and go on strike at the drop of a hat. It does not even mean that they would have to join a union, which they can do now. It means they would have the coverage of the Industrial Commission in respect of award conditions. Whether or not they have a union, the workers at Government House or at Parliament House ought

to be able to go to the Industrial Commission when they believe there should be an improvement in their working conditions. That right will be taken away from them, and they will be classified in the same way as executives who have their salaries determined by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

I do not understand why the provision has been introduced. I know it will not alter anything, and I know that a Bill in another place has the same provisions as those contained in this Bill. We will protest, but it will go through. It is an injustice, and when there are injustices, or apparent injustices, they should be brought to light and talked about.

I am aware that the staff at Parliament House are not complaining, but that makes it worse in my view that no-one has spoken about it. There must be some feeling in this place that the staff should have better coverage than it has. There should be a set of industrial conditions governing the employment of people in this place. They have none, and they never will have any after the passing of this Bill. That is not a good situation at all.

There was nothing in the judgment of the Industrial Appeals Court to indicate these people should not have an award coverage. It is true that the court stated the Industrial Commission had no jurisdiction over the academic staff associations which operated in the tertiary institutions, but there was no reference to Government House or Parliament House workers in that judgment.

Unless there is a valid reason for the exclusion of these people from the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, we must protest. Perhaps during the course of the debate we might hear something to justify the action by the Government. I have not read the speeches made in another place, or the Minister's reply; perhaps I might receive a reply. However, I have not been informed yet.

I repeat: This Bill will destroy some of the industrial relations which now exist between the academic staff associations in the tertiary institutions. It is taking away their umpire and they will have nowhere to go with respect to their conditions. They can rely only on the Commonwealth Remuneration Tribunal for a determination on their salaries from time to time which, in my experience, is quite adequate. But, under all circumstances there must be an award covering general conditions. Where will they go for their long service conditions, their annual leave conditions and their hours? Will they go to

the Factories and Shops Act, and be determined at the minimum standard?

In respect of workers at Parliament House, will they have to rely on the Joint House Committee to have their conditions determined without having any right of appeal against the decision of the committee? That is what this Bill means. The Government will do away with the arbitration system in respect of these workers, and academic staff in the tertiary institutions. It is not proper to do this unless there is some valid explanation. I do not know where they will go to redress any grievance. It has not been stated by the Minister in his second reading speech. Until the Government can justify the exclusion of these people from the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, the Bill should not be supported.

**THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON** (East Metropolitan) [9.57 p.m.]: If the tertiary education academic staff association, because it is backed into a corner, finally becomes a militant union, this Government would achieve some kind of miracle with nobody to blame but itself. To me this seems to be a particularly stupid Bill where the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, between them, are trying to push academic staffs into a corner and trying to make them fearful of their conditions of service. I do not know where it will end; it is entirely unnecessary.

In some way this Bill is the result of an accident some years ago when an attempt was made to form a union to cover all university staffs. There was an attempt to register that union in the Industrial Commission, and to take over the Western Australian University Staff Association. That association decided to defend its own independence, which necessitated its being registered with the Industrial Commission. The association applied for registration, and got it.

I was rather amused at the time because it meant the Western Australian University Staff Association became the Western Australian University Staff Association (Union of Workers). I found it ironical because members of the academic staff tend to regard themselves as somewhat higher than the average worker, and they would not enjoy that term.

The association stayed in that position until recently. When the Federal Government started to make funds available for universities the university staff associations formed into a Federal body, the Federation of Australian Staff Associations. There was hard lobbying in the presentation of cases, and there were approaches to various Ministers. A series of *ad hoc* tribunals

was established under the Act, under Mr Justice Campbell. Eventually the Academic Salaries Tribunal was established and from time to time salaries were recommended to the Commonwealth Government in order that it might grant funds to the universities and to the States so that the salaries of the university staffs could be paid.

