

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 3 November 1981

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## EDUCATION

### *Four-year-olds: Petitions*

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia and in the Parliament assembled.

The Petition of the undersigned Citizens of Western Australia respectfully sheweth a grave concern that Government funding for the education of four year old children in Community based preschool centres, may be cut and we would respectfully draw the attention of Honourable members to this.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray you will give this matter your earnest consideration and your Petitioners in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 37 signatures and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

I have two other petitions couched in similar terms, one bearing 23 signatures from people of the Dardanup district and one bearing 22 signatures from people of the Nedlands district. I have certified the petitions conform with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petitions be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition Nos. 107, 108, and 109.)

## EDUCATION

### *Four-year-olds: Petition*

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [4.33 p.m.]: I have a petition couched in terms similar to those of the petitions which have just been presented. It bears 41 signatures and I have certified that, as far as I can see, it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition No. 110.)

## MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [4.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In recent times approaches have been made to the Government by various promoters to run car fairs, mainly on weekends. These would be conducted in some large area—for example, a racecourse or show ground—the intention being to bring together large numbers of private vendors and private purchasers of motor vehicles.

At the time the approaches were made it was thought, and the promoters were advised, that this type of operation could well constitute a breach of the Factories and Shops Act and/or the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

Members will be aware that a car fair, in fact, was held recently despite the advice given by the Department of Labour and Industry that the holding of the fair could be in breach of the previously mentioned Acts.

Following further investigation it has been established that no offence is committed under the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act as the promoter is not a dealer as such.

A similar situation in another State has been dealt with by amending legislation.

Reports on the car fair referred to earlier disclosed that of about 20 cars presented for private sale 60 per cent were regarded as unroadworthy and, in fact, two of the vehicles had RTA work orders issued on them.

If not subject to some form of control this type of activity inevitably will attract unlicensed dealers, sellers of stolen vehicles, and perhaps some unethical dealers.

The main concern is to afford protection to the public and to ensure that people get the best possible deal as is provided for in the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act under which dealers, yard managers, salesmen, and premises must be licensed.

Licensed dealers are required under the Act to be of good character and repute and fit and proper persons to hold a licence. They must also have sufficient material and financial resources available to them to comply with the requirements of the Act.

People who present vehicles for sale at car fairs are not required to comply with any of these obligations and therefore the public are at risk.

To ensure that as much protection as possible is given to the public, this Bill will seek to control the activities of promoters of car fairs or markets.

A car market operator—that is, the person who arranges to provide the premises—will be required to obtain a licence. The requirements will be basically the same as those for dealers.

Licensed dealers, yard managers, and salesmen will not be permitted to hold a car market operator's licence and vice versa. This is seen as necessary, otherwise it would allow unethical persons to offload vehicles and avoid the warranty provisions of the Act.

To place as much responsibility as possible on operators, they will be held liable for any loss incurred where the vendor sells a vehicle subject to an encumbrance. The only exception will be in the case where a notice is displayed on the vehicle being sold stating that title to the vehicle is not guaranteed by the operator.

A substantial penalty is proposed which it is considered will deter the promoters from operating without the necessary licence.

Other matters included in the Bill will amend relevant sections of the Act to apply to car market operators.

In essence this legislation seeks to control an activity which could get out of hand and act to the detriment of the public.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

### LOTTERIES (CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**MR BRIAN BURKE** (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [4.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this simple Bill is to allow bingo to be played on licensed club premises. At present, the Lotteries (Control) Act bans bingo on licensed premises.

Bingo was legalised in 1972 by the Tonkin Labor Government as a fund-raising measure for charitable organisations, including social and sporting clubs. The ban on the playing of the game on licensed premises was imposed by the Legislative Council of the day.

In 1978—in response to considerable community pressure—a Labor member of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Grace Vaughan, introduced a private member's Bill to remove the ban. However, it was voted out after almost no debate because of a drafting technicality.

Following the recent Government committee of inquiry into the Liquor Act, it was widely expected that, in conjunction with amendments to that Act, the Government would bring forward legislation to end the bingo ban. However, it did not do so, despite the recommendation of the committee of inquiry that the ban be lifted.

This was the only recommendation of the committee of inquiry that the Government did not adopt and the Chief Secretary failed to give any reason for the Government's rejection of this solitary recommendation. His only comment on it when introducing the Liquor Bill was that "the Government and its supporters have decided not to put forward an amendment". The Parliament certainly deserved a fuller explanation than that.

The Opposition therefore puts forward this Bill to rectify the Government's unexplained omission and in response to considerable community demand. Our decision to do so was reinforced during the Liquor Bill debate by the comments of six members opposite that the bingo ban should go. The members were those representing Karrinyup, Moore, Merredin, Albany, Darling Range, and Murray, none of whom, in my opinion, could be regarded as being morally derelict.

The reasons for the introduction of the ban are difficult to fathom, even after a reading of the 1972 debates on the legalisation of bingo. There does not appear ever to have been any community demand for this prohibition. The kindest thing that one can say about the people who voted for it in the Legislative Council is that their decision appears to have been due to some unexplained and probably misguided quirk of human nature.

Since that time, no-one to my knowledge has spoken up strongly in support of the ban. Certainly, when Mrs Vaughan's Bill was before the Legislative Council in 1978, no-one spoke up in favour of the ban. The sole reason for the Bill's demise was its deficient drafting. And, as I said a few moments ago, the Government has not offered a single reason in support of its failure to adopt the recommendation of the Liquor Act committee of inquiry that the ban be lifted. However, there has been considerable demand, particularly from licensed clubs and from country areas, for the ban to be ended.

In 1977, Mrs Vaughan, on behalf of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, wrote to 360 clubs about the ban. Of these clubs, 252—or 70 per cent—replied. Only five said they were not interested in the removal of the ban. The remainder—182 country clubs and 65 metropolitan clubs—said they wanted the ban to

go. It is my belief that those overwhelming figures would be even greater today.

The letters circulated to all members recently by the Association of Licensed Clubs demonstrated the depth of feeling amongst these voluntary community organisations in favour of the change my Bill proposes. At present many clubs with comfortable, modern, licensed premises have to hire other premises—many of them of an inferior standard—to cater for the demand from their members for bingo. This sort of situation exists for no good reason.

It could not be argued that people playing bingo on licensed premises will have too much to drink and wager more than they can afford to lose. When bingo is being played for 20c a card, it is hard to lose much money.

In any case, if this argument were to be advanced seriously it would also have to be argued that alcohol should not be sold at racecourses or trotting tracks and that TAB agencies should not be permitted in or near hotels. Gambling is permitted on racehorses, pacers, the dogs, and in connection with lotteries. The Government agencies—the Lotteries Commission and the Totalisator Agency Board—spend thousands of dollars annually advertising their particular forms of gambling and pushing people to participate.

The Government officially acknowledges and tolerates the existence of illegal gambling casinos which turn over millions of dollars each year. It is well known that as soon as the Premier retires the Government will move to legalise those casinos. Therefore, an argument against this Bill can hardly be advanced on the basis of community opposition to gambling.

In addition, since bingo already is legal on unlicensed premises, it cannot be argued that this is an unwarranted extension of gambling. This Bill merely seeks to extend the range of premises on which an already legal activity may be carried out and to improve the physical surroundings in which those who like to play bingo may do so.

The Bill itself is relatively simple. It seeks to alter section 18 of the Lotteries (Control) Act by inserting two new subsections which will give the Lotteries Commission the right to grant to the holder of a club licence or to the nominee of a club a permit to conduct bingo on licensed premises, subject to conditions.

These conditions are—

that the proceeds be applied only for the benefit of the club;

that the participants in the game may be only members of the club and their guests to a maximum of three guests per member.

The commission also may impose whatever other terms and conditions it sees fit.

The adoption of this legislation will meet a clear community demand without any ill-effects.

It also will meet the demand of members sitting opposite me in this House, as expressed during the debate on the recent amendments. I quote the member for Karrinyup as follows—

I do not accept the decision to reject the recommendation for the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. I see no harm in allowing bingo to be played on those premises.

I quote the member for Moore as follows—

Most licensed club premises today are very modern and up-to-date and offer very acceptable venues for such activities.

The following was said by the member for Merredin—

I am at something of a loss to understand the restrictions placed on games such as bingo... why is it licensed clubs cannot designate a particular area of their premises as an unlicensed area for a prescribed period of time so that they could conduct bingo.

I quote the member for Albany who said—

I support the call for the use of licensed club premises for the playing of bingo.

I quote the member for Darling Range as follows—

I intend to support any amendment relating to the playing of bingo on licensed club premises.

Mr Bryce: There will be a few pairs that night!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I quote the member for Murray who said—

The time is now appropriate for the legalisation of bingo in licensed clubs... I am happy to say I will support the legalisation of bingo in licensed clubs.

Buoyed up, as I am, by the obvious support for this measure by Government members, I have no doubt that it will succeed, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Chief Secretary).

# ST. CATHERINE'S HALL GREENOUGH BILL

## *Second Reading*

**MR TUBBY** (Greenough) [4.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

St. Catherine's Hall which is of historical significance is situated at Greenough and forms part of the Greenough hamlet, which was the original town of Greenough. The complete town has been taken over by the National Trust and the majority of the buildings restored, with the exception of St. Catherine's Hall which is held freehold in certificate of title volume 64 folio 169 in the name of Messrs. Robert Elliott, Arthur Clinch, Reuben Backshall, David Duncan, and Charles Duncan. These persons were registered as proprietors on 5 January 1895, and with the exception of Robert Elliott, the dates of death are known.

The registered proprietors of the land were the original committee members of the St. Catherine's Hall committee, the function of which it appears was to maintain the hall in a reasonable standard of repair and make it available to the public for general use. The minute books of the committee have been obtained and have been examined to clarify the intent and purpose of the original committee.

The St. Catherine's Hall Committee still exists today and the present members are Kenneth Harrison, Septimus Morrell, Cyril Thomas Ducas, Alec Vince, Charles Duncan, and Thomas Clinch.

The present committee members wish to give the hall to the National Trust, but the trust cannot outlay funds for badly needed repairs to the hall until it has secured title to the land. It should be noted that the present committee members do have possession of the duplicate certificate of title.

It may be possible to transfer the hall to the National Trust if, amongst other things, the date of death of the Reverend Elliott can be determined. An extensive search of the Registrar General's records and those of the Anglican Church have failed to reveal anything. Battye Library records show only that he had a wife and daughter.

This means that contact would need to be made with the executor of the last surviving registered proprietor and, if that person was willing, thereby effect a transfer of the hall to the National Trust. There are many problems associated with this procedure, the most significant of which is that

the date of death of the Reverend Elliott cannot be determined. Another potential problem is that probate may not have been granted on the will of the last surviving registered proprietor—or letters of administration in the case of an intestacy—and, further, the executor—or administrator—may himself be deceased or unable or unwilling to act.

The matter has been discussed between the solicitors for the trust and the Deputy Registrar of Titles and the conclusion has been reached that there is no alternative means within the terms of the Transfer of Land Act to effect a transfer of the land to the National Trust. The only alternative therefore is this special Act of Parliament.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

## APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from 29 October.

**MR CLARKO** (Karrinyup) [4.52 p.m.]: The fundamental virtue of the 1981-82 Budget is the containment of the increase in outlays of expenditure to 11.3 per cent when compared with last year, and that increase is virtually matched by the overall increase in revenue of almost the same amount—11.4 per cent.

Mr Davies: In other words, a stand-still Budget.

Mr CLARKO: When we take cognisance of the exciting development programmes ahead of us in the 1980s, those that are under way or imminent; when we remember we have a population rate of increase higher than the Australian average; and when we discount from increases the inflation rate of approximately 9 per cent; then not surprisingly we have a Budget which is obviously much more muted and restrained than we would have liked—

Mr Davies: Muted! It is silent.

Mr CLARKO:—when we accept that that restraint is the result of the unfair share that the Commonwealth has given to the States for this current financial year.

Mr Bertram: New federalism.

Mr CLARKO: When all of these things are taken into account we find the Budget is a responsible economic document.

I am happy to talk about new federalism, but I will do so later.

I am extremely dissatisfied with the way the Federal Government has conducted its financial relations with Western Australia.

Mr Bryce: We warned you.

Mr CLARKO: The Federal Government has increased our total revenue by only 7 per cent and that is a substantial reduction in real terms.

Mr Bertram: New federalism.

Mr CLARKO: At the same time if one excludes the payments to the States one will see that the Commonwealth Government has increased outlays by approximately 15 per cent and the total revenue has increased by a similar amount. If the Commonwealth Government had increased this State's revenue and its outlays by comparable amounts I could have accepted a significant cut in real terms. However, I cannot accept a 7 per cent increase for Western Australia and a 15 per cent increase for the Federal Government.

What the Federal Treasurer has really said to us this year is that the States can practise small government while the Federal Government will preach small government and practise big government. Clearly that is not new federalism and I will be only too happy to discuss later my views on federalism, whether new or old, and to express my concern as to what has happened to federalism in Australia. We no longer have any form of federalism. We have a quasi-unitarian system of government.

The amount of \$500 million which has been denied to the States is only one-eightieth of the total Federal Budget. The total Federal Budget is \$40 billion, which is 80 times the \$500 million to which I am referring; in other words, it is only 1.25 per cent of that Budget. I defy those people who prepare the Federal Budget to forecast accurately in such large amounts and be within 1 per cent of their estimate, except by the greatest of chance.

What we in Western Australia have been denied by the Federal Government is peanuts in terms of its own finances, but, of course, it is a severe handicap to us. We are poised to take tremendous steps into the 1980s and we are prepared to take the responsibility and burden of development—something which our political opponents are never prepared to do—because we are anticipating the fruits of these exertions and these programmes.

The 1981-82 State Budget is the first Budget to reach the amount of \$2 billion. The Treasurer pointed out that it is only five years since the State reached a Budget of \$1 billion. The Western Australian Budget is only \$2 billion

compared with the \$40 billion Budget of the Federal Government. Obviously our situation is one-twentieth of the Commonwealth's. So when the Federal Treasurer denies the State of Western Australia an amount of, say, \$58 million in tax-sharing grants and denies, say, another \$19 million for hospitals, that is a total of \$77 million, and that excludes the way we are being squeezed in regard to roads and other things of that nature. That approximate figure of \$80 million must be divided by 20 in order to put it into terms comparable with those of the Federal Government. So what is \$80 million? To the Federal Government "in comparable terms" it is only \$4 million.

I repeat, that is only a drop in the bucket. The Federal Government has robbed the poor. The Federal Government could have gained the \$500 million it has taken from the States in three other ways. It could have increased taxes and charges—principally taxes—by \$500 million; it could have reduced the outlays by \$500 million; or it could have provided for a deficit of \$646 million overall instead of the \$146 million which has been provided for. That would mean instead of there being a domestic surplus of \$1 500 million as proposed, there would be a domestic surplus of \$1 000 million.

In considering the three alternatives I would oppose the first one because I believe taxes in Australia are already far too high. I regret the recent decision by the Federal Government to abolish half tax indexation by the end of this financial year because that will have the effect, of course, of putting us back into an inflationary growth trend which is so attractive to Federal Treasurers.

I know there has been considerable concern and alarm at the Commonwealth Government's budgeting for an increase of 18.9 per cent in personal income tax collections. Last year, the Federal Government collected in personal income tax an amount of \$32.5 billion; this year, it seeks to collect \$37.8 billion, an increase of \$5.3 billion. In addition, most experts believe that amount has been understated seriously by the Federal Government and that its actual income tax collections will be significantly higher than the estimate.

In the first Fraser Budget of 1976-77, the Federal Government collected \$19.6 billion in income tax. Members will note that in this year it seeks to collect approximately twice that amount. It is a crying shame that a Federal Liberal Government should collect that amount of income tax revenue.

The choice is the Federal Government's, and it could choose the second option. If the Federal Government genuinely believed in small government, which it is thrusting on us, it could reduce its outlay by \$500 million. So, instead of increasing its outlay from \$36.2 billion to \$40.8 billion—an increase of \$4.6 billion—it could have increased its outlay by \$4.1 billion and saved the \$500 million in that way. The difference between the Federal Government's spending \$40 862 million this financial year and spending, as I have postulated, an amount of \$40 362 million is miniscule; it is only 1 per cent, which, as I have said, cannot be measured in advance.

The third option would have been to increase the overall deficit from \$146 million to \$646 million. If the Government had adopted that course, I doubt whether it would have significantly affected interest rates in Australia, or added any heat to our economy. That is an extremely small amount in terms of the total borrowings, both Government and private, within the community.

I am told that over the next five years, loan moneys will be sought for some \$30 billion worth of private projects which are in the pipeline. So, an amount of \$500 million is minute when compared with an amount of \$30 billion, and would have no significant effect on the economy; other factors in our economy are much more dominant than that relatively small amount of money.

As I have said, the Federal Budget cannot finitely measure that sort of amount. In fact, a projected deficit of \$146 million in a Budget of \$40 billion is too small to forecast. I refer members to the occasion on 4 May in the last financial year when the Premiers went to Canberra. I presume the figures presented to the Premiers would have been based on April or even March projections, but they were found to be \$300 million less than the amount ultimately collected by the Federal Government. Last year, the Federal Government sought to increase its collections by 15 per cent, but, in fact, increased collections by 16 per cent. So, that \$300 million, expanded this year for a much bigger Budget, would get very close to the \$500 million to which I am referring. In fact, that probably is what will happen.

The figures set up by the Federal Government are paper figures which will not be realised, and the sort of situation I am prophesying is highly likely to be achieved. What we have instead is a tremendous conundrum.

If the Federal Government says, "The States shall practise small government and we shall practise small government", I will clap it and give it my full support. However, I am diametrically opposed to big government in Canberra and small government in Western Australia, particularly when the people of Western Australia have paid for that big government through their excessive taxes.

Two major problems face Western Australia today: The smaller problem, but still huge, is that of industrial relations, and the other is that of federalism.

It concerns me, as I am sure it concerns the majority of people in Western Australia, to pick up the daily newspapers and find nearly every day that another strike is in the offing, whether it is by the waterside workers, by the people in the iron ore industry, or by workers in Perth.

I have gone on record in this place as not supporting the ever increasing move towards public transport; I have questioned it here many times. I believe that, instead, we should make available more parking in Perth. One reason—although only a minor one—I feel this way is the situation which occurs every time a bus drivers' stopwork meeting is held during the middle of the day. The bus drivers take people to work and then leave them stranded in the city; young people, old people, invalids, and the ordinary people able to fend for themselves are left to find their own way home. If parking is limited in the city, these people are not given a full choice as to whether they will use public transport or take their cars to work. A person, realising the difficulty of parking his car, may take a punt and travel by bus.

We have seen a couple of examples recently, and regrettably, from a union which, to date, has behaved itself extremely well. At the last two stopwork meetings, its members have decided not to return to work.

This is the sort of situation we must consider when deciding whether to increase the number of taxis which are licensed to operate. A number of taxi drivers have complained to me about the Government's recent decision to increase by 18 the number of taxis. However, people very much need an adequate taxi service when the bus drivers decide to go on strike; in addition, extra parking must be made available in the city to cater for such eventualities.

Such strikes do a great deal of harm to the community. Take the situation in which an elderly pensioner lady finds herself. She has gone to town for the day and is trying to get home at

four o'clock in the afternoon. She sits at the bus stop for some time, not realising the bus drivers are on strike. Because she is elderly, she is not physically mobile enough to secure a taxi; and, being a pensioner, she probably could not afford a taxi, anyway. This is a classic example of strikes which hurt the wrong people.

Mr Skidmore: That is what happens when management will not talk to unions.

Mr CLARKO: We have an arbitration system and an Industrial Commission. Most of these strikes are caused by unions which decide to get what they can from management first, and go to arbitration afterwards.

Mr Skidmore: Management will not talk to them.

Mr CLARKO: If management does not talk to them, they simply go on strike, rather than use the proper processes of the arbitration system. All unions do not follow this practice, of course.