That is what the tribunal in fact does, and it does no more than that. In a moment I will come back to a statement made by the Minister for Labour and Industry in another place in which he promised in due course—when he gets around to it—to establish another tribunal to look after the fringe benefits of academic staffs of the two universities, the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and the CAEs. I am referring to fringe benefits as he describes them which are, of course, the hours and conditions that apply to staffs; because those staffs like other people want security of tenure, they want holidays, and they have special needs which have been developed over the years.

One of the things which has been most under attack and which I have mentioned before is what some members of this place regard as a holiday; that is, paid study leave after every seventh year. This is an important thing, particularly for scientists who come from overseas and who need to return every now and then to spend their time in laboratories in England or the United States in order to carry out research and get back into the general international framework of their discipline. This has never been regarded as a holiday, but as something quite important; so much so that it was written into the contract of employment of members of the academic staff of the University of Western Australia that it was the duty of members to take study leave. It was not a privilege, but a duty; and, of course, it was a duty that often meant they finished up worse off financially after being overseas.

It was a duty which means they faced numbers of difficulties; but it meant they could go overseas and get back to the source of some of their knowledge. They could get in touch with universities and academics throughout the world. This, of course, is what makes a university different from many other institutions.

As a result of the cutbacks by the Federal Government, the conditions of staff have been threatened. We have possible threats to tenure, and positive threats to study leave which is likely to be cut down. There is a great fear that a lack of staff will occur and that staff will be cut down. Of course, already many of the young tutors—the academics of the future—are finding they cannot

get jobs because money is not available for them, and university staffs are suffering.

As a result of that, because there was nowhere else to go, and because the university senate was being squeezed by the Federal Government and it in turn was making conditions for the staff association which the association found unacceptable, it was decided to serve a log of claims on the university senate, and to appear before the Industrial Commission. The staff appeared before Commissioner Collier. The university senate appealed to the Court of Industrial Appeal, which upheld the appeal and found in fact the commission had no jurisdiction. That got rid of the two universities.

However, that has some incidental side effects because one of the things that had happened since 1974 when the teachers' colleges became autonomous, was that they were admitted to the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission. Indeed at times when the teachers' colleges—now colleges of advanced education—approached the Minister for Education, he told them the proper thing to do was to put their case before the Industrial Commission. In other words, he relied on the commission and said that was the proper thing for the academic staffs of the CAEs to do. Since 1974 those staffs have gone before the commission in respect of salaries and conditions and the world has not collapsed. No vast departure has occurred from salaries in the rest of Australia. The commission has not been unreasonable. The system has worked well and satisfactorily.

The Minister has never complained about the system, and the only correspondence the Tertiary Education Academic Staffs Association has had from the Minister suggested that he was perfectly satisfied with the way things were working.

That association, together with the staff association at the Western Australian Institute of Technology, found the commission had no jurisdiction over them. So the awards they had been given and the conditions they had been granted by the commission now had no legal foundation or validity. At the same time it was found this applied also to various other organisations, including the police, firemen, I think nurses, and I am not sure who else.

So the Government decided it should do something about the matter. It would seem to me that universities and CAEs are in a parlous position; that things are changing; and that there are many problems. When one talks to people from the various institutions, as I have done, one

is given all sorts of arguments and all sorts of problems.

The universities are finding now that their much vaunted autonomy is being threatened by the hand that feeds them. In other words, if the Federal Government grants the major proportion of their salaries, it can restrict the grants and stipulate the conditions. So we have a problem in respect of university autonomy.

Some people argue that universities—I am not now talking about the CAEs—should not appear before tribunals at all because that takes away their autonomy. Much is being said at present about the accountability of universities, and this whole situation needs to be rethought.

I would have thought the sensible thing for the Government to do would be to legislate to maintain the status quo; that is, to leave out the universities which had survived this long before appearing before the commission, and to leave the Tertiary Education Academic Staffs Association—which consisted of staffs of the colleges of advanced education—under the jurisdiction of the commission at least for the time being.

I would have thought the staffs of the CAEs should be left under the jurisdiction of the commission so that they could be sure their awards, with which everybody seemed to be satisfied, could continue to operate. No complaints were made by principals or the councils of colleges regarding the awards, and not many complaints were made by the staff. At the same time, the whole position should be re-examined and discussions held similar to the ones we are told the Minister for Education now holds with the Teachers' Union on occasions. This is the time for rather more wide-ranging discussions than those held with the Teachers' Union, because we have to decide what to do.