The real thing wrong with strikes is that they hurt the wrong people. When workers on the wharves strike, their action does not hurt the wharfies, or big business; business will simply pass on its increases in transport costs, and the community will pay. Such strikes hurt the people who need the services offered by the workers. They hurt the small manufacturer who is trying to get his product in to be processed, and then exported, as a friend of mine does from time to time. When a strike occurs, his goods sit on the wharfs and he loses his export markets and we in Australia suffer.

We know the situation which has occurred in the iron ore industry. Increasingly the Japanese have moved to other sources, even though the distance their ships must travel may be greater, and even though they may experience difficulties with the size of ports in other places. Australia is receiving a smaller percentage share of the iron ore market. In my opinion, the unions, particularly the maritime unions, are responsible to a tremendous degree.

Mr Brian Burke: The Seamen's Union has not had a strike in years.

Mr CLARKO: I understand that if one flew over Newcastle, one would see a great number of boats tied up outside that port, unable to enter as a result of a strike by maritime unions. I understand from today's newspaper that a strike is planned involving the four union elements associated with shipping; the four groups have resolved to work together so as to apply maximum pressure.

We know that maritime unions have been the home of many Communists, although nowadays it is fashionable to call oneself an ex-Communist. I see Mr Latter received a big write-up the other day in *Convocations* stating he would give lectures on industrial relations, although I will bet his first word was "strike" and his last word was "strike". Many people call themselves ex-Communists today. One of the strategies of a Communist, of course, is to call himself an ex-Communist while remaining a Communist. It is just as likely Mr Latter is still a Communist.

Unions are tearing this country down, yet while they are tearing it down they are hurting the wrong people. If unions took the industrial action which affected the people they wanted to get at and it were a case of an employee confronting his employer and confining the issue, the punishment, and the disabilities which flow from that action to the employer, we might accept it. However, that is not what happens. Strikes are called, quite deliberately, for various reasons. The unions never admit to this situation, of course, although sometimes they apologise for the trouble they are causing to the young, the old, and the sick. However, the fact that they are causing such massive inconvenience never deters them for a moment.

Nowadays, strikes are called merely to get a bit of extra publicity. I would hope there is no industrial commission in the land which ever takes any notice of strikes called for that reason. Why should it? If it did, we would reach a stage where everybody would think they had to go on strike to publicise their cause, and eventually everybody would regard strike action as a normal part of industrial relations. Heaven forbid we ever reach that situation. Australia already has a reputation throughout the world as being unreliable because of strikes.

Mr Bryce: You are helping increase that reputation.

Mr CLARKO: It is all right for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; his masters are part of that process. I do not mind his attacking me because of my beliefs; that is his job.

Mr Bryce: You are helping to spread a lie.

Mr CLARKO: If members talk to Joe Blow in the streets of Perth they would find he is extremely unhappy with the level of strike action which takes place in our community. One would have to be a babe in the wood not to realise that unions indulge in strikes for arrant political purposes. Sometimes, of course, they do not indulge in strikes for arrant political purposes. When we are coming up to an election, certain

unions are told that they must be quiet. Fortunately for our side of politics, some unions do not do as they are told and carry on with their industrial action, regardless.

Mr Grill: It also demonstrates—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grill: —your Government's incompetence—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grill: —in the field of industrial relations—

The SPEAKER: Order! I called "order" three times, but the member for Yilgarn-Dundas continued to interject while I was speaking. I ask him to desist.

Mr Grill: I had only one interjection.

Mr CLARKO: I well recall the member for Dianella making a speech in this House in which he said that only his parents and those of his colleagues were working people and that members on this side were all the sons of millionaires. I will never forget his remarks. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas, I understand, has just picked up another \$800 000-odd from one of his projects. He is looking after his workers with his "Omo-clean" hands.

Mr Grill: Jealousy will get you nowhere.

Mr CLARKO: I do not know whether to laugh or cry, although I note, from last week of Federal politics, crying is one of the methods now used.

I noted with considerable interest the court decision in respect of Noel Latham, the man who comes from the bully town of "bully Broken Hill", where the unions grind everybody into the ground, so much so that they demand each householder must buy a copy of the *Barrier Times*. Shades of 1984, when people in a particular community are forced to buy a newspaper! One can imagine how even-handed that newspaper would be. Mr Latham has just been awarded \$100 000 by the courts as a result of the bullying and intimidation he has suffered, simply because he gave a legitimate instruction to one of his workmates. What resulted was that a boycott was placed on him, and the union used all forms of intimidation. He has had a victory in the sense that \$100 000 has been awarded to him. I suppose that could be described as a victory for justice and may redress slightly the upward rush of the bullying left wing unions. However, it is a blow to Australian mateship and fellowship by these militant bully boys.

No doubt Noel Latham will continue to live a lonely life on the edge of the town where he runs his caravan park. It is a very sad thing. It is typical of what we might expect in a system based

on compulsory unionism. Let us hope that this evil thing which is so rightly rejected by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is abolished not only in Western Australia, but also throughout the whole of Australia, and that ultimately there will be no compulsory unionism in this fair land of ours.

I have said already that these strikes are a bad blemish and blot on the future of both Western Australia and Australia. I particularly regret the recent strike by teachers. Certainly that strike was very ineffective except to the point that it did divide—and as an ex-teacher I hope not permanently—teachers on the staffs of many of our schools.

We now see that varying forms of intimidation and bullying have been practised by the union against some teachers. It was interesting to read the union has decided it would fine people for not going on strike. That decision was qualified in that if a teacher had shut up and had not said anything he would not be punished, but anyone who had spoken up—and certainly a group of teachers should be able to say what they feel is right—would be bullied and intimidated. I regret that this situation should come about. I was proud to be a member of the Teachers' Union and, in fact, I did take a small part in it once.

Mr Pearce: It has improved since you left.

Mr CLARKO: The member for Gosnells can say that if he wishes, but I certainly regret what has happened to the union, and I suspect the honourable member does, too; I do not think he enjoys the idea of teachers leaving the union or teachers being fined for not going on strike.

I think the current atmosphere will pass away although I do not have too much confidence that this will happen after reading the remarks of the president of the union (John Negus) which were reported in the Press on 14 October. He said that the passive acceptance of education decisions is a thing of the past. His remarks were reported at the first meeting of the Trades and Labor Council which his union attended. I think the members of the union will regret aligning themselves with the TLC, because in the past it has been significantly to the left of the general consensus view of teachers and their union. I believe the union's move is a mistake and will have the effect of driving out of the union those teachers who are more moderate in their views. This will perhaps leave the union more and more in the hands of that left wing element which traditionally is disproportionately represented at the union's August conference.

Mr Coyne: They will no longer be professionals.



Mr CLARKO: I would like to think this would not happen and I would like teachers still to be regarded as professionals; but if they totally align themselves with the TLC they will not be regarded as such.

It disturbs me that levies have been collected to help pay for future strikes. This action is building into the union a method of resolving future disputes, large or small, by the strike weapon. The only people who suffer in such strikes are the children themselves. The recent teachers' strike affected no-one but the school children.

I would like to finish my contribution by making a couple of points about "new federalism". Someone once said to J. B. Priestley, I think, that Christianity had been tried and found wanting, to which remark he replied that it had not been tried. It is a long time since federalism has been tried in Australia. Clearly what our founding fathers sought to set up and what people of the various colonies thought they were getting has not come about.

The chariot wheels have gone over our necks and a whole series of them are banking up in circles to continue to drive over us and to continue to drive us into the ground. We went through the ghastly period of the Whitlam Federal Government between 1972 and 1975, when the whole of Australia was in turmoil to such an extent the people threw out that Government by a record majority in voting on a one-vote-one-value system.

Mr Bryce: Is one-vote-one-value democracy?

Mr CLARKO: I am prepared to talk about that. Amazingly we see the front page of *The West Australian* given over today to headlines of the Australian Labor Party with a story of no consequence. In Western Australia, in 1975 and in 1977, at the Federal elections—held on a one-vote-one-value basis—we got nine seats out of 10; we got 90 per cent of seats in both elections. The Labor party got 10 per cent of the seats. It nearly did not get even one seat in 1975 when it only just managed to hold on to the seat of Fremantle. The ALP got 10 per cent of the seats and 40-plus per cent of the votes. This happened again in 1977. Members of the ALP try to tell us that it is a great system; yet we had 90 per cent of the seats and about 55 per cent of the votes. That is a very unusual and extreme example, but that is what can happen with a one-vote-one-value system. I do not think anyone would consider it reasonable or just that a party should get 10 per cent of the seats with 40 per cent of the votes, but this happened in two elections in a row. That is the weakness in a one-vote-one-value system.

Mr Bryce: We will take the punt.

Mr CLARKO: As far as I know, in respect of a lower House, the Labor Party has never said it believes in proportional votes.

Mr Jamieson: Tasmania does not do too bad.

Mr CLARKO: In Tasmania there are multi-constituency seats. The situation there is that if one party has six out of seven seats and the person holding the seventh seat dies, the major party finishes up with seven out of seven seats because it is the party which is most popular in the particular area. It is 5 x 7, so there are 35 seats. Let us say that in one part of Tasmania the Labor Party always gets four seats out of seven. If it should happen that the man holding one of the three seats dies, a by-election is held and the party which controls the area gets the other seat. That is one of the weaknesses of the multi-constituency elections.

Mr Bryce: You do not have a by-election; you continue the count.

Mr CLARKO: Tasmania also has the other dreadful system where anyone who throws in his name and gets even one vote is later considered in such circumstances. That is a dreadful aberration of the multi-constituency system.

A few weeks ago a journalist from *The West Australian* travelled with me on a trip to Cockburn Sound. I went there by the courtesy of the Minister for Transport. The journalist said to me, "We will continue to run the question of one-vote-one-value". I thought, "Good luck to you. There is no merit in that". The Labor Party has not practised it because it is a Federal party. No federation has it. I have said this many times before.

That business on the front page of *The West Australian* is a waste of page 1. The space could have been given over to a story on Bob Hawke playing cricket against a kindergarten side. It is beyond me that he should get such coverage. He is a man who for years and years has been rude and nasty on our television sets. He does not give a damn for the people against whom he argues. When he talks on a subject which is important to him he cries and says that people who argue against him are hitting below the belt. His arguments have hit below the belt whenever he has been able to achieve this.

It seems that now he has cried a few tears we are to think of him differently. The public will remember the statement in *The Western Mail* last Saturday that he has handled only two debates well in the last 12 months and that Mr Hayden is way ahead of him. I would hate to think of him as a Prime Minister. The papers would have him on

page 1 playing cricket. Stories on Lebanon would be further back. I am surprised that I have not seen a photo of him playing cricket for a few months.

Is it so important that a man sheds a few tears? There are many people in politics who shed tears, although not obviously or overtly. The Press makes him out to be the alternative Prime Minister, but let us hope he never gets to that position.

On the matter of new federalism, it is a great pity we have been denied our true share of the taxes from our citizens. This State is being raped by the Federal Government. The Federal Labor Government did this on a greater scale. Nevertheless, new federalism had something to it for it involved a higher degree of co-operation, which was really the essence of new federalism. Instead of the Federal Government brutally and ruthlessly using its powers, it should come to the States and discuss a particular matter with them in a rational way and negotiate an acceptable solution. That happened on some occasions under the Fraser Federal Government, but there has not been enough of it.

In recent times our State Ministers have reached the stage where they even have had to call for the resignation of a Federal Minister. I am sure the Honorary Minister who called for that resignation did it after very careful consideration. He is not noted for outbursts and he is a man who carefully considers and judges matters. I can assume only that his remarks were well-founded. This same sort of thing has happened in the health arena and no doubt in other areas as well. This is to the shame of any Federal Government and it would be so, irrespective of what political party was involved.

A federation is more than an arrangement based on a constitution which sets down in black and white what the powers of the Government will be. The agreement entered into at the beginning of this century was designed to give the Federal Government minimal powers. It was never expected that the Government should grow into the juggernaut it is today, where it is collecting in the order of \$40 billion in taxes from the people of Australia, which money is being doled out in very small amounts to the States.

I am totally disillusioned by the Federal system we have. It is a pity we could not move to a confederal system; it is a pity we did not have such a system at the beginning. People from various parts of Australia might then be able to truly give their particular nuance, skill, application, or ideas about emphasis on

manufacturing, agriculture, or whatever. It is not essential that we all wear grey flannel suits; this is most undesirable.

I note that this is not just an Australian viewpoint, but a viewpoint shared overseas also. The people on the west coast of Canada and its prairie provinces are not always happy with decisions made in Ottawa. A similar situation applies in the United States of America.

It would apply in the Soviet Union if any form of democracy existed there. But that is the master socialist country, the ideal for our political opponents here. The people there get no say at all if they are sent to Siberia as a punishment in that great Federal socialist republic.

New federalism has not been tried and found wanting—it has not been tried. When members on this side of the House find our political colleagues in Canberra cannot give us a fair go it is time for us to take those political steps which ultimately must be ratified by a change in the Constitution so that those people who come from the less populous States get a greater share of the action and so that the economy is not designed and aimed at resolving problems of the Canberra-Melbourne-Sydney nexus. Until that happens we will have to struggle; we will not be able to provide the people of Western Australia with a real opportunity to live in a golden State.

**MR BRYCE** (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.30 p.m.]: Well may the member for Karrinyup condemn the Federal member for Wills for shedding a tear in public. We have just seen the member for Karrinyup shed political tears in this place over the sense of betrayal that he and his colleagues feel in respect of new federalism at the hands of the Fraser Government. We do not expect the member for Karrinyup to shed a tear in public; we are firmly of the view that he lacks the humanity to do so.

Mr Clarko interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The Federal member for Wills has nothing of which to be ashamed in his act of revealing his concern. I congratulate him on his ability to demonstrate that sort of commitment to a cause.

I shall not spend too much of my time rebutting the nonsense put to the House by the member for Karrinyup because I am certain even he does not believe a great deal of the bilge he delivered over the course of the last 25 minutes. I will refer to two specific issues about which the member expressed his concern. The first relates to industrial relations.

I remind members of this House that the member for Karrinyup continues to do this State a great disservice indeed when he uses this forum

to condemn Western Australia. He condemned our reputation as a reliable supplier of raw materials, in particular, iron ore. In fact, Western Australia is nowhere near as unreliable as a supplier of raw materials as certain trouble-making conservative politicians would have the Japanese believe. Through you, Sir, I suggest to members opposite they should pause for a while to realise that every time they trot out the so called tried and true tactics of the 1950s and 1960s to lambaste the workers of this State, they play into the hands of the Japanese companies which buy our iron ore. The Japanese go to Canada to play the Canadians off against the Australians, and they do the same in Brazil. The Japanese come to this country to quote to us statements by our political leaders condemning our own community—our own work force and our own iron ore industry.

It is a disgrace that the Liberal Party of Western Australia has not woken up to the reality of what the Japanese are doing. I can tell members that representatives of the Western Australian iron ore industry are very concerned about the impact that trouble-making conservative politicians have on the reputation of this State in so far as its ability to provide raw materials is concerned. When I refer to representatives, I am referring to the top-level management of the iron ore industry.

Mr Young: Are you saying you are not concerned about the unions in the Pilbara?

Mr BRYCE: Most of these leaders of the industry—

Mr Young: Are you concerned about the unions in the Pilbara?

Mr BRYCE: Will the Minister for Health allow me to answer the question in my way? Most of these leaders of the industry are ready to concede that the responsibility for industrial unrest in the Pilbara about which they are concerned—a concern which I share—rests 50 per cent with management and 50 per cent with the work force. These leaders realise that there is no way forward for this community if the politicians who sit opposite seek to grandstand politically by blaming one side of the equation for the industrial unrest and absolving the other. On many occasions we have seen members of Parliament, like the one who has just resumed his seat, demonstrate by looking over their shoulders back to the tactics of the 1950s and 1960s, that the real instrument of government—the fundamental instrument of government—the Liberal Party employs is the rear vision mirror. They consult the rear vision mirror and do not realise how much

damage they do in the 1980s because the tactics of the 1950s and 1960s simply will not work.

The other issue to which the member for Karrinyup referred is new federalism. The Leader of the Opposition very adequately dealt with the great errors of judgment the mugs who sit opposite made when they dared to trust Malcolm Fraser. Is it not cute that members of the Liberal Party sit in this place and seek to distance themselves from Malcolm Fraser, the arch betrayer of the Australian Liberal Party in regard to new federalism? Members opposite conveniently forget it was their leader, the Premier, who in 1975 and 1976 helped to conceive that unbelievable old-fashioned federalism policy which was floated publicly as new federalism. They conveniently forget it was the baby of Sir Charles Court who did not intend it to develop as it did. The precise point is that the Premier trusted Fraser. Everybody else in his or her political career who has trusted Fraser has finished up in the political dustbin—in a political graveyard somewhere.

Mr Clarko: They don't trust you, either.

Mr BRYCE: In politics possibly I can share the sentiments of the member for Karrinyup.

The principal issue to which I want to devote my time and which this debate affords me the opportunity to do is that of Western Australia's defence, an issue which the Premier has chosen to float in recent times. I take this opportunity of the Budget debate to take the Premier and the Western Australian Liberal Party to task for the sizeable dose of contempt it has dished up to the people of Western Australia on the subject of Western Australia's defence.

Mr O'Connor: Didn't your leader support him?

Mr BRYCE: What is the Minister talking about?

Mr O'Connor: In connection with the statement he made. It doesn't matter, I will come back to it.

Mr BRYCE: I do not deny that this State needs a hell of a lot more defence, and I will spend a few of the minutes available to me to indicate to the Premier and his colleagues how insincere the Liberal Party in this State and the Western Australian Liberal politicians in the Federal sphere have been so far as our basic defence necessities are concerned. The member for Karrinyup referred to the front page of Saturday's edition of *The West Australian*. Well may he have reflected upon the statement attributed to a speech made by the Premier, although in fact it related to a paper delivered by his proxy at a conference several thousand miles away. The statement reflects the gross insincerity

of the Liberal Party and its various members of Parliament in this place and in the Federal Parliament in respect of the subject of defence.

Mr MacKinnon: What is insincere about it?

Mr BRYCE: What is insincere about the statement? The people who read the headline may well be forgiven for imagining that a Federal election is to be held in a few months' time. Usually when we see such headlines we are on the eve of a State or Federal election. That is the only time we hear any talk about defending the 12½ thousand kilometres of Western Australian coastline.

Mr MacKinnon: You still haven't answered the question, as per usual.

Mr BRYCE: At the time of every election since the 1950s we have had a parade of Liberal Federal Government Ministers come to Western Australia and promise to bolster the defence of this State. Each and every time they have made those promises they have had no intention whatsoever of delivering the goods. Most of those promises have been buried before those Federal Ministers have touched down on the tarmac of an eastern coast airport. That is how quickly they have forgotten the promises.

This latest reference to our State's defence reeks with insincerity—it is absolutely idle speculation. The Government is taking the people for granted; it is treating them with monumental contempt. It is absolute armchair talk to make the sort of statements the Premier made by proxy at that conference so far away. We all remember the Premier's gullibility, and his tendency to make statements of that kind. In the same way he has talked about a university in the Pilbara, jumbo steel mills in the Pilbara, and nuclear power stations in the Pilbara or near Perth. Those things are forgotten quickly when it suits the Premier to work out an armchair method of gaining a headline. This Government has never shown real concern for the defence of Western Australia.

Mr MacKinnon: That is not true.

Mr BRYCE: I will demonstrate how and why it is true. The Premier's political career is coming to an end. During his career of 32 years a Federal Liberal Government has been making decisions about Western Australian's defence for 29 years. What this State needs is not the pathetic speculation in which the Premier indulged during the weekend. What we want is the promises that have been made during the last 30 years to be kept. In a minute I will deal with some of those promises.

Mr MacKinnon: Refer to some of the dramatic increases in defence spending followed by the

Whitlam Government during which time the Tonkin Government was in power in Western Australia!

Mr BRYCE: If the Honorary Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce suggests that the Labor Party must accept responsibility for the defence nakedness of this State I suggest we are prepared to accept 3/32 of that responsibility which would leave the lion's share without question resting squarely at the foot of the Honorary Minister and his colleagues.

We need to follow the treasured words of the famous Senator Chipp. In regard to defence Western Australia needs "somebody who will keep the bastards in Canberra honest". We need some Government to do that. On the eve of elections we have heard countless and repeated promises made to the people of Western Australia that the promises will be kept. Such promises are reflected in the headline to which I have just referred.

We have heard the promise that a Federal Liberal Government will establish a comprehensive naval base at Cockburn Sound, and we have been promised by those same people that the potential of such a Cockburn Sound base would be fully utilised. We have been promised that a patrol boat system for the north-west will be established. We have been promised that there will be an effective air force system established for the west coast. These promises have been made in one form or another over a period of more than 20 years. However, as I have said, before the Federal Ministers who have made those promises have arrived back in Sydney or Melbourne, they have conveniently closed their latest books on political promises to the people of Western Australia. This situation demonstrates that the State Government does not have a sincere or genuine commitment to the defence of Western Australia.

I ask the Deputy Premier, if he does not believe the point I am making is correct, to indicate by way of answer one example of the Western Australian Government berating the Fraser Government, either publicly or by private representations, for failing to fulfil its 1977 and 1980 election promises.

Mr O'Connor: We make frequent representations to them, and as you would well know the Premier has been most forthright in this way. We have already made representations to the Federal Government in regard to defence.

Mr BRYCE: If that is so, the representations have been kept quiet.

Mr Rushton: Last week we did on transport.

Mr BRYCE: Nobody in Western Australia can remember a time when the State Government has taken the Federal Government to task on the subject of defence. If it did occur on the last occasion of a dispute it was only as a result of an armchair conception of something the Premier needed to float at a far-away conference.

What are the consequences? Western Australia has developed as the jewel in the crown of Australia's resource development industry, yet we are defenceless. We stand naked and defenceless to the rest of the world yet repeatedly we hear promises from Federal Ministers on the eve of Federal and State elections. We have 12 500 kilometres of the most vulnerable and defenceless coastline in the world.

#### *Leave to Continue Speech*

Mr BRYCE: I move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at a later stage of the sitting.

Motion put and passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Questions were taken at this stage.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

#### **BILLS (9): ASSENT**

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

1. Misuse of Drugs Bill.
2. Architects Amendment Bill.
3. Abattoirs Amendment Bill.
4. Acts Amendment (Mining) Bill.
5. Transport Amendment Bill (No. 3).
6. Road Traffic Amendment Bill (No. 2).
7. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Amendment Bill (No. 2).
8. Fisheries Amendment Bill.
9. Bills of Sale Amendment Bill.

#### **APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL**

##### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR BRYCE (Ascol Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.33 p.m.]: Prior to the tea adjournment, I was expressing my concern about the disturbing lack of defence in Western

Australia and, more particularly, the treatment which Western Australians have received at the hands of successive Liberal Party Administrations at the national and State levels. The political arithmetic shows that for 29 of the last 32 years the decisions concerning Western Australia's defence have been made by Liberal Ministers for Defence. During 19 of the last 22 years, the Premier of this State has been effectively at the helm of the affairs of State in Western Australia.

Western Australia has 12 500 kilometres of the most vulnerable, unprotected, and undefended coastline anywhere in the world. In 1981 we can boast one patrol boat as the effective means of surveillance and defence along 12 500 kilometres of coastline. We are in the rather pathetic state that Western Australia could not repel a well-organised invasion by Vietnamese boat people and Taiwanese fishermen, such would be the task facing one patrol boat.

The Menzies, Gortons, McMahons, and Frasers all took Western Australia for granted—

Mr Sibson: And the Whitlams.

Mr BRYCE: Not at all. One could scarcely claim that the Whitlam Government was in office long enough to reorganise and alter the defence priorities of this country.

Mr Young: You never take the blame for anything.

Mr BRYCE: Could members imagine anybody suggesting seriously that the blame for the appalling state of affairs in Western Australia's defence system could be laid at the feet of the Whitlam Government that was in office for three years of the last 32?

Mr Young: Did he do anything about it except to say, "Who do you want to defend yourselves against?"

Mr BRYCE: Can the Minister for Health remember Mr Whitlam, as Prime Minister, making any of the extravagant promises that successive Liberal Ministers for Defence and Prime Ministers have made? In fact, Mr Whitlam ended the war in Vietnam. He brought the troops home, and probably he trebled the defence capacity of this nation overnight, with one decision early in his Administration.

Mr Young: That is brilliant! We will read it in *Hansard* one day as one of the most brilliant statements on defence.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Whitlam also improved the morale of the defence forces by improving significantly the level of salaries and pensions schemes available—financial incentives to the people who were leaving the armed forces in

droves by the time he came to office. On its own, that was a substantial contribution.

Mr Sodeman: He bought himself a submarine, and talked about the nation's economy.

Mr BRYCE: I am sure I echo the sentiments of the people of Western Australia when I say, "Give us the submarines. Give us the ships. Give us the aircraft that we have been promised for 25 years by conservative politicians who have used and abused the political scene in Western Australia in their endeavours to win a few seats in the House of Representatives".

Mr Young: When did you blokes become so Churchillian on defence? This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr BRYCE: It hurts members sitting opposite to be reminded that over a period of 25 years one Minister for Defence after another, and one Tory Prime Minister after another, came to this side of the continent and promised various defence measures. They promised to establish a comprehensive naval base at Cockburn Sound; they promised the people of Western Australia a full utilisation of the naval facilities at that base; they promised a patrol boat system to be established in the north-west; and they promised an effective Air Force system of defence for Western Australia. They promised those things in slightly different forms over 10 elections.

As I said before the tea suspension, before those cynical, untrustworthy politicians reached the other side of the nation, and before their planes touched down on the tarmac, they buried those promises in the far reaches at the backs of their minds. They had no intention of appropriating the money to make good those promises.

As a consequence, what do we have in Western Australia now? We have a regional economy which has become the jewel in the crown of Australia's resource industry. We are about to have brought into this Parliament a Bill that will ratify an agreement between the State of Western Australia and the Ashton Joint Venture to establish a fabulously important and very exciting diamond industry in this State—one which, in terms of its potential, will equal the total capacity of the world's diamond industry. At present, we are witnessing the development of the gas project on the North-West Shelf. It is inevitable that oil will be discovered and exploited in Western Australia. Additional deposits of coal, bauxite and iron ore are being discovered.

There is practically no end to the list of mineral resource projects that are possible in this State.

Yet this State happens to be the most defenceless piece of real estate one could find anywhere in the world. That is because the decisions about the defence of this State are made by people who live on the other side of the continent. They do not care a bumper about the welfare of Western Australia.

As I have said, Western Australia needs the submarines and the destroyers it has been promised. We are entitled to the aircraft that have been promised to us on so many occasions over the last decade. In particular, we ask for the patrol boats in the north-west.

How cynical and hypocritical it is for the Premier to send to the northern development conference his proxy to read a paper on his behalf advocating the spending of money on a special defence task force for the north-west when he has been in office for nearly 30 years, and he has done practically nothing, in a public sense, to condemn the tardiness of the Federal Government in putting its money where its mouth is.

Mr Blaikie: Absolute claptrap! You do not know what you are talking about. What about Cockburn Sound?

Mr BRYCE: What about Cockburn Sound! There is nothing there. Has the member for Vasse ever been to Cockburn Sound?

Mr Blaikie: What do you know about it?

Mr BRYCE: Has he been there? What has he done about it?

Mr Blaikie: What have you done about it?

Mr BRYCE: I am insisting right now that the Government that holds the reins of power in this State should be demanding of our national Government that at least three submarines be home ported in Cockburn Sound, and at least four destroyer-escort vessels be based in Cockburn Sound.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The last time the great promise was made about Cockburn Sound was on the eve of the 1977 Federal election. Then we were promised by a Federal Government—and that promise was reiterated by a State Premier—that Western Australia would receive a comprehensive naval base at Cockburn Sound, and home ported at that base would be submarines and destroyer-escort types of vessels. Of course, four years later not one cent has been appropriated by the national Government to make good that promise.

That was another case of a promise forgotten by the time Killen returned to the Eastern States. That promise was like the promises made during the 1950s and the 1960s.

Mr Blaikie: You would not want to talk about that if you had seen what your colleagues did in Canberra. When they were in Government, they completely emasculated the defence force of Australia.

Mr BRYCE: I have answered that inane interjection which was echoed by other members of the Government back bench and I do not intend to waste any more time on such a pathetic suggestion. I feel sorry for the member for Vasse if he took so long to come back from the dining room that he missed the answer to that particular interjection which was well and truly given to that side of the House.

What we insist should happen in Western Australia is that these promises which have been made on so many countless occasions be made good before we hear talk from the Premier about another defence force in the north. We do not deny the very great economic significance and need for a fundamental defence system which will cover not just the north-west, but also the whole of the 12 500 miles of coastline of this State.

Submarines should be based in Cockburn Sound.

Mr Young: What sort of submarines?

Mr BRYCE: Might I suggest, for a start, the first-class Oberon submarines which have proved to be among the most effective purchases the navy has ever made.

Mr Young: What about nuclear submarines?

Mr BRYCE: I ask members: Is not the Minister for Health the most original and cute interjector when it comes to the question of defence? Would not he dearly like to subvert a genuine discussion about defence in this State? Would not he dearly like us to start talking about the Americans' nuclear-powered submarines? Would not he like us to talk about the endeavours of himself and his colleagues to parade American vessels here and pretend we have a defence system?

I do not intend to allow the Minister for Health to sidetrack me from my purpose tonight which will sheet home to him and his colleagues the responsibility for the pathetic state of defence in Western Australia.

Mr Young: Do you believe we ought to have nuclear-powered submarines based in Cockburn Sound?

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: Listen to the jackals. Mr Speaker! Let me give them the answer in the simplest terms.

Mr Young: Yes, let us have it.

Mr BRYCE: Under no circumstances would I or the members of my party approve of the idea—obviously the Minister for Health does—of basing submarines with nuclear weapons—

Mr Young: I said, "nuclear-powered submarines".

Mr BRYCE: Now the Minister is bringing in qualifications—

Mr Young: I did not refer to nuclear weapons. I asked about nuclear-powered submarines.

Mr BRYCE: Members should watch the Minister for Health squirm. Now it is the Minister who is seeking to qualify himself.

Mr Young: I asked whether you would have nuclear-powered submarines in Cockburn Sound.

Mr BRYCE: There are no nuclear-powered submarines in the Australian Navy.

Mr Young: I did not ask that.

Mr BRYCE: I am talking about the Australian Navy, am I not, Sir?

Mr Old: The Americans can home port here.

Mr BRYCE: I am aware US nuclear-powered submarines are visiting but not home porting here every day of the week. I am talking about the Australian Navy and, for the information of the Minister for Health who should stick to the Tronada machine and other complicated matters of that nature, there are no nuclear-powered submarines in the Australian Navy.

Mr Young: I know that.

Mr BRYCE: I for one would be prepared to accept the advice of the experts and the Australian defence advisers that, at this stage, it does not appear nuclear-powered submarines are necessary or desirable, nor is it suggested they are.

Mr Young: Every country needs allies.

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister for Health would indicate to me now he will move to extend my time when I have five minutes to go, I will accommodate him and follow him up and down every blind alley he cares to define; but he is obviously not prepared to do that.

Mr Young: No way!

Mr BRYCE: Therefore, I shall have to treat him with a certain amount of contempt.

Mr Young: And fill in the next 14 minutes with rubbish.

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister for Health is prepared to state unequivocally that he would be content to see submarines and other vessels with nuclear weapons on board and with nuclear strike capacity based in Cockburn Sound—

Mr Young: I referred to nuclear-powered submarines.

Mr BRYCE:—vessels which would involve the storage of nuclear weapons—let him say so now.

Mr Young: I asked whether you agreed with nuclear-powered submarines being based in Cockburn Sound.

Mr BRYCE: So the Minister is not in favour of submarines, nor any other form of naval vessel, with nuclear weapons being based in Cockburn Sound. As I understand it, nuclear-powered submarines from other nations are using Cockburn Sound. I do not think it is a particularly good idea to have nuclear-powered submarines in the Australian Navy.

Mr Sibson: Why not?

Mr BRYCE: The member for Bunbury should go back and sell used cars. He knows nothing about defence.

The last set of promises which were made in 1980 contained a promise that Western Australia should and would have a patrol boat base in the north-west. I am entitled to take this opportunity to express my concern that the same will happen with the Fraser Government's promise for a patrol boat base in the north-west as has happened to repeated and frequent promises from the Federal Liberal Government for a comprehensive and expanded naval facility in Cockburn Sound, because I ask you Sir: What has happened? In the last two years survey work has proceeded at a snail's pace and virtually nothing has happened so far as a major decision to commit funds to the patrol boat base in the north-west is concerned.

Western Australia has one patrol boat. That is effectively the beginning and end of our defence system. The nearest patrol boat is one based in Darwin. The supreme irony of this situation is that one of the Government's closest friends, a very wealthy and successful fisherman in Western Australia (Mr Kailis) expressed his concern some 18 months ago about this question. He offered part of his fishing fleet to the Federal Government on a lease basis to provide a patrol system along the coast of WA. So concerned was he—a public friend of the Government—he was prepared to rent or lease some of his special fishing craft to the Federal Government as a basis for an effective patrol system. We simply do not have it.

What concerns us is that, in 1980, the promise was made by the Federal Government to provide a patrol boat base in the north-west and we see in the Budget for the 1981-82 financial year brought down already in the Federal Parliament that there

was no reference to such a patrol boat base in the north-west of Western Australia. Two years after that promise was made, nothing has been done, and, as far as the Liberal Party's track record is concerned, we can expect that promise to be buried, as were promises about an Air Force base in Western Australia and a comprehensive naval facility at Cockburn Sound.

The other aspect in relation to our defence needs upon which I should like to touch briefly concerns the importance in the future of the new FA18 aircraft which will be introduced by the Australian Air Force to replace the Mirage jets by the mid-1980s. I could ask the Government what representations have been made to the Fraser Government to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided at Learmonth or Derby to allow those FA18 aircraft to operate out of our own north-west. I suspect the answer is, "No representations have been made as yet".

Those aircraft—I understand there will be 75 of them—will be based in Darwin. Here is the supreme irony of the situation: The FA18 aircraft has an operational radius of 740 kilometres. The FA18 is an aircraft built in the USA and designed for European conditions and needs. It is an aircraft which would drop out of the sky short of its destination in the Pilbara.

Mr Trethowan: They have over 3 000 kilometres of transport radius.

Mr BRYCE: I am not talking about their transport radius; I am talking about their attack and defence capacity. The FA18 is a multi-purpose aircraft and, for the benefit of the member for East Melville, I shall set out the detail of the situation. The FA18 is a multi-purpose aircraft and it can effectively be a fighter-interceptor or a ground attack aircraft, or it can be used for maritime surveillance or strike. The irony of it is that it has an operational radius of only 740 kilometres.

The reason I emphasise that point is to bring home to the Western Australian decision makers that there ought to be base facilities or infrastructure at Learmonth in order that these aircraft might operate from Western Australia. That infrastructure should include ammunition dumps, special radar systems, and special air defence missile systems. These facilities have not been provided at Learmonth and, as we understand the position at the present time, there is no provision for them to be installed there.

Therefore, we have airstrips at Derby and Learmonth and a training ground at Pearce with a handful of Macchi training jets which, all



together, amount to no air defence in Western Australia.

However, on countless occasions on the eve of Federal elections—to a lesser extent this has occurred on the eve of State elections—in the last decade or so we have heard repeated promises that a comprehensive, effective, and meaningful defence system will be provided for Western Australia. I suggest to the Chamber that, if this Government has any influence on the Fraser Government, now is the time for the public representations to be made to ensure that the infrastructure is provided at Learmonth and Derby to enable the FA18 aircraft, which will replace the Mirage aircraft, to operate from Western Australia as well as from Darwin and presumably from other places along the east coast.

Mr O'Connor: Do you support national service?

Mr BRYCE: I do not know what I think about national service. I have not thought about it for a long time. I certainly do not believe in compulsory national service nor do I believe in the lottery system the Deputy Premier and his colleagues designed and used to dragoon people into the Vietnam War.

Mr O'Connor: Did you support the moratorium on the arms race?

Mr BRYCE: Whose arms race?

Mr O'Connor: The ALP supported it strongly a few years back.

Mr BRYCE: I want to issue an invitation to the Deputy Premier to the effect that if he and his colleague, the Premier, do in fact exercise political muscle and influence inside the Liberal Party, they assume a sense of responsibility as a State Government and keep their Federal Liberal Party colleagues honest so far as the promises that have been made for Western Australia's defence are concerned.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [7.59 p.m.]: It is evident from the delight on the faces of members opposite—especially the faces of the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy—that they enjoy reading about or hearing the Premier and others on this side of the House criticising the Federal Government and the Prime Minister.

In past years strong criticism was levelled at the Whitlam Government, and I think it is justifiable criticism now that is being levelled at the Federal Government and it reflects credit on the Premier and those who are prepared to criticise a Government of their own colour when they believe it is not acting in the State's best interests. It is justifiable on the part of the

Opposition to take a keen delight in hearing criticisms being offered by the Government to the Government in power at Federal level.

When one reads the Budget speech delivered by the Premier one sees strong criticism of the Federal Government. The Premier expressed disillusionment and disappointment in the action being proposed at the Premiers' Conference. The Premier made the point that the Budget was a very difficult one to produce and went on to explain his reasons for there being so many constraints on expenditure and the growing demand for essential services which, of course, required extra expenditure which could only come from taxpayers' money. Lack of understanding was mentioned in the Budget speech by the Commonwealth Government of States' responsibilities in these matters.

It has been well shown that the accusations made by the Premier, not only in the Budget, but also in Press statements, indicating his disappointments, justified a continuing attack on a Government which does appear to be attempting to centralise its policies at the Federal level in Canberra, something we all objected to when the previous Labor Government was in power. We accused that Government of trying to centralise the power in Canberra. We now have a situation where it appears the present Federal Government is leaning that way and one wonders why this action is being demonstrated and the reasons for it.

The Federal Government is advised by the best economists at its disposal, as are all Governments, in an attempt to manage the country's economy to the best of its ability and endeavours to keep inflationary rates down to an acceptable level and it may be that the Federal Government, being advised by these economists, is offering a system whereby it will afford some control on the inflationary rate. What other reason would there be? The Federal Government has kept inflation rates lower than previous levels and Australia compares very favourably with other western countries throughout the world. Inflation is a much talked about problem and the word "inflation" is bandied around. One wonders what is the definition of "inflation", how it is applied, and what the Federal Government is trying to do in regard to its control.

I have done some research and reading on this subject and have spent a great deal of time reading Milton Freidman's book *Free to Choose* wherein he offers the policy that communities and societies should be free to operate without Government constraints and choose to market and merchandise their products however they please

and let the market forces dictate the price structures and markets throughout the world. He qualifies that policy by saying that in some areas it does not always work to the satisfaction of Governments and the people concerned and he gives five simple truths which embody most of our knowledge on inflation and these are quite revealing. Firstly, he says that inflation is a monetary phenomenon arising from a more rapid increase in the quantity of money than in output and, of course, the reasons for the increase in money may be various. Secondly, he says that in today's world Governments determine or can determine the quantity of money; thirdly, that there is only one cure for inflation—a slower rate of increase in the quantity of money; fourthly, that it takes time, measured in years, not months, for inflation to develop—it takes time for inflation to be cured; and, fifthly that unpleasant side effects of the cure are unavoidable.

After reflecting on those five points, one perhaps could say that the Federal Government is working along those lines. No doubt the Government's advisers would be well versed in this simple principle. Mr Friedman's book tells how in America and Japan these measures have been applied and proved to be effective over a period of years. I wonder whether the Federal Government is not applying that sort of philosophy in an endeavour to try to control the rate of inflation. We do not like constraints that are applied from Commonwealth or State levels, but we know the State Government was forced into applying constraints and expenditure cuts in departments, and before the Budget was recently released all departments were examined to see whether cuts could be made. None of us like to see this sort of thing happening, but it has been forced on the State Government because of the Federal Government's philosophist policy of trying to curb inflationary trends. Even with our present difficulties, there has been a continual demand for higher wages and salaries and there should be some restraints on these measures.