One of the matters which is argued by the Government is that we want overall uniformity. In fact, some argument can be advanced in favour of having parity for all tertiary institutions so that it is much easier for persons to transfer from one to another, and it is harder for wealthier institutions—if we have any left—to buy better academics. If all other things are equal, there are some advantages in going to the University of Western Australia; for example, the lack of pressure from students and the quietness of the campus means academic staff can get on with more research. This does not apply to everyone, because different people like different things.

However, at the same time, many of the conditions set up in the University of Western

Australia have been superior to those in other universities, and the association is loath to lose them. This is what it was trying to maintain when it went before the arbitration court.

Therefore, we need to examine the whole position. Certainly the Tertiary Education Academic Staffs Association could not see why, through an accident of jurisdiction—when the Industrial Court of Appeal found the Industrial Commission no longer had jurisdiction over them—a system which had been working satisfactorily and well and which had suited the Government since 1974, should not be maintained.

The only argument put forward by the Minister here or in another place is that the Government must take a consistent approach in respect of the academic staff of every institution of advanced education, by confirming the exclusion from the commission's jurisdiction of the Murdoch University, the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and the teachers' colleges. The Government does not say why it must have that consistency. After all, it was thought in the past that the commission had jurisdiction over the colleges, and nobody thought then the inconsistency mattered very much. The system seemed to be working well, and had the Government adopted a sensible, pragmatic approach, it would have left it as it was.

However, the Government has decided to pass a Bill to restore jurisdiction to those unions to which it considers jurisdiction should be restored. They include the policemen, firemen, and nurses, but exclude academics in the CAEs and possibly the Western Australian Institute of Technology, who are also working under an agreement registered with the commission.

That agreement now has no legal standing, and it is not surprising that many members of the academic staff of WAIT and many members of the staffs of the CAEs are perturbed because they do not know what is to happen to them; particularly when a so-called Minister of the Crown does not know what they are worried about and says he will one day establish a tribunal to look after their fringe benefits.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: He did not say "one day". He said it would be established.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: When will it happen?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: He said it would be done.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It has not been done and it seems unlikely that it will be done in this session.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are making wild statements.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not making wild statements. Until such a tribunal is established and given legal status, the staff conditions of the tertiary institutions of this State have no legality, and the councils and the senates can do anything they can get away with. In other words, we are back to the bargaining of the 19th century. I do not see why we could not have had temporary legislation to maintain the status quo until the matter is sorted out and thought out. However, there seems to be a determination to ensure that the academic staffs—nobody else—are taken out of the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, even though they have been under that jurisdiction since 1974. I cannot see the sense in this. I think I can see what the Government is doing, and it does it no credit. It seems to me the Minister for Labour and Industry does not know what applies. In answer to a question in another place, he said—

The Senates of both the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University are the governing authorities of the respective universities. The senates have the power under their governing legislation to make regulations or statutes relating to conditions of employment and internal procedures are in existence for settling industrial disputes. These internal procedures ensure adequate consultation to reach agreement before disputes arise.

I would like a Minister in this House to tell me precisely what those internal procedures are. That does not line up with anything in my experience.

Disputes can sometimes become fairly nasty, even in universities. Now we have multiplied the colleges of advanced education they have nowhere to go for arbitration, and things may become considerably worse.

I wish to quote from a letter in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 12th October, from the Presidents of the Staff Associations of the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University as follows—

We refer to your report (October 3) indicating that the Government intends to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act to give non-academic staff in tertiary institutions access to conciliation and arbitration tribunals while specifically excluding academic staff from access to the West Australian Industrial Commission.

While it is quite proper that the Government should legislate to give non-

academic staff access to industrial tribunals, we must ask the Government why academic staff should be singled out for exclusion from the Industrial Commission which serves the role of arbitrator and conciliator.

No appropriate machinery exists for the resolution of disputes between academic staff and their institutions.