We know the impact of the arbitration court and Conciliation and Arbitration Commission decisions. I am amazed at times when a decision is handed down such as the recent one under which 300 000 workers were granted a \$6 a week increase, which will have the impact of something like \$90 million on the economy and will debit the State for the responsibility of something like an extra \$11 million. If this sort of thing is allowed to continue, one wonders what the situation will be in a few years' time. If everyone were prepared to mark time and not continue to demand extra salaries and wages, and if they were to be held at

the prevailing level, perhaps the economy could settle down; but the unions are not content to do that sort of thing and continue to take strike action.

Mr Tonkin: What about members of Parliament?

Mr McPHARLIN: I am including members of Parliament in the context of not seeking any salary increases. I am appalled at the record of action taken by trade unions throughout Western Australia and how this action has disrupted industry—the member for Karrinyup made mention of it—and how the general public of Western Australia are sick and tired of industrial unrest and disruption—

Mr Bryce: So they will stay.

Mr McPHARLIN: —and are fed up to the back teeth with this sort of action.

Mr Bryce: Whose responsibility is it to find a solution?

Mr McPHARLIN: There is responsibility on both sides.

Mr Bryce: I am pleased to hear you say that.

Mr McPHARLIN: When one sees disruption of industry and strike action, a blame is attachable to the trade union movement.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: You are not saying we support that, are you?

Mr Blaikie: Invariably.

Mr McPHARLIN: There are two sides to every argument, but when one sees some of the decisions handed down by the industrial courts and by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission which the unions accept if it suits them, and will not accept them if it does not one realises that that represents a breaking of the law and it should not be tolerated.

Mr Bryce: You are in Government; do something about it. Fraser has done the same thing. Fraser did exactly the same thing with the Federal civil servants. They didn't like the decision the court brought down.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Bureau of Statistics—

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McPHARLIN:—gave me the figures for man days lost through strike action for the 12 months ended December 1980 for Australia. In Western Australia for that 12-month period there were 191 000 man days lost. What a shocking indictment that is!

Mr Bryce: Do you know there were more than two million man days lost in the same period because of unemployment?

A Government member: That is irrelevant.

Mr Bryce: Your side is in Government. Do something about it.

Mr McPHARLIN: The total Australian figures given to me for the same period were 3.32 million man days lost. How can a country survive and develop when that sort of thing goes on?

Mr Bryce: It can't.

Mr McPHARLIN: In the 12 months ended September 1980 in Western Australia wages lost were \$8 million and for the whole of Australia the loss was \$139 million.

Mr Tonkin: You are in power—act!

Mr McPHARLIN: In relation to man days lost, for the first quarter of 1981 Western Australia lost 36 400 and for the whole of Australia, 655 000.

Mr Brian Burke: Tell us about it.

Mr McPHARLIN: What a shocking indictment! Surely to God common sense must be applied by the trade union movement. I guarantee that a great percentage of unionists do not want to go on strike.

Mr Bryce: Of course they don't.

Mr McPHARLIN: If we had a secret ballot system applying effectively, we would not have half as many strikes.

A Government member: Well said.

Mr McPHARLIN: The report indicated that the amount of export income lost per week by the Telecom dispute which took place some time ago was \$200 million. This was because in many cases ships were unable to complete their documentation and were leaving without the goods. What a shocking indictment.

Mr Tonkin: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr McPHARLIN: When those people who have dedicated their lives to the development of the country, hear and see this sort of thing going on, they become sick and tired of it and, hopefully, ask for some solution.

Mr Tonkin: Hopefully.

Mr McPHARLIN: One does not want to see the direct militant action that has been advocated by some people. Surely there is a better way around it. There does not appear to be a solution at the present time.

Mr Bertram: That is a defeatist attitude.

Mr McPHARLIN: If members on that side told their union fellows to adopt a more common-sense approach, there would be fewer strikes.

Mr Bryce: So you are blaming them now!

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Karrinyup made comment about how he regretted the recent strike action of the Teachers' Union. Everybody regretted it.

Mr Bertram: What about when the Government put the whole State out on strike?

Mr McPHARLIN: The union's use of children as an excuse is despicable.

Mr Bryce: You fomented it all. You set fire to it.

Mr McPHARLIN: At a recent Teachers Union Conference a recommendation to "work towards affiliation" with the ILC was amended "to seek affiliation" with the TLC.

Mr Bertram: They were forced into that.

Mr Bryce: You lit the bushfires.

Mr Bertram: Your Minister did more with the TLC than anyone else.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Clarko: "We would make inquiries of the TLC whether we could join", or words to that effect.

Mr McPHARLIN: That was rubbed out and put aside, and the motion was that the Teacher's Union would seek affiliation with the TLC. It shows that teachers certainly are left wing and they have a socialistic attitude.

Mr Bryce: Why don't you admit you light the bushfires and sit back and watch them burn?

Mr McPHARLIN: Fears are being expressed that they are trying to get more militant and the reason they wanted to join the TLC was to give them more muscle. That is a threat to the whole system.

Mr Tonkin: It is only because of your Government's talk of education this has happened.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Minister for Education has reported to this House that the Teachers' Union in Victoria acted so militantly that special legislation has been introduced to control their actions. Let us hope that sort of thing does not happen here. The way things are going it appears it will. I will never concede that teachers have the right to strike. They do have the right to protest and avenues are available for them to take such action.

Mr Bryce: Have farmers the right to strike?

Mr McPHARLIN: Teachers are giving children a lead in the future and it is frightening that they should take strike action.

Mr Tonkin: Farmers withhold produce when prices are down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! Members will cease interjecting. We have seen examples this evening where a member on his feet has indicated he is not prepared to answer interjections. When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was speaking he indicated that he was prepared to answer interjections. I call on the member for Mt. Marshall and ask members to give due deference to him while he is speaking. The member for Mt. Marshall.

Mr McPHARLIN: It is very regrettable that action was taken. We all were quite concerned about it and we were hoping it would be settled amicably and that the Teachers' Union, being a responsible union, would act responsibly knowing the Government was applying expenditure cuts in all departments, and not specifying any one particular department. We hoped it would act responsibly and say, "Yes, we believe we can help and can go on with our education programmes", when an expenditure cut of 3 per cent was advocated, but look how it performed. I think it was rather a poor effort on the union's part, and one would have thought that there would have been more balance and common sense applied throughout the whole union.

I was very interested to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition comment about defence matters and the lack of defence in Western Australia. Recently I had the opportunity to undertake some research on this matter and I would like to make some comment about it. I refer to the Defence Report 1980 which was submitted to the Minister for Defence (the Hon. D. J. Killen), in August 1980. It outlines the measures which are being investigated concerning the defence of Australia. Not only does it mention the ports of Australia but also it refers to the South Pacific region, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, the Alliance, South-East Asia, Papua New Guinea and Indonesia. All these countries are involved in discussions on the matter of strategic planning for the defence of South-East Asia and the South Pacific area and, of course, Australia and Western Australia.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made reference to the Indian Ocean, the extent of our coastline, and the lack of defence. The Prime Minister in his statement to Australia on 19 February 1980 announced that the Defence Department was having discussions with United

States authorities concerning the way in which Australia could assist the United States forces operating in the Indian Ocean. We know this assistance is taking place and we know also that there has been the greatest co-operation between the Australian and the American Governments. The exercises in the Indian Ocean are part of the overall planning to build up a defence force which is capable of protecting us in the event of attack, and we know these things cannot be done overnight. It takes time and it takes money. All of those regions of which I have spoken have been involved. Members would know that we have a base in Butterworth, Malaysia.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that very little expenditure was allocated to defence—or words to that effect. The report shows the Government has taken decisions and its expenditure on defence will involve some \$17 600 million—at August 1979 prices—over the next five years; it involves an average increase of 7 per cent a year. In 1984-85 the Government will have a total defence expenditure of about 3 per cent of the gross domestic product. It is indicated the percentage of expenditure on major items will rise from 16 in 1979-80 to 75 in 1984-85. There is a great deal of planning being carried out in regard to the defence of Australia and for defence in the Indian Ocean.

I refer to a report of a seminar which was held in Perth in April last year. A total of 12 papers were delivered to that seminar and they outlined what is required for the defence of Australia and for the defence of Western Australia. A great deal of research and planning is being undertaken in relation to the weapons and equipment required for the defence of Western Australia.

When we talk about having adequate defence and submarines at Garden Island surely we should be guided by what other countries and the major powers in the world are doing. We have to look at the best equipment that can be procured. Nuclear powered submarines have proved to be the most efficient submarines that have been built.

Mr Bryce: Why hasn't Fraser bought some?

Mr McPHARLIN: There has been strategic planning for all types of equipment and this is indicated in the report.

Mr Tonkin: Except nuclear submarines!

Mr McPHARLIN: It is a slow progress and we cannot get them overnight. The report refers to submarine launched torpedoes, submarine fire control systems, electronic support measurers for frigates, guided missiles, sonar systems, the lot.

Mr Tonkin: But no nuclear submarines.

Mr McPHARLIN: No, they are not mentioned as such; but does the member expect the Government to spell out in detail every move it is making in relation to defence? When the Government is planning defence for its country it does not broadcast its plans to the world.

Mr Bryce: It has announced to the world that it will buy 75 FA18 planes in the mid 1980s.

Mr McPHARLIN: What is wrong with that?

Mr Bryce: That is the point I am making, they are announcing it to the whole world.

Mr McPHARLIN: The world already knows that those aircraft are on order. There are many other systems which are secret and which I do not think should be revealed. If I remember correctly the Labor Party in Canberra was opposed to the North-West Cape.

Sir Charles Court: They even had a demonstration about it. A long march.

Mr McPHARLIN: Yes, they had a demonstration here. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is complaining and criticising the Government for not having adequate defence, yet his own party in Canberra was opposed to the defence programme at North-West Cape.

Mr Tonkin: We are talking about the Royal Australian Navy.

Mr Bryce: We are talking about the Australian Navy or do you think in terms of being a vassal to other parts of the world?

Mr McPHARLIN: I have here a map of Australia which shows the major communication system which includes Darwin, North-West Cape and Perth as part of the major system. If we do not encourage the Americans to provide us with the best equipment they have we would have a naked coast line and it would be bare and open as members of the Opposition are saying it is.

Mr Bryce: It is.

Mr McPHARLIN: Does not the member want the Americans to establish North-West Cape? We have to rely on them and encourage them in every direction.

Mr Stephens: We wanted them in 1941.

Sir Charles Court: My word we did!

Mr Tonkin: What a great job the Labor Government did then.

Mr Bryce: Didn't Menzies yelp!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order!

Mr McPHARLIN: Other matters of concern relate to the economy of the country, its dependence on overseas income, and the need for the export income products to be given some sort

of protection by Governments. I consider Governments should work side by side with industry. There is criticism, from time to time, about systems which are organised to give some stability to an industry.

Governments have recognised the need for this over the years and they have accepted the responsibility in many cases, but there are some people and members whom I have heard say that had they had their way they would do away with organised systems and let free market forces dictate the price structure of the commodities concerned.

I would recommend to members who are interested that they read the book *Merchants of Grain*. I read this book recently and if members want an illustration of how the grain industry developed I would suggest they read it. The grain industry throughout the world is one of the most important sources of food and trade and gives tremendous power to the countries which are the major exporters. It gives an example of how, when free market forces were operating, markets were manipulated and producers were cheated—there is no other word for it—so much so that even America and that bastion of free enterprise, Canada, introduced legislation which offered protection to the industry.

On page 100 it states—

... even then, a century ago, agricultural trade had become a matter that was far too important to be left to the grain traders.

Even a century ago, the Government realised the importance of endeavouring to keep these manipulators honest. However, it found it to be a difficult task. In fact, a great deal of the crash of 1929, in the days of the depression, was attributable to the manipulation of the world grain market. The paper continues—

The United States came out of the 1930s conditioned to farm price supports, wheat export subsidies, and farm programs that regulated the amount of acreage planted to certain crops.

That remains the situation in America today and illustrates the clear need for Governments to work side by side with industry—I do not advocate takeovers—to ensure the stability of the industry which, in turn, reflects favourably on the economy of a country and provides a fair return to the producer, who is the first to suffer if an adequate return is not available to him.

This point was mentioned in a speech by the Minister for Primary Industry at a recent conference held by the Australian Wheat Growers Federation when he said—

There is concern about the security of food supplies, and grains are a mainstay of food security.

We must work towards that end to ensure the security of the industry, and to defeat people like Mr Ubergang, who recently tried to upset a decision of the Australian Wheat Board, and challenged it in the High Court, which subsequently upheld the decision of the board. I understand he is still stirring.

Mr Brian Burke: What is his background?

Mr McPHARLIN: He is a large farmer from New South Wales.

Mr Brian Burke: What do you think of the Tuckey plan?

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not know the details of his proposal so I cannot comment on it. I believe he is kite flying a little and, in fact, is raising support in certain quarters; some people believe his suggestion is the right thing to do. I understand he is talking about taking over the grain terminal at Kwinana. I hope that sort of thing does not come about because it will cause a great deal of bad feeling and even bloodshed.

I wish to refer now to a couple of matters which are very close to my heart and which also affect my electorate. I refer first to the proposed Agaton water supply. In 1979 the State Government made a submission to the Federal Government requesting it to give consideration to financing the project on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Subsequently, a Commonwealth-State committee was appointed to examine the proposal and the committee made its report. Another committee, called a "cost benefit study group", was appointed by the State Treasury to do another study. In between all this, a committee which included some shire councils was formed by the rural water council for the purpose of conducting its own study.

Naturally enough, the people within the boundaries of the proposed project are upset and frustrated at the continual delays. Now it has been announced by the Government that it will hold a seminar so that everybody can have the report of the cost benefit study group explained to them.

Quite a few people have spoken to me in the last week or so complaining that once again—after having had three or four reports—they are to have another report explained to them. They are hoping that when the seminar takes place, a satisfactory solution to their problem will be arrived at. Many of these people have spent thousands of dollars on boring for suitable water and on installing dams. Over the drought years, those dams did not fill, and a

number of the originally successful bore holes now are producing water which is too saline to be used. There is a genuine need for an adequately reticulated water supply, and I hope the Government views the matter sympathetically.

Many of the people within the area concerned are second generation and even third generation farmers who, as I have said, have spent many thousands of dollars in an endeavour—in many cases, unsuccessfully—to obtain adequate water supplies.

The original estimated cost of the project was \$46 million, which subsequently has been updated to about \$55 million. It was proposed during the early stages that the Commonwealth fund the project on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the State over a period of eight years. A figure of \$55 million, between two Governments, spread over eight years is a relatively small amount. The people in the area feel they are being sidetracked unnecessarily. I believe there will be a large attendance at the seminar and I hope the Government comes up with a proposal which will be acceptable to the community and which will get the project moving.

The other matter to which I refer has been raised by me in this House on a number of occasions. Indeed, the Treasurer mentioned the matter in his Budget speech when he referred to proposed expenditure on soil degradation and salinity control. Committees have been appointed to look into these matters. It is of major importance that there be co-operation between all those committees, including the organisation with which I have been associated since its inception; namely, the organisation known as WISALTS.

More and more reports are coming through every day about the success of the system which has been applied in many areas. In fact, I am so convinced the method is successful that at this very moment I am having my property surveyed with the objective of installing a further 16 kilometres of interceptor banks in a salt-affected area. I have seen the results of this method so often that there is no longer any argument as to whether the system works. Indeed, in the *Daily News* of last Thursday there is a full-page story of the system, outlining the results and the successes which have been achieved.

The Government has an opportunity which is denied other Governments in Australia. I know Mr Whittington and several of his top level surveyors have implemented their system in parts of South Australia and Victoria, and the method has proved successful over there and great interest already is being shown in those States. The

Government of Western Australia has an excellent opportunity to take advantage of Mr Whittington's system.

Nobody knocks tree planting. However, we need co-ordination and co-operation in an endeavour to reclaim the thousands upon thousands of hectares which have gone out of production, or which are going out of production due to salt encroachment. If the Government does not take advantage of the expertise which is available it will be missing out badly.

Scientists still argue that salt encroachment is due to rising water tables. However I am informed by certain scientists that that belief is only a hypothesis, which can be defined as a proposition or a principle which is taken for granted in order to draw a conclusion or inference to prove the point in question. It is something which is not proved, but assumed for the purposes of argument.

These arguments will continue. I believe we should agree to disagree, and work together towards achieving a satisfactory solution. Indeed, there appears to be a better understanding now between the scientists than there was a couple of years ago; there seems to be a softening of their attitude. Something like 1 000 member-farmers are using this method and are proving it to be effective, and it is difficult to argue against what is seen to be a fact. The results are there for anybody to see, and it is becoming more and more difficult for those scientists who originally were so much opposed to the system to maintain their opposition.

In fact, I have been informed the new Commissioner of Soil Conservation has inspected certain areas, on one occasion in company with the Treasurer, and came away very impressed. That is a step forward and is something we should applaud. Nobody who has an objective view of these things and who has witnessed the work which has been done and the results which have been achieved could continue to oppose the system. We must accept it is the most beneficial system to fight salt encroachment. I believe we are set for a lengthy period of success in our fight against this problem.

**MR CRANE (Moore)** [8.45 p.m.]: I lend my support to the Budget debate and preface my remarks by saying I was quite relieved that the Budget was not as harsh as I contemplated it might have been. That is not to say I am completely satisfied with it. Members are never completely satisfied: they are always striving—as they should do—to achieve the results the people in their electorates require of them, as long as the

demands are fair and just. Generally speaking, the demands of the people in my electorate are reasonable and just.

I realise, as the Treasurer has said, that the Budget was framed in very difficult and tight monetary circumstances. Many members have canvassed the area of our new federalism. Previously I have expressed my concern that our new federalism is not working. The Treasurer has said this on many occasions also. Nevertheless, that does not mean to say we should not strive to make it work. We make our contribution to the Federal coffers, as this is the system under which we operate; but we are entitled to have our fair share of our contribution returned for spending in our State. It is the responsibility of State Governments to spend such money wisely; it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, which collects this money, to ensure that it is returned equitably to the States. Our Federal Governments have failed to do this. Further, it is the responsibility not only of the Prime Minister, but also of all members who represent Western Australia in the House of Representatives and the Senate to ensure that we get our fair share of the cake. In this regard they have failed us miserably.

It is very sad indeed that our Premier repeatedly has to go to Canberra and fight for Western Australia when we have representatives over there supposedly representing this State who should be doing a great deal of the fighting for us. Time and time again I have read in the Press of back-bench revolts over air fares and other matters. I remind members that only a small percentage of our population is affected by air fares, but everyone is affected by the lack of money coming here, money which we have earned and which we are entitled to receive.

I can assure members I do not intend to vote for any of those people and have them returned, because they have not satisfied me that they are worthy of my support. I suppose they will be endorsed again through our party system, yet they are as worthless as tits on a bull. I cannot speak strongly enough against them, because they have let us down so miserably. If other members wish to support them, that is their right; however, it is also their responsibility to ensure that we send to Canberra to represent Western Australia people who are prepared to do just that.

As a result of our tight budgetary situation there has been some curtailment in spending in our various electorates. I have been disappointed with some areas of spending and elated with others. I am happy that two of my district high schools—Yanchep and Gingin—will continue to go ahead to serve those areas in the fields of

primary and secondary education. I was disappointed that the Edgewater primary school was shelved, although I note it will be continued eventually and will not be very far behind schedule.

I was disappointed that there was no mention in the Budget of money to be spent on the Bolgart school. This is constructed of concrete slabs and is in an earthquake-prone area. It is a danger to the children attending the school. The Education Department has agreed that there is a need to make the school earthquake-proof. I consider it would be better to demolish it and to build a new school. Considering the devastation that earthquakes can cause, we should consider the safety of the children and plan a new school as a high priority. The Minister for Education is aware of this matter, but I remind him of it once again.