I will repeat that—

No appropriate machinery exists for the resolution of disputes between academic staff and their institutions.

With the Federal Government imposing or threatening to impose restrictive conditions of service in areas such as study leave and tenure, the academic staff should have an avenue for resolution of disputes arising from these initiatives.

We see the present legislation as a classic example of discriminatory practice which should not go unnoticed in the community.

Furthermore, we call on the Government to amend the legislation to give all employees in tertiary institutions the same rights of access to arbitration.

I have met both Professor Walls, the president of the Murdoch association, and Professor Reeves of the University of Western Australia Staff Association. They are both men of honesty and probity. I am not asking the House to accept their views necessarily; but if they have said something is a fact, then it is so.

They are concerned to deny the very thing that the Minister, in his ignorance, was concerned to state. I have no doubt that the Minister is ignorant on this matter. It is a matter in which many people do not have a great deal of knowledge and understanding. Universities have muddled along for a long time in their relations between the staff and the governing bodies.

Since the mid-1960s or earlier—I think it was in the 1950s when Sir Robert Menzies was the Prime Minister—we have had a series of Governments, in times of economic growth and boom, which were well disposed towards universities. We have had times of growth and boom when universities managed to improve their conditions. Of course, that time has gone. Now we have reached the stage where, in the general sense, there needs to be an arbiter. This is what is being requested.

The Academic Salaries Tribunal is not such an arbiter. I have spoken to members of the tribunal at various times. Their task is to give advice to Governments. Their findings are not mandatory.

Governments normally accept them; and I presume they will go on doing so.

The tribunal has worked quite well as far as salaries are concerned; but it is still not an arbitral body in the way that the Federal arbitration commission is, or the State Industrial Commission is.

The Federation of University Staff Associations is anxious that it have the right to appear before the Federal arbitration commission or, if that is not possible, for an arbitral tribunal to be established for it.

Now, I plead no university's cause on this at all, because there is the problem of university independence and autonomy which needs to be considered. Certainly the whole issue is a much broader and more important one than would be imagined by a reading of the second reading speech of the Minister in this House, or the ill-informed comments of the Minister in another place.

It is a great pity this Bill has been introduced. It will cause a great deal of bitterness among people who have not been badly disposed towards this Government. I find that rather ironic.

Perhaps I should advise the Government to go on with this ill-considered measure, because it will do nothing but cause bitterness and resentment among people none of whom hitherto have supported the Government. However, I still think that some sense and justice and some conciliation should be brought in.

I wonder what will happen now in the universities. Where will they go? It has been suggested that the only body to whom the universities can turn is to the Visitor, the Visitor being His Excellency the Governor. Normally His Excellency the Governor acts on the advice of his Ministers. Let us hope the Cabinet will not become the arbitral process. Will the Governor have to set up his own privy council? Perhaps the Governor should appoint his own judicial committee of the Executive Council to advise him; but I do not think that kind of constitutional development would be agreeable to us.

I cannot see the sense in carrying on with this measure particularly, as Mr Cooley has pointed out, as there is an arbitration Bill already presented in another place that will repeal this legislation. There is a hurry to make sure that the right thing is done by the police and the firemen. In the meantime, there will be an injustice done to the academic staffs of the colleges of advanced education.

Part of the Bill reads as follows—

(3) The registrations, or purported registrations, under this Act, before the coming into operation of the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Act, 1979, of The Tertiary Education Academic Staffs Association Union of Workers Western Australian Division and the University of Western Australia Academic Staff Association (Union of Workers) are hereby cancelled.

It validates everything that was done for everybody else; but the awards that applied in the colleges of advanced education for the last five years are hereby cancelled. They will be wiped out as the Governor signs this measure when it is passed by both Houses. This is disgraceful and short-sighted.

The other matter with which I wish to deal has been mentioned by my colleague quite adequately. I do not see that people who work in either House of Parliament should be in a grace or favour situation. I do not see why they cannot unionise and cannot have awards. What is so sacrosanct about this place that the people who are employed here cannot be employed under a proper award? It is all very well for the Minister to say—

These employees have customarily received the same rates of pay and conditions of employment as their counterparts elsewhere in Government employment and receive any changes of those conditions from the same time and in the same terms as their counterparts.