It is only fair I point out that I am very thankful for the assistance I have received from the officers of various Government departments throughout my time as a member of Parliament. Almost all of them are very co-operative and helpful. They rarely receive much praise and are often referred to as "steely-eyed bureaucrats" or something similar. On behalf of my constituents I thank those officers for gaining for my electorate those necessities it requires. It would not be proper to name any particular officer, for they are all most helpful indeed.

I note in the allocation for the Public Works Department that we are to get some lead lights in Seabird. I am concerned at the lack of speed in the development of the fishing boat harbour at Jurien. Last year the Government spent \$18 000 and it has budgeted to spend \$31 000 this year on more investigations for a harbour. I hope that as a result of the investigations a new fishing boat harbour will be commenced soon.

Previously I have expressed concern that Fremantle, which already has a fishing boat harbour, is to have \$84 000 spent on land-locked wharf additions. Fremantle already has a harbour while Jurien has nothing. Jurien faces the open sea and is the home of a fishing fleet of over 50 vessels.

I notice also that \$150 000 is to be spent in Albany so that deep-sea vessels can gain protection in the Albany Harbour. I wonder whether this is as urgent as the need for a harbour in Jurien, especially when we consider that the town jetty in Albany has been in existence for a considerable time. The whale chasers tied up there for many years. The tug *Ahwina* used to tie up there. The money being spent there is a premature expenditure because fishing boat

protection is available in Oyster Harbour. I venture to say that the fishing fleet in Albany is smaller than the fleet in the Jurien area.

I will comment again on the prices we charge for boat pens in these marinas. While I am not one to encourage high prices or heavy charges, I believe the Government has been remiss in providing these expensive facilities in the various ports and not charging a reasonable rental to those who use them. This has caused some concern in the Two Rocks marina over the last couple of years. The people there quite rightly were objecting to the increased prices for the use of those facilities. They were basing their objections on the fact that similar facilities in Government fishing boat harbours were considerably cheaper at around \$300 per pen compared with \$1 000 per pen in the Two Rocks area. The free enterprise harbour seemed excessively pricey and they felt justified in complaining. The fishermen up the coast have said to me often that when a person considers the cost of putting down a mooring, \$1 000 for a private pen in a fishing boat harbour is not too much. It certainly is too much if other people are paying only \$300. If the Government charged a reasonable price it would receive more income which could be used to help build more harbours for other people.

The member for Mt. Marshall earlier mentioned the Agaton water supply, about which we both have spoken on several occasions. It is a scheme which is of great concern to the people in the northern and north-eastern wheat belt areas who at present do not enjoy an adequate water supply. The Department of Agriculture has said on many occasions that it is possible to supply on-farm water at a considerably lower price than is paid for water pumped through a comprehensive scheme.

Theoretically I suppose this would be correct, but in practice it does not work. For on-farm water supplies to be successful rain has to fall in a certain way; it has to be heavy rainfall so that we get good runoff. We need roaded catchments into dams and we need dams which do not leak and which will hold the water which does run off. It is not possible to say that an area had so many millimetres of rain last year and therefore people there would have a certain amount of runoff.

I have a dam on a property at Bindi Bindi which I put down a number of years ago. It has a roaded catchment and was built to the specifications of the Department of Agriculture. The department advised me what to do and supervised my work. Last year, in the paddock adjacent to this dam, I grew a crop of barley



which yielded over 38 bushels and a crop of wheat which yielded over 30 bushels an acre. This would suggest there was adequate water to grow a good crop of grain. However, the dam was dry at Christmas time. So although rain fell satisfactorily last year, it did not fall heavily enough to fill the dam. I had all the feed in the world for the sheep, but no water. That is just one example, and there are many others.

I express my disappointment with some of the officers in the Department of Agriculture who insist that on-farm water supplies can be provided cheaper than water from a comprehensive water scheme. I was very thankful to receive the answer to a question I directed to the Premier the week before last, because he admitted that on-farm water supplies cannot serve all areas. Thank goodness he has recognised the argument that some of us have been submitting for a long time.

I notice also that we are getting new vessels for our transport along the north-west coast. Again I ask the Minister for Transport whether he has considered going back to a system which would promote tourism. The old ships such as the *Koolinda*, *Koolama* and *Kybra* provided adequate accommodation for a few passengers. I know that the Bakke boats, which ply from Australia to Japan and across to America, cater for 12 passengers.

I understand that if no more than 12 passengers are carried on board a vessel no need exists for a medical officer to be employed. The passengers can eat with the ship's officers, so the messing arrangements would cause no problem. The tourist potential of the west coast, and the fact that so many people would enjoy such a trip, as people were able to enjoy trips on the old *Koolinda*, means that we should consider the possibility of providing accommodation for 12 passengers on the vessels to which I have referred to open up the west coast to people who want to visit that area by sea.

Again referring to transport, I believe we should lay down plans for a deep water port to serve the agricultural areas of Western Australia. The port should cater for vessels of more than 100 000 tonnes. The cost of transporting grain is increasing all the time, and many of the vessels which carry our grain, particularly from the Port of Geraldton, are going off the run.

The Geraldton port cannot be deepened because of the harbour's rocky bottom. Even if it could be, the extra large vessels cannot turn unless the breakwater is moved further out to sea. I know the Port of Geraldton very well because in my younger days my father was the harbour

master at that port. At times I was able to go with him on the pilot boat and scramble up the rope ladder to the ship. I went with my father when he brought the ships in, so I know the port very well. It would be tremendously expensive to enlarge the harbour to cater for the larger vessels. I do not know the potential of the Jurien or North Head areas for a port to cater for the larger vessels; I do not know whether the water is deep enough or the bottom satisfactory for dredging, but we should consider the future provision of a port for large and extra large vessels.

Even the new installation at Kwinana will not be big enough for the types of vessels in the future used to transport our grain. Whilst it can cater for many of the large vessels, the extra large vessels need to be catered for to better serve our wheat-growing industry.

In regard to our wheat-growing industry, our farmers are no better than any others, but God has smiled on them more often. We have the climate, the land and know-how for wheat production, and it is one thing Western Australian farmers are good at—rural production. Therefore it is in the interests of us all, no matter what our occupations are, to encourage rural production. It is our bread and butter. The wheat we grow is money in the pockets of everybody. I know that for a fact because it never seems to stay long in mine. It always goes to someone else. The same situation applies in regard to live sheep exports to the Middle East. The money earned is money in the pockets of us all, and therefore that export trade should be encouraged.

Last week I was absolutely aghast when I read of the Wilson Tuckey plan. The member for Mt. Marshall was tonight asked a question about it. I assure members that I think it is absolute rubbish. It was ill-conceived and sabre rattling of the worst kind. It is something which we do not want in Western Australia—for that matter, anywhere. I am not a supporter of people on strike or people who refuse to work, but it is the province of people employed on our wharves to do certain work, whether they be waterside workers or others. It is not the responsibility of the farmer to do that work, and I use the word "responsibility" assuredly. Anyone who suggests we take over from waterside workers "forcibly" as the paper stated, is suggesting that we resort to anarchy. There is no way in the world I would support anarchy. The Wilson Tuckey plan should be thrown out the window because it is ridiculous. It should never have been conceived. It is probably the result of a very bad dream.

I would like to bring a couple of matters to the notice of the Premier; unfortunately he is not here, but I am sure the points will be referred to him. I express the concern of shire councils in my electorate about the funding restrictions to local government associations as mooted in recent times by the State Government. I will refer to, and speak briefly about, the restrictions in the order they were handed to me.

Concern was expressed at the proposal to abolish the swimming pool subsidy. Members know that subsidy provides to a council up to \$3 000 a year or the loss incurred by a council in the running of a swimming pool. I know we have a tight budgetary situation, but I remind members that country swimming pools provided by councils are not necessarily a luxury. In fact, they are a necessity; they serve a very real purpose. It is the right of country children to be taught to swim, and it is important that they should have some form of recreation. When I was a young fellow living in the country I did not have the opportunity to learn to swim. Sometimes children were thrown into a dam in the hope that they would flounder to the shore; however, many people in the country never learnt to swim. That situation concerns me. As one who served in the Navy I saw non-swimmers drown, and I did not like that at all. I will do all I can to ensure that all people have the opportunity to learn to swim.

Swimming pools in country areas are necessary for the purpose of teaching people to swim, as well as for the recreational facility they provide for country school children. If a council has a swimming pool it allows the schools in its area to use the pool and charges only the normal admission fee. The cost of running the pool is nowhere near covered by that charge, and in the past the loss has been picked up to a certain extent by the swimming pool subsidy provided by the State Government. If the subsidy is taken away the swimming activities of children in many rural areas will be seriously curtailed.

The next matter to which I refer is the transfer of local government auditing responsibilities to the private sector. Many country shires have had the privilege of using the Government's auditing system, and this privilege has saved the shire much money. If the service is abolished certain councils will be required to pay several thousand dollars for a private sector service.

The next matter relates to the phasing out of local authority assistance funds provided by the State. In the Premier's letter to local authorities he said that this year the Federal Government will provide \$32.9 million for the fund, and that the provision will increase by not less than 18 per

cent next year. That is what we expected the increase would be. I remind the Premier and other members of the hullabaloo we kicked up when the Whitlam Government tried to bypass the State Government in an attempt to give assistance to local authorities directly from the Federal Government. The phasing out of the assistance to which I have referred is tantamount to that which the Whitlam Government tried to do. We should encourage the provision of money by the State Government so that we have much closer contact with local authorities. We should pass the money on to local authorities and assist them in any way we can. The State Government is closest to local authorities, which are closest to the people. Local authorities form part of the sensitive part of government and should be encouraged and helped in any way the State Government can help them.

The country sewerage scheme subsidy will be reduced from 85 per cent to 75 per cent. This reduction may not seem to be very much, but it causes concern to country people and is causing concern to councils in the framing of their budgets.

The amount of subsidy for sporting facilities will be reduced from 33 1/3 per cent to 25 per cent. I do congratulate the Government for the wonderful job it has done for sporting facilities in country areas through the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation. Without the assistance provided, many sparsely populated country areas would not enjoy the sporting facilities they presently have available which in many instances are of a standard comparable with facilities enjoyed by sporting bodies in the metropolitan area. This applies in metropolitan areas which have the economy of scale to support the sporting facility—they have the number of people for it. Without the assistance provided, country areas will be drastically disadvantaged. I ask the Government to give serious consideration to this matter because the assistance is greatly needed. It provides a tremendous service to people who in the past have had to provide their own facilities. It is not many years ago that people in country areas had to build a bough shed with tea tree for their sporting facilities. I know we must crawl before we can walk, but surely we have gone beyond that point.

Sporting facilities in country areas have been upgraded to a great extent, which has been to the advantage of country people, but we must encourage the Government to continue. The decrease of the assistance will cost one shire an extra \$52 000. It must raise that money from somewhere.

I have mentioned these points because they are of concern to country shire councils.

During the recent recess I was privileged to travel north along the Canning Stock Route. During that trip I witnessed relics of our early history which ought to be preserved for posterity. We should not forget our pioneers. We preserved the Barracks Arch, even though many people did not want us to, and we have preserved many old buildings. The Canning Stock Route was surveyed and built by Canning personally and is a monument to the courage and endurance of our early pioneers.

There are 51 wells along that route and I would like to have some of them preserved for people who travel along the route. It is possible to travel the 1 600 kilometres by four-wheel drive vehicles; it is not a difficult route if one uses one's common sense and goes in convoy. I must admit that at times I wished I had had a camel.

We could repair several of the wells which are capable of being used. Without those wells I would not have got through the trip. If we repaired them they would be available for more people to use that route and would be preserved as a monument to the people who built them. I would like the Public Works Department to go along the route at some stage and bring back some of the buckets and other relics just laying and waiting for vandals to steal. One of the wells could be brought back to be placed in the Museum. Obviously one cannot bring back a hole, but the materials used to construct the wells are capable of being brought back.

The wells were lined with desert oak timber, hewn with adzes. The wells are a tribute to the people who constructed them. The materials used were those available on the spot, and it would be fitting if the materials used in one well could be brought back and used in the construction of a similar well at the Museum. A hole about 10 feet deep would be required and would be lined with the materials to which I have referred. The whip poles, bucket, and windlass from one well could be brought back. All those things would serve as a monument to our early pioneers.

Recently a question was asked in another place about a monument to be erected, in the Museum, of some rustic art or something made from scrap iron; I call it scrap art. The cost was over \$50 000 and it did not symbolise anything. I could have saved the Government some money because at home on the farm I have some scrap heaps and a welding plant. I would be happy to weld some of this rustic stupidity and present it to the Museum free of charge. This modern art does nothing for

me. I do not know what it is supposed to symbolise. I would prefer that the \$50 000 be used to set up one of the wells in the Museum as a reminder of our strong and faithful pioneers.

I hope that will be considered, especially from the point of view of tourism. I do not mean we should spend money on roads; they should be left for four-wheel drive vehicles. This must be one of the longest stock routes in the world, and one about which very little is known. It has many historical points, one being a stone fort built by Lord Forrest in 1874. At that time he was attacked by Aborigines so he built the fort which still stands today. Further along the track are some Aboriginal carvings in caves which have to be seen to be appreciated. Further still along the track is the Southesk Range which was named by the Honourable David Carnegie in 1896 when he carved his own 96 on the walls. H. S. Trotman also carved his name and Canning carved his "C" 23 also. These are all historical points which are tourist attractions.

Some may say that they are available only to those who have a four-wheel drive vehicle. We all know that one man's medicine is another man's poison. Many of us make a contribution to all sorts of art, including rustic art, which I will never go to see. I suppose somewhere along the line I must have made a contribution. Many of us make contributions to paintings and all sorts of things which some people enjoy, but others do not. There is nothing which is for any one alone and if we do make contributions we will be only following our own desires.

It would be in the interests of Australia and tourism to preserve some of these wells and have a signpost or two pointing to them. They must be cemented into the ground because people often turn signs around so they point to the wrong track. If that were done there, it could mean someone's life could be lost. At certain times we got through only because of the navigational equipment we took with us. I believe this early part of our history ought to be preserved. I did take a 16 mm film of the whole trip and I will be happy if it does create some interest.

I am concerned about some of the cuts which have been necessary. I have been concerned also about some of the despicable behaviour of some people as a result of those cuts. I refer in particular to the school teachers who went on strike. Whilst I would not object to the right of anyone to voice his objection to whatever he feels is wrong, I do not believe it is the right of school teachers to go on strike and punish children.

Mr Bateman: Why not?

Mr CRANE: It is compulsory for children to be sent to school. They are not sent to school to sit around and twiddle their thumbs. They are sent to be taught by people who are paid to teach. Whilst they are paid to teach, it is their responsibility to do so. I was concerned that they went on strike to voice their objections.

Mr Bateman: What other weapon do they have?

Mr CRANE: It is nice to know that the member for Canning has heard what I have said because I know in his heart he agrees with me.

Mr Bateman: I do not agree with you.

Mr CRANE: We must remember our responsibility to people, and teachers must remember their responsibility to children. They have ample opportunity to voice their objections.

Mr Bateman: To whom?

Mr CRANE: The schoolroom is not the place to play politics; the place to play politics is here.

With those remarks I support the Premier and his Budget for austerity.

**MR A. D. TAYLOR** (Cockburn) [9.23 p.m.]: The previous speaker made a comment which I think gives me a lead to the Budget debate: He mentioned that in rural areas it was the farmer who put money into "your pocket", meaning the members on this side of the House.

I would like to remind members tonight that what is occurring in Kwinana at present will take money out of the pockets of people in this State. I remind the previous speaker that when talking about rural people he should remember that there are people in Kwinana who have skills which are not being utilised. Just as a drought stops rural people from producing, an economic drought will stop people in Kwinana from producing.

To place that production into perspective, I remind members that some years ago I was able to make the comment in this place that the combined production from the Kwinana industrial area towards the gross national product—that is, in money terms—was greater than the primary production in this State, other than wheat and wool. That production is greater than the fishing industry, the fruit and vegetable industry, the timber industry, and many others. It is a figure almost as high as the total wheat production in this State. Wool is the only competitor. When we take the value added from refining crude oil to the finished product; nickel matt to the nickel ingots; superphosphate from the raw material to the super that comes from it; the bauxite that goes into Alcoa and comes out as alumina; and the pig iron ingots from AIS, we realise the

tremendous value of production compared with that which stems from the rural areas. We then realise also that the production from the Kwinana area deserves special consideration. However, it seems the production from this small section of the State, in terms of value added towards this country's wealth, does not deserve the lack of consideration that it has.

I would like to speak a little about the closure of AIS because I think it should receive far more attention from the Government and members of Parliament than it has so far. Seven hundred men have been told that they are likely to be unemployed within six months—some men have already been dismissed—and that means 3 000 people at least will be affected directly; that includes wives and children. More people will have this threat hanging over their heads in the future.

We have heard virtually nothing at all from a Government which used to pride itself on the fact that it helped to establish that industry. The effect on those 3 000 people will have a snowballing reaction. I am not an economist, but I would say that if, as the Government has claimed in the past, each job it creates in a primary industry produces a further five jobs which flow from it, we can assume that, by the same token, if a job is lost in the primary sector, five additional jobs will be lost in the tertiary sector. Therefore many jobs will be lost in Kwinana.

An additional reason that the Government should take some special interest in this situation and the effects which may flow on—

Mr MacKinnon: Will you explain what you would do if you were in Government?

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: I do not have to because we are not in Government. I suggest to the Minister that if he believes that because the Opposition will not provide him with an answer the Government should not be required to do so. He believes also that the Government is on the same level as the Opposition.

Mr O'Connor: I think he was looking for constructive criticism.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: If he wishes to suggest that the Government is more competent than the Opposition, he should not ask me for an answer to his problem. It is his problem.

Four years ago there was a shake out in the nickel industry when 60 or 70 men were dismissed. At the same time 600 nickel miners at Kambalda lost their jobs. The only action from the Government was to send officers to Kambalda. Those officers ran around in a flurry, holding talks in an effort to obtain other

employment for the men. Fortunately for this State and the men involved, things sorted themselves out and work became available for the men.

The nickel refinery is a little different. The people involved are those who were least able to look after themselves: some were the more senior members of the staff and some were juniors.

In answer to a question asked of him tonight, the Premier said that the BP refinery was not considering closure, bearing in mind the over-production in Singapore and the Eastern States. I do not believe they will close because they have a place in this State. However, I am sure there will be some retrenchments. In other words, the economic climate is being taken advantage of by large enterprises which believe that to suit the situation they can do as they see fit at the moment. At the very time we need higher employment, the company is likely to cut its work force.

A Press report suggested that Alcoa of Australia Ltd. could take up 600 workers because of a possible move to reduce the hours of work. Another Press report indicated that it would take up 300 workers. In an answer to a question I asked the Minister for Labour and Industry, he reminded me that the matter was still one for arbitration, and that no jobs may flow from it. Hopefully some jobs will flow, if only for the reason that the workers at the Alcoa plant will drop their hours to about 38 a week, still above the hours of civil servants, thereby creating more jobs.

Mr MacKinnon: Would not that make Alcoa less competitive?

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: I should not think so. The Honorary Minister should know that five of the large aluminium groups form a cartel to buy and sell aluminium throughout the world, and the price is fixed. It becomes not competitive in the general sense. It becomes a matter of a world market rather than a local one. Our industry is very competitive, and it should remain that way.

As far as Australian Iron & Steel Pty. Ltd. is concerned, the real problem is that for some 20 to 30 years the western nations, and certainly this State, have held the belief that an industrial base can be established on steel, which, in turn, will create stability in terms of economic growth. A State needs a strong industrial base in order to provide employment and an increasing standard of living. That has been accepted, and certainly it has been proved in Japan, West Germany, and most of the advanced nations of the world.