It is a custom; it is not a right. The workers who work for us have the same right to industrial justice as have any other workers. The workers in this place should have that right. The fact they are employed by the President, or the Speaker, or the Joint House Committee, or His Excellency the Governor should not mean they do not have the right to unionise and to have proper awards like anybody else. Why is there this discrimination?

This will not protect any Government. It is not a financial consideration, because there are not sufficient people involved to make a great deal of difference in the Government's Budget. It is a matter of some kind of perverted principle. As far as I am concerned, there is a better principle than that, and that is that all workers have the right to arbitration in a modern State, whether they be employees of the Parliament or academic employees of tertiary institutions.

I find this Bill repugnant. I have talked to people from the colleges who have come to see me

and Mr Arthur Tonkin about the Bill. They are not wild, rabble-rousing people. They are anything but that. They are sensible, sensitive people who want their just desserts. If they are forced into militancy, that will be because they have been backed into a corner.

This Government may go down as the Government that achieved the miracle of turning tertiary academic staff into militants. I hope that does not become necessary, and I hope that the worst fears of the academic staff members are not realised.

We should recognise that in times of economic stringency and in times when universities, like all other institutions, are finding their numbers going down, we should put their salaries and conditions on some kind of legal, arbitral basis.

I am not offering any easy solutions. I am not suggesting that the Government should do anything at this stage but maintain the status quo. For some of the reasons I have already mentioned, this is a complex problem, and it should be discussed seriously as a complex problem, to see how it can be solved in the best interests of everybody.

I suggest it has been solved arbitrarily and in a cavalier manner in the worst interests of everybody. For this reason, despite the fact I appreciate the need to validate the jurisdiction of the commission over a whole range of unions, I must oppose the Bill as it stands because it is discriminatory and unjust.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON:** (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.28 p.m.]: I thank members for their interest in the Bill. I apologise to some members. I told Mr Cooley I would handle this Bill tonight because he could not be here tomorrow. He said it would be 20 minutes. It has taken a lot longer than that, and I am sorry for that. I did not realise there would be more speakers.

What it really boils down to is that Mr Cooley wants two courts for the one group of people. The difference between the main group of people who have been included and those who have been excluded is that the former have nowhere else to go and need a court to which they can have reference.

It is amazing how all of a sudden courts become good, if it suits a certain group's book. It seems to me these days that the Industrial Commission is very good if it makes a decision in one's favour. If it does not, one goes on strike against it *ad nauseam*.

Mr Hetherington interjected.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON:** I am talking to Mr Cooley who spoke on the Bill. I understand he was the lead speaker for the Opposition. I will attend to his argument for now and I will get to Mr Hetherington's diatribe in a minute.

I tend to agree with the Premier's comments made a little while ago that the arbitral system seems to have been rendered almost useless by the disregard it gets from some segments of organised unions. The fact remains that the history of this matter, as outlined by Mr Hetherington, had a mild thread of fact running through it and was a classic indication of how the real history can be moved around to suit a set of conditions.

I was Minister for Education when this matter came up, and I know precisely what the score was and the relationship it bears to the account tendered to us by Mr Hetherington which, quite coincidentally, had odd pieces along the way which dealt with the matter, but other than that bore no factual relationship to it at all.

Mr Hetherington went on hearsay and on conversations with people who really knew little or nothing about the matter.

**The Hon. R. Hetherington:** You could just be wrong again.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON:** I was right slap bang in the middle of this at the time it happened. I happened to be the Minister for Education and I know what caused the problem; I know why it came about. I know that one particular academic organisation removed a principal of a certain college from the chair and nominated an outside person to the board of that particular academic institution. Those people went over the wishes of the majority of the members of the institution's board because, as always, these people were not at the meeting. The academics were there, but the community members were not.

On that occasion, because of that action, I amended the Act and changed the nature of the membership of the board running that particular academic institution. That academic organisation became left-wing. This was back in 1975; yet Mr Hetherington has said that if this Bill is passed we will make these organisations move to the left.

**The Hon. R. Hetherington:** I did not say that at all.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** He said militant.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON:** Mr Hetherington's remarks indicated a total lack of knowledge of the situation. He would have been better off had he left the Bill to the lead speaker for the Opposition (Mr Cooley).

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Don't you like the truth?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I live by the truth. The only Ministers I know of who have been sacked are those who have tampered with the truth. Mr Hetherington should know that because he has lectured on the subject often enough and he has told us how he has often lectured on these matters.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: And I will do so again.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course; Mr Hetherington cannot leave well enough alone. Mr Cooley handled the Bill adequately and did not pretend to know about things he knew nothing of. He stated things as they were.

In the evidence presented 15 years ago in North America it was clear for everyone to see what the future would be for academic institutions and what the future would be for academics. In 1965, the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife was accepting bright young fellows who were qualified for entry into tertiary institutions as cadets so it could turn them out in three or four years as qualified scientists in order that the department would have scientists to call on. Within five years, not only was the department not training cadets, but it was also not employing anyone who did not have a master's degree with honours.

I can remember back in 1970 going down to the university at the invitation of Professor Maine and talking with zoologists and marine biologists. There were about 25 of them with all sorts of qualifications. They were excellent people.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does this have anything to do with the Bill?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It has a lot to do with the lecture given to us by Mr Hetherington. Not one of those people was looking at any prospect of securing employment. That was the change in five years.

Mr Hetherington said certain things that were true and attributed them to quite the wrong bases in trying to tie them to what arose in this legislation. The simple reason for this legislation being introduced was that the chairman of a Federal Government committee (Mr Campbell) set terms for salaries for academics across Australia and a group of people here who thought they could do a little better made a subsidiary application.

From memory, the trouble started back in 1975. It simply was not on for these

people—because we did not fund them—to talk about autonomy for universities when they had gone over to being totally funded by the Federal Government and where the standard requests for funding led to a great deal of nonsense. There are only two things that make for autonomy, and they are wealth and independence. There is no way an organisation which goes cap in hand to another body for finance can expect to be autonomous.

Mr Dans was quite right when he said none of this has anything to do with the Bill; but he should have made that interjection when Mr Hetherington was trying to help Mr Cooley who, in fact, did not need help. Mr Cooley mentioned everything that needed mentioning.

The Minister has said that what difficulties there are will be righted by the establishment of an individual tribunal to which these people can go with their particular worries. The staff of Parliament House are looked after in the same way as people in their same walk of life are catered for outside. This situation has worked quite satisfactorily in the past.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They are not, you know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not accept the argument presented by Opposition members in respect of the legality of dotting every "i" and crossing every "t". The unions have this sort of thing and they take almost no notice of it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You made a statement which is quite wrong. You were on the Joint House Committee, so you should know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is where Mr Dans is wrong. Opposition members simply must learn to do their research. This is the criticism I direct to Mr Hetherington. I am quite sure that over the years Mr Hetherington has lectured to many people and one can visualise his saying, "Do your research; take nothing for granted; study your parameters; look at your subject matter and study it properly." Mr Dans should not say, "You must have learned that when you were on the Joint House Committee".

I was never on the Joint House Committee! I have been a member and President of the Privileges Committee; I have been a member and Vice-President of the CPA. I have never been a member of the Joint House Committee. I ask Opposition members to please do their research and also to vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.*



# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## SHIPPING: STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

### *Stevedoring*

279. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a decision been made to allow the State Shipping Service to hand over its stevedoring operations to Mercantile Stevedores W.A. Pty. Ltd. and Smith Patricks, another private stevedoring company?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes"—
  - (a) when was the decision taken;
  - (b) why was the decision taken; and
  - (c) will the decision cause further redundancies on the Fremantle waterfront?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No, but negotiations are currently taking place on the possibility of transferring part of State ships' stevedoring work in Fremantle to private stevedores.
- (2) (a) to (c) Not applicable.