In this State we have tended to follow that line. The establishment of the steel plant at Kwinana was the linchpin of the future of this State in terms of industrial development. All was to hinge on the development of steel mills in this State, and the establishment of the jobs that would follow. However, the basis of that development has gone. The one industry which could have formed the base of future industrial expansion in this State has now gone.

The work begun by the Hawke Government in the 1950s with pig iron at Wundowie, followed by the Brand Government with AIS, established an industrial base that will now be thrown away. We will dissipate the only steel makers we have in this State. We have only six months for someone to do something about it, otherwise we will lose that base on which we have been working.

If AIS goes, the Government, as long as it is the Government, will have to come up with some answers as to the future base of the economic strength of this State. As the previous member suggested, perhaps we are moving back to an agricultural base, because there does not seem to be enough of a base in nickel or aluminium to establish the type of industrial society which we need to have.

It seems that we will not see established the dreams of the Brand Government, the Tonkin Government, and the early Court Government for a jumbo steel mill, in the first stage of which we would have been sending steel ingots overseas to South-East Asian and Pacific markets, as the beginnings of an industry here. However, those dreams have all gone, and we will have to start from scratch.

We will be left with a giant hole in the thinking on both sides of this House. Where will we go from here? What future will we have in 10 or 15 years' time? We must have some form of self-sufficient industry on which to base our future.

We have spoken in the past about assembling motor vehicles, manufacturing tractors, and other types of industrial development. However, the projects that were mooted in the Brand and Tonkin Governments' days will not come to fruition. The steel mill expertise established in this State will be thrown away, and it will be next to impossible to recommence the steel industry.

There must be an answer. Someone must come up with a suggestion as to where we will go.

I would like to indicate the human dimension of the Kwinana shut-down. It will have wider repercussions than appear on the surface. The Government should give consideration to them.

A degree of despondency is developing amongst the members of the work force of AIS and the major industries at Kwinana, which has an enviable industrial record. Its number of strike days has been among the lowest in the nation—an exceptionally low record. The industries which provide the employment have had a very high degree of loyalty from their employees; and that is really unusual. Normally the workers are anti their employers; but at Kwinana they have been very loyal to the employers. However, when first the nickel refinery and now AIS have dismissed employees, that loyalty has been shattered.

It is ironic that of the 700 people who have lost their jobs or will lose them, 300 are staff members. The ones who already have been given their notice were given it within a few hours of the announcement of the problem; and some of those people have been with AIS the longest. The apprentice master, who spent much of his lifetime working for BHP, was one of the first to go. Supervisors who have given their all to the company have been dismissed.

I am reminded of an acquaintance of mine who would not go out at night during the week because he wanted to be efficient. He had worked his way up from the tools to a supervisory job, but he did not last a day. When it was announced that the closure would take place in six months, he was given his time for the week. His loyalty to the company was such that he would not go out during the week because he wanted to be efficient for his company, yet he was dismissed.

When such things happen, the confidence of the workers is shattered. They have had an excellent record for industrial relations; and they have contributed to the wealth of this State.

Several sections of the work force will be in trouble. The answers given to me tonight by the Minister for Labour and Industry did not satisfy me completely. Perhaps by interjection he can tell me whether he had discussions with the General Manager of AIS before he received my question, or afterwards.

Mr O'Connor: It was Thursday, in my office.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: That was not as I understood the situation.

Mr O'Connor: I will check and tell you in a second.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: This matter has been going on now for a long time.

Mr O'Connor: We have had several discussions with him. That was not the first we had.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: It is not germane to the comments I want to make.

The problem with AIS has been continuing for a long time. Members would know that a Bill was introduced in this House almost 12 months ago to amend the agreement with BHP. Firstly there was a Bill to amend the part of the agreement requiring the company to establish steel-making procedures by 1981-82; and then last year a Bill was introduced to delete the provision completely.

Mr O'Connor: The last discussions were Thursday morning at 8.30.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: I was discussing the matter last Tuesday; and I did not gather much had been happening up to that point.

Mr P. V. Jones: Could I just comment? I provided some information to your colleague in another place relative to this, indicating that we were having discussions with the company in December of last year—I am referring to my department—regarding the difficult trading situation that the company was already feeling. This was following our entering into an arrangement with it regarding the relining of the blast furnace, and all the follow-on and the negotiations that were referred to in the amending Bill to which you are now making reference. It goes back to December 1980, when I and my department had discussions.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: Perhaps even before that, or was it since?

Mr P. V. Jones: Well before.

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: It has been well known that the furnace has been on a three-month by three-month basis; but the move to close it has come very suddenly. That move will affect more than one component of the work force. It may be important to the activities of the company; but there is nothing in it as far as the work force is concerned.

Mr P. V. Jones: How do you mean that the move has come so suddenly, because we indicated that a statement should be made by the company some weeks ago about the situation? It was made. I do not know what you mean by "suddenly".

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: The Minister referred to talks about the critical situation last December. At the beginning of 1981, the company took on a number of apprentices for a five-year term. That is the sort of thing about which I am talking. It took on a group of apprentices for a five-year term, and now they have been told to go. The first one to go is the apprentice master. He has worked for the company for many years, and now he has been told to go.

Other than the answers given by the Minister for Labour and Industry, not much attention has

been paid to this. It will be the 50 new apprentices and the older members of the work force who will be affected the most. It is ironic that the most experienced workers at AIS are the workers who are 45 years and older, yet they will find the greatest difficulty in obtaining employment. The positions that are available are likely to go to the younger, more active members of the work force. However, they are the ones who are more mobile, and perhaps they could go north or elsewhere seeking work. The older members of the work force will not be able to obtain employment.

Let me give an example of that. Alcoa of Australia Ltd., which is next door to AIS, is an admirable employer in many ways. Nonetheless, it has a stringent intake system. Alcoa is very selective, and it has a high health requirement. It requires perfect hearing, amongst other things. I know of a Mr Harry Wass from Kwinana who was rejected by Alcoa eight or 10 years ago because of his hearing. He visited a doctor, and he was told that his hearing was perfect. The doctor rang Alcoa and remonstrated with it, but it would not change its mind. Harry Wass then obtained work in the BP refinery, doing a much more onerous and hazardous job than he would have been doing if he had worked at Alcoa; and he has worked with BP ever since.

Alcoa appears to be the company that can absorb a reasonable number of the work force from AIS, but that is problematical, as I indicated. However, there is at least a possibility of that.

It is the responsibility of the Government to talk to Alcoa to ascertain whether it will lower its standard of entry—I do not mean that it should adopt a low standard—in order that the workers to whom I have referred might be employed. I do not believe that, because Alcoa pays good money, it should be able to take the cream of the workers from AIS when skilled workers are required elsewhere, thus leaving only the untrained and the older men from 45 years upwards to obtain alternative employment.

Mr Shalders: Don't you think if we take the Opposition's point of view and charge a higher royalty, these companies will have to be more efficient and take the cream?

Mr A. D. TAYLOR: The member for Murray must have seen the refinery in his own area and he would be as well aware as I am that the majority of the workers in the work force there do not perform tasks which require specialised skills. The fitters and turners can be of any age. The position at the refinery differs from that which obtains at the foundry which requires very active

workers for the sort of tasks which are performed. Therefore, Alcoa should be encouraged to absorb older men into the work force. It already has men of 40 years and upwards in the work force and, if their hearing deteriorates slightly, they are able to stay on. It is essential that the men who will be unemployed as a result of the closure of AIS be absorbed back into the work force.

Not only should the Government provide assistance for apprentices and talk to employers in an endeavour to increase the employment chances of the older men, but also it should establish an office in the area to help these men find work.

The suggestion of the Commonwealth Employment Service that it put an officer on the "Kwinana strip" will not work. I do not believe an officer of the Commonwealth Employment Service would have the right sort of background and "feel" for the situation. However, were the Government to establish an office in the area, negotiations could be made with the relevant unions and much could be done to re-establish the work force.

Another problem I should like to mention in this regard concerns the key people who will keep the furnace going up until the death knock. They will be the last ones to leave. Approximately 400 or 500 jobs depend on the operation of the furnace; therefore, it is essential that it operate until the last possible moment. However, the furnace workers are concerned that, by the time they leave AIS, all the good jobs in the area will have been taken and it will be extremely difficult for them to find alternative employment.

If the men on the furnace leave their jobs and take positions elsewhere, it will mean the furnace will not be manned and all the workers will lose their positions. They all rely on the furnace being kept in operation and when the furnace workers finally blanket down the furnace and leave, they fear that they will not be able to get alternative employment, because all the jobs will be taken. Hopefully the Department of Labour and Industry will be able to look at these sorts of problems.

Another area of concern where problems will arise is in relation to SHC rents and the way in which payments for home purchases will be measured. All these matters must be considered when major catastrophies of this nature occur. The Government must take an interest in this matter, because it will cause major problems. It cannot allow a situation similar to that which occurred at Kambalda to develop. In that case, 600 or 700 miners were stood down and were told, "It is just bad luck. We will not do anything

about it". Something must be done by the Government to assist these people.

The story of AIS will be a continuing saga and the Government should take a continuous interest in it. During the next four or five months while the men are working there, everything will run on a rather even keel. However, once the workers find themselves without employment the mood will be such that major problems could occur. The workers in the plant are losing faith in their employers and they no longer believe loyalty will be rewarded. Any self-respecting Government would try to avert the sorts of problems which could arise as a result of the closure of AIS.

I should like to speak briefly on another matter which affects Cockburn also and I am sure my remarks will be passed on to the appropriate Minister. I refer to the construction of a deep sewerage pumping station in Mayor Road, South Coogee. I wish to record some of the effects which are being experienced presently in that area.

Approximately four weeks ago I asked a question in this House which referred to the fact that tests of groundwater from this site—the tests were taken below the water table—indicated the existence of quite fresh water. A sample taken four or five days after the first test was conducted showed the water was purer than that analysed in the first test. The people responsible considered the situation was under control and no more tests

were taken for a month. During that time the salinity in the water increased sixfold.

As a result, a market gardener, Mr Tomasich, lost a full crop of vegetables. Mr Srhoy in Garden Road lost his crop and Mr Perica's capsicum, cucumber, and carrots were badly stained. Another person whose crop was affected was Mr Cadinavich, and Mr Estimoff lost his crop of beans. It is presumed all these crop losses can be attributed to the encroachment of salt water.

The Minister has agreed tests will be taken on these various properties and the Department of Agriculture will examine the crops. The geology people will examine the groundwater along with the MWB. I am aware that this work has begun already.

I record this matter primarily because the people affected must receive some form of compensation. This is not the time to criticise the Government for inactivity in this regard, because something is being done in this area at the present time. However, I wish to serve notice that concrete results must come from the activities which are under way, because the water problem effectively has wiped out the livelihood of a number of people for the next six to 12 months.

I support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Herzfeld.

*House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.*



## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## INCOME TAX: SHARING

*Allocations*

2448. Mr COWAN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) In each year since income tax sharing commenced, what are the amounts of money made available to—

(a) State Government;

(b) local authorities,

from the Commonwealth by—

(i) tax sharing entitlements;

(ii) specific purpose grants;

(iii) road grants?

- (2) For the same period, what amount of money has been made available to local authorities by the State Government from—

(a) local authority assistance fund;

(b) swimming pool subsidies;

(c) road grants;

(d) specific purpose grants?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) (i) State tax sharing entitlements—

Year	\$ million
1976-77	440.8
1977-78	519.9
1978-79	579.5
1979-80	662.9
1980-81	734.2
1981-82	806.3

(Estimate including \$4.8 million to take account of the absorption of some specific purpose programmes.)

- (ii) Specific purpose payments (recurrent and capital)—

Year	\$ million
1976-77	344.1
1977-78	393.6
1978-79	395.1
1979-80	399.4
1980-81	458.4
1981-82	458.5

(Estimate including health grants of \$150.9 million which under the new arrangements are classified as general revenue assistance)

The above figures include specific purpose payments to local government but exclude road grants.

- (iii) Road grants (including amounts allocated to local authorities)—

Year	\$ million
1976-77	57.2
1977-78	61.3
1978-79	64.4
1979-80	69.2
1980-81	76.9
1981-82	83.9

- (b) (i) Local authorities tax sharing entitlements—

Year	\$ million
1976-77	13.2
1977-78	15.5
1978-79	16.8
1979-80	20.8
1980-81	28.2
1981-82	32.9

- (ii) Complete information on specific purpose payments to local government is not separately identifiable in Commonwealth Budget papers. However, excluding road funds the amount involved is not great—in the order of an estimated \$5 million in 1980-81.

If the member requires more precise information it would be necessary for the Commonwealth Government to be asked to supply details.

- (iii) The following amounts which are included in (iii) above have been allocated to local authorities for expenditure on roads under their control—

Year	\$ million
1976-77	17.9
1977-78	20.6
1978-79	22.0
1979-80	22.2
1980-81	24.6

1981-82 Not yet available

- (2) Details of grants to local authorities by the State Government for the same period are as follows—

	Actual 1976-77 \$	Actual 1977-78 \$	Actual 1978-79 \$
(a) Local authorities assistance fund*	1 338 647	2 127 603	2 543 214
(b) Swimming pool subsidies	389 648	298 929	310 624
(c) Road grants	7 180 391	5 888 104	7 761 737
(d) Other specific purpose grants**	1 685 118	2 089 565	2 419 212
	Actual 1979-80 \$	Actual 1980-81 \$	Estimate 1981-82 \$
(a) Local authorities assistance fund*	2 785 173	4 379 541	5 250 000
(b) Swimming pool subsidies	254 833	263 468	276 000
(c) Road grants	9 440 119	8 844 879	9 000 000
(d) Other specific purpose grants**	2 706 325	2 605 018	2 071 000

\* Includes payments for pensioner deferred rates and the pensioner rates subsidy. Also includes general purpose assistance (\$1.15 million in 1981-82)

\*\* Balance of items identified under "Payments to Local Authorities" in the Miscellaneous Services Division of the Estimates.

**HOUSING: ABORIGINES***Aboriginal Housing Board: Country Representatives*

2464. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he confirm that country representatives on the Aboriginal Housing Board are expected to work in a voluntary capacity apart from the provision of a travelling allowance, air fares to and from Perth for meetings of the board and a \$20 sitting fee?
- (2) If "Yes", in view of the increasing demands being made on these representatives by the growing number of applications for assistance and the time involved in travelling, for instance in the case of the Eastern Goldfields representative who has to cover an area stretching from Laverton to Esperance and Southern Cross in the west, is he willing to give consideration to the provision of an honorarium to compensate for such rapidly growing work loads?
- (3) Is he also willing to consider providing phones for these country representatives to facilitate their work?
- (4) If "No" to (2) and (3), why not?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (4) Country representatives of the Aboriginal Housing Board are the nominees of local housing committees. They operate on a part-time voluntary basis with the support facilities of the State Housing Commission at local and regional levels. Their involvement in Aboriginal housing is in an advisory capacity in the assessment of applications for housing and the placement of these applications and housing construction programmes.

I have had discussions with the board and with individual members on the level of involvement expected of the members and the provision of facilities and honorariums. Negotiations are continuing.

**HOUSING: SHC***Maintenance: Forced Entry*

2465. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he confirm that employees of the State Housing Commission and private contractors carrying out maintenance on commission rental properties are empowered to force entry into homes if the tenant concerned is not home when they call?
- (2) If "No", why was entry forced at flat 8, 29 Hornsey Way, Balga, this week by contractors under these circumstances, and why did the maintenance supervisor at the Mirrabooka office of the State Housing Commission claim that it was the commission's policy to approve of forced entry under these circumstances?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) State Housing Commission employers or contractors are not authorised to enter any rental property without the consent of the tenant unless there are extraordinary circumstances.
- (2) The glazier subcontracting to a maintenance contractor forced entry to carry out work. This contractor claims he was informed by persons nearby at the time that it was all right to enter providing the apartment was secured upon departure. It is not unusual for tenants to make such arrangements with maintenance contractors and this incident seems to be a genuine mistake.

**COURTS: LAW COURTS***Building: Security Agents*

2467. Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government has considered, or is considering, the employment of private security agents to help man the new law courts complex?
- (2) If "Yes", will he please provide details?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Security personnel will be on duty 24 hours each day. They will control security doors to the parking area and access to judges' security areas. Tenders are currently being called for this work.

## WATER RESOURCES: CATCHMENT AREAS

### *Clearing Bans: Compensation*

2470. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

How much has been provided in the 1981-82 Budget for the compensation of landholders in the water catchment areas, when clearing bans apply?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

An amount of \$4.1 million has been provided in the miscellaneous division of the Budget for the water salinity programme in the south-west region.

It is estimated that most of this finance will be required for compensation payments, or acquisition of land in lieu of compensation, for the Mundaring Weir and Denmark Dam catchment areas and the Warren and Kent River water reserves.

A further allocation of \$1.6 million has been provided for the Collie River Salinity programme of which \$1.045 million has been allocated for compensation, or purchase in lieu of compensation.

## SUPERANNUATION

### *Members of Parliament*

2471. Mr STEPHENS, to the Premier:

- (1) With regard to members of the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council, what was the average cost per member of the Government contribution to the parliamentary superannuation fund for the 12 months ended 30 June 1981, and the budgeted amount for the year ending June 1982?
- (2) What was the amount of subsidy paid by the Government to the parliamentary superannuation fund to offset the actuarial deficiency for the year ended 30 June 1981 and the budgeted amount for the year ending June 1982?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The average cost per member of the Parliament of the Government's contributions to the parliamentary superannuation fund for the year ended 30 June 1981 was \$17 213, and the budgeted amount for the year ending 30 June 1982 is \$1 772 000, which is an average of \$20 368 per member.
- (2) The actuarial deficiency subsidy paid by the Government to the parliamentary superannuation fund for the year ended 30 June 1981 was \$990 942.83, and the budgeted amount for the year ending 30 June 1982 is \$1 106 000.

## EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

### *Teachers: Unfilled Vacancies*

2472. Mr PEARCE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) How much of the \$11 877 700 estimated savings on staff turnover, and delays in filling vacancies, and accrued salaries brought forward in part 10 item 1 of the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates, is attributable to savings to be made by not filling vacancies for pre-school teachers?
- (2) How many unfilled vacancies for pre-school teachers does this represent?
- (3) Will he give a detailed breakdown of this item?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The estimated saving in 1981-82 for pre-school teachers and aides is \$625 000.
- (2) Approximately 55 equivalent full-time teaching positions and 55 equivalent full-time aide positions.
- (3) In addition to an amount of \$4.3 million accrued salaries brought forward from 1980-81 and the saving identified in (1), the balance of the item is an estimate of likely savings from staff turnover during the year and other economies arising from better deployment of staff in accordance with recommendations of the Cabinet expenditure review committee shortly to be announced.

## HERBICIDE: 2,4,5-T

### *Aborigines: Trainees*

2473. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In respect of the Western Australian Agriculture Protection Board's Aboriginal training programme in the

Kimberley, are Aboriginal trainees engaged by the Agriculture Protection Board to work at Ord River Station, Kununurra experimental farm, Fox River Station and on the board's flora and fauna conservation training programme, required to use dangerous herbicides in the course of their work?

- (2) If so, what precautions are taken to safeguard their health?
- (3) Has the chemical, 2,4,5-T, also known as Agent Orange, been used by trainees in the board's programme?
- (4) Have any steps been taken to ensure comprehensive medical assessment for trainees who, as a result of the training programme, developed symptoms including severe burns and scalding requiring in one instance skin grafts, and in another instance recurrent peeling of facial tissue?
- (5) Have any steps been taken to make the general public, and in particular Aboriginal communities, aware of the dangers to health associated with the use of dangerous herbicides such as 2,4,5-T?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) No pesticides used in the Kimberley by trainees could be described as dangerous. Where trainees are required to use pesticides, appropriate protective clothing is available.
- (3) 2,4,5-T is not Agent Orange. 2,4,5-T has been used on occasions by trainees.
- (4) There are no medical reports available to the Agriculture Protection Board of trainees receiving injuries of the type mentioned in the question. Medical reports show that some trainees were treated for an allergic rash sustained by handling Noogoora burr. In these cases normal workers' compensation arrangements have applied.
- (5) The community is constantly reminded to follow the instructions on the label when using any pesticide. If this is done there are no dangers to health associated with their use. This is amply demonstrated by the widespread use of pesticides and the lack of any evidence of damage to human health.

## TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

### *Regulations: Standards and Weights*

2474. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is he aware that—
  - (a) vehicle standards regulations (1975);
  - (b) the traffic vehicle weights regulations (1975),
 are not available for purchase by the public?
- (2) Have instructions been issued to publish new copies of these regulations?
- (3) When will new copies of the regulations be available?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Yes. Both regulations were revoked by notice in the *Government Gazette* of 10 November 1977.
- (2) Instructions have been given to reprint the vehicle standards regulations 1977 which replaced the regulations mentioned in 1(a) and (b).
- (3) Availability will depend upon the priorities of the Government Printer but it is expected that copies will be available within six to eight weeks.

## LAND: RESERVES

### *"A"-class: Beelaring and Goonaring Springs*

2475. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Relative to the "A"-class reserves containing Beelaring and Goonaring Springs, what is the area of land considered to be the watershed for the springs?
- (2) What portions of this watershed land are owned freehold by—
  - (a) JIMWA Pty. Ltd.;
  - (b) any other company or companies?
- (3) How much of the watershed land has been cleared by JIMWA Pty. Ltd.?
- (4) (a) At what hectareage per day is it being cleared;
- (b) on what date did clearing commence?
- (5) What action has been taken by him or the Government to forestall the clearing operations?

- (6) (a) Is it a fact that 779 hectares of land adjoining the reserves have been ceded to the Crown;
- (b) when did this happen?
- (7) Is it a fact that the System 6 report recommends that the land which has so far been cleared should be set aside in its natural state as a buffer zone?
- (8) When did the Minister first become aware of the fact that JIMWA Pty. Ltd. intended to clear the land?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Approximately 570 ha.
- (2) (a) Approximately 90 per cent;
- (b) approximately 10 per cent.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) (a) Not known;
- (b) on or about 3 October 1981.
- (5) The Minister has had several discussions with the principal of JIMWA Pty. Ltd.
- (6) (a) No;
- (b) not applicable.
- (7) Some clearing has taken place on land recommended in the System 6 report for reservation.
- (8) Despite an understanding reached with the principal of JIMWA Pty. Ltd., the Minister received no prior notification of the company's intention to clear the land north of the springs.

## FISHERIES

### *Crustacea: Freshwater*

2476. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Relative to Beelaring and Goonaring Springs in the Toodyay area, what rare freshwater crustacea are to be found in the springs?
- (2) In what numbers can they be found in the springs?
- (3) In what other areas of the State can these same crustacea be found?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The springs contain a crustacean of the Koonac group which does not key out to a standard identification.
- (2) A population study has not been undertaken.
- (3) Not known.

## AGNEW CLOUGH LTD.: LAND

### *Toodyay: Agreement*

2477. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Relative to the land surrounding Beelaring and Goonaring Springs in the Toodyay area, and which land was formerly owned by Agnew Clough Ltd., is it a fact that an agreement was reached between the Government and Agnew Clough Ltd. that subdivision of 150 lots could take place providing a parcel of land surrounding the springs was left uncleared?
- (2) (a) What was the area of land to be left uncleared;
- (b) what was the nature of the agreement, i.e., was it a signed agreement?
- (3) Was the agreement such that it applied equally to Agnew Clough Ltd and any future owners?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) There is no formal agreement between Agnew Clough Ltd. and the Government on this matter. However, at a meeting held on 14 April 1978, between the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning and representatives of the Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife, Agriculture, Conservation and Environment, Forests, and Town Planning, it was generally agreed that should the subdivision of 100 lots proceed, a condition of approval would require 780 hectares of land east of St. Fergus Road be ceded to the Crown, free of cost, for public open space purposes (for conservation of flora and fauna).

In August 1980 the Town Planning Board received an application for the subdivision of the land in question and granted conditional approval—one of the conditions requiring the 780 hectares of land east of St. Fergus Road being ceded to the Crown free of cost for public open space purposes. Since then, no further action in the form of diagrams of survey being lodged, has occurred.

- (2) (a) and (b) Answered by (1) above.

- (3) The arrangement referred to in (1) above would apply to any person who sought to subdivide land during the period of the board's approval.
- (4) Answered by (3) above.

## BIRDS: SPECIES

### *Special Protection*

2478. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

Relative to the 1981 report of the Western Australian Wildlife Authority and specifically the section relating to bird species which are rare or otherwise in need of special protection, which birds in this list have not been given special protection as yet?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

None; all of the birds listed have been gazetted as rare or otherwise in need of special protection.

## WILDLIFE: MAMMALS

### *Species: Special Protection*

2479. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

Relative to the 1981 report of the Western Australian Wildlife Authority and specifically the section relating to mammals which are rare or otherwise in need of special protection—

- (a) which of the mammals are considered rare; and
- (b) which of the mammals in the total list have not been afforded special protection?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) Barrow Island euro  
Spectacled hare-wallaby  
Western hare-wallaby  
Banded hare-wallaby  
Brush-tailed rock wallaby  
Woolie  
Boodie  
Rock-haunting ringtail  
Marl  
Dalgyte  
Dibbler  
Long-tailed dunnart

Ingram's planigale  
Pygmy marsupial-mouse  
Dusky hopping mouse  
Shark Bay mouse  
Gould's native mouse  
Dugong;

(b) none.

## REPTILES AND AMPHIBIANS

### *Species: Special Protection*

2480. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

Relative to the 1981 report of the Western Australian Wildlife Authority and specifically the section relating to reptiles and amphibians which are rare or otherwise in need of special protection—

- (a) which of them are considered rare; and
- (b) which of them have not as yet been afforded special protection?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

### (a) Reptiles

Salt-water crocodile  
Western swamp (short-necked) tortoise  
Leathery turtle  
Lancelin Island skink  
Linked skink  
Amphibians  
Round frog.

(b) None.

## LAND: RESERVES

### *Nature*

2481. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) When was the first time the WA Wildlife Authority asked the Government to appoint rural based nature reserve management teams?
- (2) (a) How many teams have been appointed since that first request;  
(b) when were they appointed;  
(c) how many jobs are involved, and at what cost per annum?

(3) What commitments for work on nature reserves in country areas have been made by the authority and the department?

(4) Which of these commitments have not been met?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) 1976.

(2) (a) Two members of one three-man team;

(b) July and September 1978;

(c) two jobs; cost of running team appointed is \$85 000 p.a.

(3) The authority and the department are committed to providing firebreaks on nature reserves, and to progressively classifying and preparing management plans for nature reserves.

(4) 807 nature reserves require firebreaks.

## LAND: RESERVES

### *Nature*

2482. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) How many reasonable requests for reserve management work from—

(a) local authorities;

(b) adjoining landholders,

have been received over the last two years?

(2) How many of these requests have been met, and why in each case?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) (a) and (b) This information is not recorded and thus is not available.

(2) See (1).

## LAND: RESERVES

### *Firebreaks*

2483. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) Is it a fact that insufficient funds were available last year to provide adequate firebreaks to several reserves under the Minister's control?

(2) Which are the reserves involved?

(3) Is a similar situation going to occur again this year?

(4) How many wild fires occurred in the reserves referred to in (2) last summer?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Of 1 062 nature reserves 164 have firebreaks and 91 do not require firebreaks leaving 807 still requiring firebreaks.

(3) Yes, but with some further progress being made with funds available.

(4) Four that are known.

## EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

### *Driver Training: Programme*

2484. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the estimated cost saving to the physical education vote by the decision to eliminate the student driver education programme?

(2) If an alternative programme is being developed, why have high school principals been instructed by letter from the superintendent of physical education to advise students in year 11 to seek alternative driving instruction in 1982?

(3) What will the increased allocation of funds for physical education be used for?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) \$77 000 approximately which is 50 per cent of the 1980-81 budget allocated to driver education. The programme continues until the end of Term 3, 1981.

(2) I refer the member to a detailed response to a question without notice by my colleague the Minister for Police and Traffic on Thursday, 29 October 1981.

(3) The funds saved are among the various economies effected by the department and have not been re-allocated to other Physical Education Branch items.

## LAND

### *Corrigin*

2485. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Has the privately owned land situated in Short Street, Corrigin, been acquired by a Government department?

- (2) If "Yes", when is it estimated that the three houses will be removed from the land and will it be vested in the Education Department?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Transfers of title of two of the properties have been registered and action on the third is proceeding. Shire action to close Short Street is awaited.
- (2) The newly acquired properties and the Short Street road reserve are to be included in the school site reserve. Completion of this action, with a concurrent removal of the houses, is not expected to be finalised for some months.

### WATER RESOURCES

#### *Consumption*

2486. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

As the latest Metropolitan Water Board report indicates that consumption per person under its jurisdiction is 508 cubic metres per year, what is the latest known comparative consumption rates in the cities of—

- (a) Adelaide;  
(b) Melbourne;  
(c) Sydney;  
(d) Brisbane;  
(e) Newcastle; and  
(f) Canberra?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) to (f) The figure of 508 cubic metres per service quoted by the member is the gross output from all sources divided by the total number of services, including industrial and commercial users supplied by the Metropolitan Water Board.

Average residential consumption figures per service for 1980-81 are as follows—

	Cubic Metres
Perth	325
Adelaide	350
Melbourne	287
Sydney	364
Brisbane	400
Newcastle	330
Canberra	480

In Perth there is an average of 3.1 persons per residential service.

### PRISONS: PRISONER

#### *Shooting: Inquiry*

2487. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Was an internal inquiry held into the shooting of Mr Howard Coker, now an inmate of Fremantle Prison?
- (2) Was the policeman who shot Mr Coker questioned regarding the shooting?
- (3) If an internal investigation was held, who conducted it?
- (4) Was there a ballistics report?
- (5) If "No" to (4), why?
- (6) Will he table the report?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Inspector Goodman.
- (4) No.
- (5) It was not in dispute who had fired the shot, or which firearm was used.
- (6) Answered by (4).

### EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

#### *Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.: Retrenchments*

2488. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) With respect to the possible retrenchment of work force from Australian Iron & Steel, Kwinana, has his attention been drawn to a newspaper report which suggests that some 300 people may be employed at Alcoa, Kwinana, when they change to a 38-hour week?
- (2) If "Yes", has he any further information than that reported?
- (3) Would he make officers available to—
- (a) check out the possibilities of this action; and
- (b) assist the two companies concerned and the relevant unions to make any transfer as amicable as possible for the affected work force?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) I am aware of the suggested Alcoa work force figures; however, the Alcoa 36-hour week question is still



under consideration by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

I have already discussed the likely retrenchment from Australian Iron and Steel with the State manager of that company and arrangements are in hand for officers of the Department of Labour and Industry and the Commonwealth Employment Service to immediately begin exploring possible avenues of alternative employment and/or training. This would include any prospects of employment of Alcoa.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.: Apprentices*

2489. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Has he been advised in his official capacity of the likely problem of some 50 apprentices at Australian Iron & Steel, Kwinana, who may have their contracts terminated at the end of this year because of the proposed blast furnace turndown?
- (2) Whether "Yes" or "No", will he make officers available from his department to discuss with the company, work for the apprentices in order to protect their interests?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I have already had discussions with the Manager of Australian Iron and Steel in connection with this matter. Officers of the Department of Labour and Industry are currently liaising with the company and the Commonwealth Employment Service in an effort to find alternative training and employment for these apprentices.

## HOUSING

### *Kwinana Area*

2490. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

What sums have been budgeted this financial year for—

- (a) new construction;
- (b) maintenance,

on dwellings in the Kwinana area?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (a) In view of vacant rental accommodation in the Kwinana area the commission has not programmed to construct any additional housing in this area in the financial year 1981-82;
- (b) the maintenance budget for 1981-82 is in excess of \$500 000 and includes external painting and repair to approximately 280 units.

## POLICE: VICE SQUAD

### *Committee*

2491. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is there a committee to tender advice to the vice squad and which includes members of the public?
- (2) If so, who are the members of the committee?
- (3) Is there any statutory basis for the committee?
- (4) Within which parameters does the committee operate?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

## WATER RESOURCES: DAMS

### *Marrinup Brook*

2492. Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Are there any plans in the foreseeable future to dam Marrinup Brook?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Preliminary investigations have been made of the feasibility of developing Marrinup Brook for water supply. There are no plans for its development in the foreseeable future.

### EDUCATION: COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTEL

#### *Katanning*

2493. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the years 1978 to 1981, how much has been spent on extending accommodation at the Katanning High School hostel?
- (2) How many extra students are, or will be, accommodated by the extensions?
- (3) Why was the surplus hostel accommodation at Albany not utilised before extending accommodation at Katanning?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) \$51 942.48 has been spent on upgrading existing facilities, but no money has been spent on extending student accommodation.
- (3) Lack of support by families, living closer to Katanning, is believed to be the reason.

### WATER RESOURCES AND SEWERAGE: CHARGES

#### *Melville Glades Golf Club*

2494. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Does the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board have an account for the Melville Glades Golf Club?
- (2) On what basis are charges for—
  - (a) sewerage;
  - (b) water,
 made to the golf club?
- (3) How much has the club paid to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board in—
  - (a) sewerage charges;
  - (b) water charges,
 of all types in each of the last five years?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Not charged; sewer not available;
- (b) non-ratable.

(3) (a) Not applicable;

(b)	\$
1976-77	476.52
1977-78	259.99
1978-79	311.51
1979-80	463.81
1980-81	567.68.

### SHIPPING: JAPAN

#### *North-West Shelf: Liquid Petroleum Gas*

2495. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Is it yet clear who will control the shipping of north-west liquid petroleum gas to Japan?
- (2) If "Yes", who will control it?
- (3) If "No", what is the position on this matter?
- (4) Who will own the seven tankers?
- (5) How many, and which, of these will be manned by Australian crews?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) A permit to export liquefied petroleum gas to Japan has not yet been granted. Only LPG which does not find a market in Australia would be available for export.
- (2) to (5) Not applicable.

### BOATS

#### *Carnarvon Yacht Club*

2496. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Did the Public Works Department refuse to allow the Carnarvon community to dredge a channel through the fascine at Carnarvon to the yacht club?
- (2) In view of the plan being well known in Carnarvon, why did the Public Works Department not inform the committee responsible until after they had launched a dredge costing \$12 000?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No. The Public Works Department only advised the fascine improvement committee that it would not recommend to the relevant authorities that approval be granted to dredge a channel in some areas of the south arm of the Gascoyne River.

- (2) The Carnarvon community was strongly advised against dredging this channel to the ocean, in a report presented to the Shire of Carnarvon by its consultants in October 1980. Furthermore, on each occasion that the Public Works Department was approached by the fascine improvement committee the committee was advised that approvals of the relevant authorities should be obtained before dredging is allowed to proceed.

## RECREATION: DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH, SPORT AND RECREATION

### *Programmes for Elderly People*

2497. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs and Recreation:

- (1) What adult programmes offered by the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation are open to elderly people?
- (2) What special programmes are offered by the department, for elderly people?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Recreation advisers attached to local authorities assist with senior citizen centres, cultural and hobby groups, and a wide range of community organisations offering sporting and recreation activities open to adults, including the elderly.
- (2) The department provides an annual grant to support retirement planning programmes conducted by the Council on Age (WA). Departmental staff assist with regular community based pre-retirement seminars and contribute to the development of resource materials.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

### *Child Care Centres*

2498. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) When does the Government hope to be able to introduce changes to legislation governing the operation of child care centres in Western Australia?
- (2) What consultative process has been established to allow for the sampling of community views leading up to the formulation of such legislation?

- (3) Is the Government concerned to see an extension of the number of centres available to meet a perceived increase in demand and need for such facilities?
- (4) Is the Government considering the introduction of a means test for parents enrolling children at day care centres and an increase in the ratio of the number of children to each day care staff member as part of the changes?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) In the next session of Parliament.
- (2) Proposals concerning this legislation are being circulated this week to interested persons and organisations for comment. Copies of proposals are available on request.
- (3) The Government would expect day care services to increase in response to an increased demand and need for such facilities.
- (4) Part (1)  
The State is not involved in the financial aspects of day care services.  
The Department of Social Security, Office of Child Care, funds some day care centres under the provisions of the Child Care Act 1972 and family day care schemes under the provisions of the children's services programme. Subsidised fees are available to parents in need. These services apply a means test to parents who may be eligible for subsidy.  
Part (2)  
No. Current proposals include provision for a 1 : 4 ratio of staff instead of the present 1 : 5 ratio for children under three years of age.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE: EMERGENCY RELIEF

### *Guidelines*

2499. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) What are the specific guidelines used by his department in assessing a person's eligibility for emergency assistance?
- (2) Are any particular circumstances given special priority?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what are these circumstances?
- (4) What is the maximum amount paid?
- (5) What was the average payment in—

- (a) 1979-80;
- (b) 1980-81?
- (6) Are applicants required to complete forms before being granted assistance?
- (7) If "Yes" to (6), will he please table the standard form used?
- (8) Who determines the amount of aid to be paid?
- (9) Is such assistance paid on a once only basis?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Emergency assistance is available to indigent persons who are temporarily incapable of providing for their day-to-day sustenance. Persons assisted must have a basic and pressing material need that they are unable to provide for from their own resources or from any other source. Section 8 of the Welfare & Assistance Act 1961 gives this authority. Specific guidelines used are—

The number and ages of the applicants' dependants.

The extent of the destitution or crisis.

The absence of funds or the severely restricted income of the applicants.

The applicant's eligibility for assistance from other sources.

- (2) Yes.
- (3) Absence of basic food and shelter. The health of the applicant or his dependants.
- (4) There is no maximum stipulated. Payments are based on the needs and relative circumstances of the emergency in each particular case.
- (5) (a) 1979-80—\$46.15.  
(b) 1980-81—\$43.46.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) Form 2 attached for tabling.
- (8) In requests for basic and urgent needs in order to facilitate immediate delivery of assistance, the local field officer or relief officer receiving the application is enabled to determine the amount of assistance extended.  
The appropriateness of action taken in each case is later reviewed by senior officers.  
In unusual situations the local field officer or relief officer must seek prior approval from a senior officer.

- (9) No. Further payments may be made depending on the circumstances of the crisis.

*The paper was tabled (see paper No. 566).*

## HOUSING: LAND

*Balga, Girrawheen, Koondoola, and Nollamara*

2500. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

On which particular lots will the State Housing Commission be building homes for purchase in the following suburbs this financial year:

- (a) Girrawheen;
- (b) Balga;
- (c) Koondoola;
- (d) Nollamara?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (a) to (d) It is commission policy not to disclose these details.

## HOUSING: ABORIGINES

*Cullacabardec Village*

2501. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Was it part of the original understanding in establishing Cullacabardec Village that a three-year lease was to have been signed when the village was handed over last year?
- (2) If "Yes", why was such a lease not signed?
- (3) Is it a fact that the State Housing Commission is considering a proposal for a 50-year lease on the village with an option to extend for a further 50 years?
- (4) Is the commission committed to consulting with existing residents of the village before building more houses in the vicinity?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It was first necessary for the land to be vested under the responsibility of the Minister for Community Welfare. The lease conditions are now being drawn up and formalised.
- (3) No.
- (4) Community leaders are consulted prior to decisions affecting the community.

# HOUSING: ABORIGINAL HOUSING BOARD

## Allocations

2502. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

Can he explain the apparent discrepancy that exists between the figure of 1 300 given for the stock of Aboriginal housing in his answer to question 2257 of 1981, and that given in the 1980 annual report of the State Housing Commission where the figure quoted for housing stock is 1 480, especially as his answer to question 2139 of 1981 implies that 143 houses were built in 1980-81?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

The answer to question 2257 listed (a) metropolitan Perth stock as 490 units and (b) country area stock as 810 units. Due to the way the question was framed stock available in the north-west and Kimberley was excluded.