## CULTURAL AFFAIRS: ART GALLERY

### *Exhibition, "USSR: Old Masters Paintings"*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Australian Gallery Directors Council Exhibition 1979-80 "USSR: Old Masters Paintings", while it will be touring Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, will not be seen in Perth?
- (2) Is he also aware that the exhibition, which includes paintings of Gorgione, Titian, Annibale, Carracci, Poussin, Lorrain, Reubens, Rembrandt, and Velazquez, carries Commonwealth Government indemnity provisions, is assisted by the Visual Arts Board of the Australia Council and the Department of Foreign Affairs?

- (3) As this exhibition is one of the most important ever to reach Australia, and in view of the significant input from the Australian Government, will the Minister make urgent representations to have the tour extended to Western Australia, particularly as we now have a gallery of a standard equal to any other in Australia?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I have been informed along these lines.
- (3) The exhibition in question has never been planned for general touring throughout Australia, but is part of a bilateral cultural exchange between Australia and the USSR by which selected works from the Sydney and Melbourne galleries will be exhibited in Moscow and Leningrad.

The Director of the Art Gallery of Western Australia has already made representations to the Australian Gallery Directors Council to display this exhibition. I will be pleased to adopt the suggestion of the honourable member by adding my representations on this matter and will be pleased to inform him of the outcome.

## TRANSPORT: BUSES

### *Mitchell Freeway: Express Service*

281. The Hon. T. McNEIL, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

Can the Minister advise me on what action may be proposed to provide an express bus service along the Mitchell Freeway to Wanneroo?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

When the Mitchell Freeway reaches a point where there are advantages to the travelling public through being able to run quicker services from Wanneroo to the city on it and when there is sufficient passenger demand, those services will be directed via the freeway.

## HOUSING AND CARAVAN PARKS

*Dampier*

282. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) What building programme is the State Housing Commission contemplating in the Dampier area if the North-West Shelf gas development gets the go ahead, for—

- (a) Government employees;
- (b) general tenants; and
- (c) purchase homes?

(2) Will the planning of caravan parks be left to the relatively inexperienced shire council, or will Government advice be available?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) The State Housing Commission, with other Government authorities, is maintaining close liaison with the Department of Industrial Development, which is co-ordinating the overall physical and financial planning of the Pilbara area; and that authority is working closely with the local authorities through the townsites development committee.

As a final decision has not yet been made as to the North-West Shelf gas development, and the company has no commitment to proceed, the State Housing Commission has not yet determined forward building programmes. However, over this and the last financial year the State Housing Commission building programmes in the Pilbara have been stepped up and accelerated to bring the waiting time of eligible applicants to acceptable levels.

- (2) The caravan parks will be planned by the townsites development committee, on which the local authorities are represented.

## EDUCATION: SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

*Rockingham*

283. The Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) (a) Which primary schools within the Rockingham Shire have "special classes" to cater for children with below normal academic ability; and  
(b) how many children at present attend these classes?
- (2) Are special class facilities available at either of the high schools within the Rockingham Shire?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "No"—  
(a) is it considered that such facilities would be desirable;  
(b) when does the department intend to provide such facilities; and  
(c) which is the closest high school to Rockingham at which special class facilities are available?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) (a) Rockingham Beach and Safety Bay.  
(b) 24.
- (2) No.
- (3) (a) Yes, if the need is demonstrated.  
(b) See (3) (a) above.  
(c) Kwinana Senior High School.

## HERDSMAN LAKE

*Dredging*

284. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister advise—

- (a) the depth to which dredging has been taken on Herdsman Lake; and
- (b) the total depth it is proposed the test dredging will be taken?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (a) No dredging has been carried out in connection with mining.
- (b) Provided the mining tenement is granted to the applicants, the depth of proposed test dredging will not be known until initial exploration drilling has been carried out.

EDUCATION: SCHOOL

*Safety Bay*

285. The Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Safety Bay Primary School applied to have a water cooler installed at the school?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes"—
  - (a) when was the water cooler purchased;

- (b) by whom was it purchased; and
- (c) when is it anticipated that the water cooler will be installed?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) The water cooler was purchased approximately six months ago by the parents and citizens' association.
- (c) It is anticipated that the unit will be installed towards the end of November.