The total stock available throughout the State under the control of the Aboriginal housing scheme is as follows—

Metropolitan Perth	490 units
Country area	810 units
North-west and Kimberley	363 units
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1 663 units</b>

The number of houses in the total stock of houses includes houses constructed, buy-ins less any units demolished.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

### Officers: Field Division

2503. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) How many of each of the following categories of officers are employed in the field division of his department:

- social work supervisors;
- psychologists;
- social workers;
- graduate welfare officers;
- family welfare officers;
- homemakers;
- welfare assistants?

(2) (a) In which other divisions of his department are the 179 homemakers and 63 welfare assistants who are listed separately in item 1 of the department's estimates employed; and

(b) what number of each category is employed in each of these divisions?

(3) With respect to the 31 currently vacant field items referred to in his answer to part (2) of question 2429 of 1981—

(a) in which positions do these vacancies exist;

(b) in which offices, including the head office and regional offices, do these vacancies exist and how many of the vacancies exist in each office for each category;

(c) what stage has been reached in filling these vacancies?

Mr HASSELL replied:

As at 2 November 1981—

- |                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| (1) (a) Social work supervisor | 22   |
| (b) Psychologists              | 14   |
| (c) Social workers             | 52   |
| (d) Graduate welfare officers  | 34   |
| (e) Family welfare officers    | 19   |
| (f) Homemakers                 | 174* |
| (g) Welfare assistants         | 63*  |

\*Total for all divisions distributed as shown below in (2)(a) and (b).

(2) (a) and (b) All homemakers and Welfare Assistants are under the control of the field division at various locations and regions throughout the State. They are shown separately in the estimates as they are part-time employees. Details of their location are given hereunder—

Division	Home-makers	Welfare Assistants
Great Southern	12	3
South-west	18	3
Central	11	4
Goldfields	9	6
Murchison	21	4
Pilbara	17	5
Kimberley	13	—
Adoptions	—	1
Children's Protection Services	7	2
Nyandi	3	—
Furniture store	3	—
Mirrabeeka	7	4
Belmont	8	3
Fremantle	2	3
Rockingham	8	3
Midland	8	3
Innaloo	4	4
Perth	2	4
Aboriginal Accommodation Service	3	—
Victoria Park	7	8
Parent education assistance project	11	—

- (3) (a) and (b) Referring to question 2429 of 1981, 31 field items referred to were those vacant at the time of the estimates (i.e. 1/7/1981) and in the context of the question, it referred to the financial allocation to provide for those items. This number varies from time to time throughout the year. As at 2 November 1981, 20 field items were vacant. Details are as follows—

Category	Location	Division
Senior social work supervisor	Head office	Field
Executive officer	Head office	Children's panel
Senior family liaison officer	Head office	Field Liaison
Social worker	Perth	Perth
Social Worker	Fremantle	Fremantle
Social worker	Midland	Midland
Senior social worker	Adoptions	Adoptions
Social worker	Mirrabeeka	Mirrabeeka
Social worker	Child life protection unit	Children's protection services
Social worker	Head Office	Drug abuse prevention
Graduate welfare officer	Laverton	Goldfields
Graduate welfare officer	Derby	Kimberley
District officer	Broome	Kimberley
Division	Homemakers	Welfare Assistants
District officer	Kalgoorlie	Goldfields
District officer	Norseman	Goldfields
District officer	Halls Creek	Kimberley
District officer	Fitzroy Crossing	Kimberley
Youth activities officer	Head office	Youth activities
Divisional assistant	Head office	Head office

(c) The above vacancies are at various stages of being filled.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION: DECISION

#### *State Awards: Increase*

717. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Is the Government planning legislation following the announcement of the Industrial Commissioner's decision to award a general increase of more than \$6 to employees working under State awards?
- (2) If "Yes", what is the general purpose of such legislation?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) No consideration has been given to this matter.

### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

#### *Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.: Apprentices*

718. Mr BARNETT, to the Deputy Premier:

My question relates to the problems experienced by Australian Iron and

Steel Pty. Ltd. with its blast furnace, and it is as follows—

- (1) Is the Deputy Premier aware that AIS issued notices to apprentices—apart from the other 700 workers—indicating that first-year apprentices will have to finish up with AIS in December this year and that the second and third-year apprentices will be allowed to continue until April of next year, if, and only if, the blast furnace continues with its limited run?
- (2) Is he further aware that fourth-year apprentices will have their exams earlier and will be able to finish up and become tradesmen?
- (3) Does the Deputy Premier know how many apprentices are involved and what the Government will be doing to ensure they are employed in other industries?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes, I am aware of the position. Last week I had discussions at my office with the Manager of AIS and the head of my department (Mr Colcutt). We considered the difficulties, and arrangements were made for Mr Colcutt to go there to discuss the placement of the apprentices in general industry. I believe the number of apprentices concerned is just over 100; it could be 104 or 105.

### CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING LTD.

#### *Take-over: Mr Tuckey*

719. Mr PEARCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the Premier put his signature to a document sent out to people in the O'Connor Federal division in this State's electorate of the Federal Parliament which was countersigned by Mr Wilson Tuckey, MHR, and which included a letter from the secretary of the O'Connor division of the Liberal Party, together with extracts of two speeches made by the member for O'Connor (Mr Tuckey) dealing with the feasibility of the takeover of CBH and the problems in the operation of shipping enterprises?

- (2) Does the Premier's signature to that document demonstrate support from the Premier for Mr Tuckey's programme?
- (3) If it does not, what action does the Premier intend to take to repudiate the action of his signature appearing on the document?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) My signature does appear on a brochure put out by the O'Connor division regarding a promotion programme proposed by the Liberal Party and that had my full authority.

It is a very simple and straightforward brochure, and one I have no reason to question. My signature does appear on that document.

With regard to the copies of Federal *Hansard*, containing the speech of Wilson Tuckey to which I gather the member for Gosnells referred, that matter has nothing to do with the brochure, or with me. I can hardly imagine anyone relating the brochure, to which I was a party, to the comments made by Mr Tuckey and recorded in *Hansard*, or otherwise, regarding the shipping problems.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: OIL

##### *Refinery: BP*

720. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the BP refinery at Kwinana is to operate at a lower than previously operating level of capacity?
- (2) What implications does this have for the Kwinana area generally?
- (3) Has the Premier any reason to believe that the BP Kwinana refinery may be winding down its operations?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) I have no reason to believe that the BP refinery will wind down its operations. The company has a large investment and an efficient refinery. On the contrary, it has been kept modernised with a number of programmes over the years.

Mr Brian Burke: AIS just reviewed it blast furnace.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is not relevant at all.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Of course it is.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The relativity between the AIS blast furnace and the market for the products of the blast furnaces has no relevance whatsoever to the oil refinery.

In my experience as Minister for Industrial Development and as Premier, I found that BP very wisely kept its refinery modernised—at great cost and as it should—because it is a continuing investment and operation.

I have no reason to suspect that BP would want to wind down its operations to any greater degree, or any lesser degree, as the case may be, to meet its commitments in this community — commitments it has met extremely well.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition that commitments have not been made easier for the company to meet by the actions of certain maritime unions.

#### MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

##### *Absence from Chamber*

721. Mr GRILL, to the Premier:

- (1) Why is the Premier's Minister for Resources Development, Mines, and Fuel and Energy almost consistently absent from the Chamber of late, during question time?
- (2) What is the Government trying to hide by shielding the Minister in this way?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Mr Grill: Look at your records before you answer.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I should treat the member for Yilgarn-Dundas' question with contempt.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is what it deserves.

Mr Pearce: He was never here when he was the Minister for Education, either.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The answer is as follows—

- (1) and (2) The Minister is not only a very capable Minister, he is also an extremely hard-working Minister. He works a jolly sight harder and better than does the member for Yilgarn-Dundas. The Minister is absent for good reason; and with my knowledge, he is acting in the best interests of the State.

## TRANSPORT: AIR

### *Amity Aviation*

722. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that there is currently no agent appointed in Halls Creek to handle bookings for Amity Aviation which has been awarded the contract for the Kimberley RPT service, and that passengers have no alternative but to proceed to the airport and take potluck as to whether they will be allocated a seat on the five-seater aircraft?
- (2) Could the Minister advise whether he has any intention of ensuring that proper booking facilities are made available to those passengers who wish to contact the airline to make travel arrangements?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware that there have been difficulties. I understand these have been resolved and that there is an official agent for Amity Aviation for the transport of passengers and freight between Halls Creek and Derby.

## LAND: RESUMPTION

### *Lord Street*

723. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called for order on a number of occasions and having allowed a certain amount of frivolity, I suggest to members on the Government side that they ought to allow the same degree of tolerance to

the member for Perth as is allowed to Ministers when they answer questions.

Mr TERRY BURKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is as follows—

Would the Minister please provide full details of the proposals for resumption of land for road widening in Lord Street, Perth as follows—

- (1) When was it first resolved to resume land in Lord Street and what were the details?
- (2) When was it resolved to resume 12 metres from the eastern side of Lord Street?
- (3) Would she please provide full details of the basis on which it was decided to resume from the eastern side only and table copies of any reports prepared for her department?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) A section of Lord Street between Bulwer Street and the Mt. Lawley subway was reserved as "important regional road" in the metropolitan region scheme — MRS — when the scheme was promulgated on 30 October 1963. The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has never resumed land along this section of Lord Street.
- (2) There has never been a resolution by the MRPA to resume 12 metres from the eastern side of Lord Street. However on 22 April 1981, the authority resolved to amend the MRS to include that section of Lord Street from the city northern bypass to Bulwer Street as an important regional road with a proposed 12 metre widening on the eastern side. As a consequence, Claisebrook Road is now proposed to be deleted from the scheme as an important regional road.
- (3) The amendment would—  
affect less properties;  
considerably reduce the cost of relocating public utility services;  
and,  
lots on the eastern side of Lord Street are relatively deep and a large number of them are served by a right-of-way at the rear.

The amendment also provides a better transportation solution than the use of Claisebrook Road where approximately 36 properties are no longer affected. I am not prepared to table reports at this



time since procedures require details of the amendment to be submitted by the authority to the Minister for approval by the Governor and for eventual tabling in both Houses of Parliament.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT: UNIFORM BUILDING BY-LAWS

*Appeal: M. and J. Cooper*

724. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Local Government:

Has the Minister received an appeal from J. Cooper under the Local Government Act, section 347 and, if so, will the Minister advise if it is her intention to uphold the appeal or, alternatively, to instruct the MRPA to take legal action against J. Cooper?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

An appeal has been received from M. and J. Cooper under section 374 of the Local Government Act.

The appeal is in relation to council's refusal to issue a building licence and the refusal concerns contravention of Uniform Building By-laws and certain provisions of the Shire of Swan's Town Planning Scheme No. 1, and will be dealt with accordingly.

I cannot understand the reference to the instructions of the MRPA. I do not instruct the MRPA; sometimes I request it to consider a matter. Appeals of this sort, have nothing to do with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

- (2) If he is aware of that fact, will he advise this House of any actions he and his Government intend to take to alleviate the problems that region will experience when the number of unemployed will be increased?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister for Labour and Industry, together with other relevant Ministers, has interested himself in the potential increase in unemployed persons, if the decision is to not relight the furnace, as distinct from the proposal to extend it for some five months while other negotiations take place.

All members can be assured that not only myself and the Ministers concerned, but also other employers have been involved in efforts to evaluate the position of these people. We do not regard the situation with any joy. We are sad that the markets which have kept this blast furnace going for so long have dried up, and also we are sad that our cost structure in Australia is becoming so prohibitive that we will find it increasingly difficult to enter other markets.

#### DEFENCE FORCE: NORTH-WEST

*Roads and Railways*

726. Mr GRILL, to the Premier:

The Premier's call for the setting up of a permanent defence force in the north-west is noted. My question is as follows—

- (1) Would the Premier agree that such a force would not be viable during times of conflict unless it could be supported, re-equipped, reinforced, and resupplied from the major defence bases in the Eastern States?
- (2) As the shortest viable railway and road links from those major Eastern States bases to the Pilbara and the north-west are through the eastern goldfields, would the Premier agree that a sealed all-weather road from Kalgoorlie to the Pilbara is a necessity on strategic grounds?

#### EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

*Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.:  
Retrenchments*

725. Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

The Premier would be aware that a number in excess of 700 people who are employed by AIS are to be thrown into the ranks of the unemployed. My question is as follows—

- (1) Is the Premier aware that unemployment in Rockingham-Kwinana at the moment is in the vicinity of 1 300 to 2 000 persons?

- (3) If the Premier agrees, why has his Government consistently refused to commit itself to build such a road?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) I do not accept that the type of road and transport system to which the member refers is a basic necessity for the resupply of the type of force we have in mind. A modern force is quite different from the old conventional-type force of which most people think, the type which was used in World War II, and the resupply situation is quite different also.

I am quite certain that if the Commonwealth Government accepts responsibility for such a force—and I sincerely hope it does—not only would it be in the most modern form, but also it would be the most mobile and versatile force possible, with a built-in resupply facility. One should not get the idea that we must have an extensive railway or road system behind a force of this kind. Far from it today. We always advocated the standardisation—

Mr Brian Burke: We haven't got any ships.

Mr Bryce: Submarines.

Mr Brian Burke: Or planes.

Mr Bryce: We have one patrol boat.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When we advocated the standardisation of the east-west railway as a defence measure, we found that was no argument at all. The only way we managed to achieve the standardisation of the rail gauge from one side of Australia to the other was on a straightout economic basis.

Mr Grill: You are aware of "Projects 81," aren't you, that recently came to the Pilbara and the eastern goldfields to deal with this question?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am aware of the advocacy that has gone on for years about the road north from Kalgoorlie and the railway line from the south to the north, to link up with the iron ore railways of the north.

These projects are being studied, and I cannot foreshadow whether funds will be made available for them. However, they would not be the main basis for sustaining the type of force we have in mind for the north.

## EDUCATION: FOUR-YEAR-OLDS

### Policy

727. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Education:

Is it true that the Government is reconsidering its previous position in respect of the funding of pre-school education with a view to abandoning its policy that playgroups are desirable for four-year-olds, and continuing the existing arrangements?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The answer is "No". Certainly we are not planning to put aside our stand in support of playgroups because we feel they fulfil a very real need in the early childhood scene. The Leader of the Opposition might know that since 1977 we have had a policy, to which we are adhering, that provides for the State to take responsibility for all children who, at the beginning of a year, are four years old. We are prepared to provide pre-school or pre-primary education for them. Over the years some pre-schools have been enrolling these young children, and this has presented a difficulty. We are examining every possible means of reducing costs in order that we can assist those pre-school centres to continue to operate.

I have had a series of discussions with representatives of early childhood groups. We have written to every pre-school group in the State seeking response to the various options we put forward. If those options are not acceptable, then we will seek their suggestions to assist us to formulate some sort of—

Mr Brian Burke: When you asked for suggestions, was one of the suggestions to continue with the present system?

Mr GRAYDEN: We have received 46 replies from groups that have attempted to put forward constructive suggestions. The suggestions are being evaluated at the moment. Some of the proposals are very practical. The groups have replied in terms of making the maximum use of our existing pre-primary centres. Certainly we will give consideration to this aspect. If we have vacancies in our pre-primary centres, we will do our best to fill those vacancies with younger

children. Instead of taking the children of three years and one day at the beginning of the year, we could do what the other States are doing—not in pre-schools I might say, but in other ways—and take children who are 3½ years of age.

Mr Davies: I bet he couldn't repeat that.

Mr GRAYDEN: It has been suggested that the parent groups and pre-schools would be happy to contribute towards the cost of—

Mr Brian Burke: Motorcars!

Mr GRAYDEN: —facilities which they are not meeting at the present time. Similarly, in respect of the pre-primary centres, some of the groups are prepared to do the gardening and cleaning, and possibly to take over the duties of aides. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will evaluate the suggestions very carefully because we are most sympathetic to all the pre-school groups.

Mr Brian Burke: Before you close them down!

Mr GRAYDEN: I am even contemplating putting forward a recommendation for a child advisory council.

Mr Brian Burke: You just abolished it—the pre-school board.

Mr GRAYDEN: That was several years ago. We are talking in terms of a different group representing the community, local government, various Government departments, such as health and education.

Mr Wilson: Parents?

Mr GRAYDEN: We will formulate long-term plans—

Mr Brian Burke: To do the gardening.

Mr GRAYDEN: —which will be suitable for the 1980s in respect of this particular group. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that we are evaluating these proposals extremely carefully in an effort to overcome the problem with which we are confronted at the moment.

## LAND: FOREIGN INVESTMENT

### *Committee*

728. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Can the Premier tell me what progress has been made by the committee appointed to inquire into foreign ownership of land in Western Australia?
- (2) When is the report likely to be made available?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The Cabinet committee set up to inquire into this matter and the officers appointed to assist the committee are undertaking the work on a continuing basis. There has been increased consultation with the Commonwealth Government. On my last inquiry it was moving along as I hoped it would, and as I am sure it will. The Leader of the Opposition is always guffawing—

Mr Brian Burke: Whenever you do not know the answer to a question you say that things are going along as you thought they would.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition shows how childish he is, instead of being a responsible person—

Mr Brian Burke: I'd rather be childish than senile.

Sir CHARLES COURT: As the member who asked the question will realise from some of the comments made in the Eastern States in the last three or four days, it is not just as easy as bringing down an edict saying what we will and will not do in regard to the foreign ownership of land.

It must be properly evaluated. Even some of the Eastern States great critics of foreign ownership are starting to admit it probably is not as important, severe, or at such a scale as they originally thought. The Government is moving sensibly in the matter in close consultation with the Commonwealth and, where necessary, co-operating with other States as well.

## EDUCATION: FOUR-YEAR-OLDS

*Policy*

729. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does he intend to continue to implement the Premier's original election undertaking to the people of Western Australia that his Government would reduce the age at which children enter primary-school to the year in which they turned five?
- (2) Is it not a fact that if the Minister implemented that part of the Premier's undertaking it would release a significant amount of Commonwealth money for four-year-olds?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not quite clear what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is talking about.

Mr Bryce: Don't you remember the Premier promised the people of Western Australia he would reduce the age at which pre-school children commenced primary school to the year in which they turned five?

Mr Clarko: What do you think pre-primary school is?

Mr Sibson: It was done five years ago.

Mr Bryce: No, that is not school; it is not covered by the Education Act.

Mr GRAYDEN: I do not understand what the member is speaking about, therefore I suggest he place his question on notice.

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) At the moment, two proposals have been put forward which would appear to save the Government the sum of money referred to in the Budget and at the same time, retain the Claremont Teachers College. Both those proposals are being thoroughly investigated this week in the hope a decision can be made next week.

## FRUIT: FRUIT FLY

*Biological Control*

731. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Has the attempt at the biological control of fruit fly in the Carnarvon area proved to be a success?

Sir Charles Court: That question smacks of sexual discrimination.

Mr OLD replied:

The results are proving to be very promising. At this stage, it is too early to give any undertaking that the programme can be applied elsewhere; it will not be until the exercise is completed that we will know whether the programme can be extended. I understand that surveys currently being carried out indicate it is very hard to find active fruit fly within the townsite of Carnarvon, which would indicate the system is working as effectively as we thought it would, and as the earlier tests indicated.

## EDUCATION: TECHNICAL

*College: Claremont*

730. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Government reversed its decision to close the Claremont Technical College?
- (2) If so, on what conditions?

## EDUCATION: FOUR-YEAR-OLDS

*Policy*

732. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Does he recall promising the people of Western Australia that his Government would reduce the age at which students entered primary school to the year in which they turned five?
- (2) Will he indicate when he believes that promise will be honoured?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I listened to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's question to the Minister for Education with some amazement and bewilderment.

Mr Bryce: Haven't you read the Education Act lately?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I listened to his question to me with the same amazement and bewilderment. If the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition really wants to pursue his question, he should place it on the notice paper, either to me, or the Minister for Education, or to both, and he will receive a very sensible, sane answer to remind him of some homework he should have done.

Mr Bryce: That means you cannot answer the question.

