

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 17th May, 1979

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS: PUBLICATION

### *Statement by Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Thompson): I wish to inform members that, commencing with the beginning of the next part of this session, a new system for the publication of questions and answers is to be followed.

Under the present system the questions on notice and their respective answers have been published first in the *Votes and Proceedings* and then subsequently appear in the weekly *Hansard*. This system has resulted in frequent delays to the publishing of *Votes and Proceedings*.

In the new proposal, questions and answers will be published in a separate daily leaflet as an "extract" from *Hansard*. This leaflet will contain the questions and answers of both Houses and, under normal circumstances, will be available on the day following the answering of the questions in the House. All questions and answers will again appear in the following weekly *Hansard*.

One of the important objectives of the system is to include questions without notice in the leaflet. However, this will depend on the ability of the Government Printer to phase all of this work onto new computer type setting equipment and may not be achieved immediately.

It is expected that this system will bring about an improved service to members and, at the same time, considerably ease the difficulties now faced by the officers of the House and the Government Printer, in producing the *Votes and Proceedings*. It is anticipated that there will be no higher printing cost involved and it is even hoped that some savings will be made.

The questions on notice will continue to be printed on the Notice Paper. The alteration affects only the *Votes and Proceedings*.

The proposal has been examined and approved by the Standing Orders Committees of both Houses and the Joint Printing Committee.

## EDUCATION: SCHOOL YEAR

### *Alteration: Petition*

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.20 p.m.]: I have a petition

addressed to the Hon. the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled. It reads—

We, the undersigned teachers of Victoria Park School, Millen Primary School and Lathlain Primary School object to the proposed alterations to the school year as contained in amendments to Regulations 171 and 193 of the Education Act 1928-1977 and published in the Government Gazette of the 29th September 1978.

We ask that the school year return to the status quo prior to the introduction of the amendments mentioned above.

The petition contains the prayer, and 41 signatures. I have certified that 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. 72.*

## RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

### *Closure: Petition*

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.21 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed to the Hon. the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled. It reads—

We, the undersigned—

1. PROTEST at the decision to withdraw the Perth-Fremantle passenger rail service and the subsequent dismantling of the Perth-Fremantle railway;
2. Are AMAZED that such a major and important decision affecting tens of thousands of people should be taken so arbitrarily;
3. DEPLORE the Government's short-sighted expediency. At a time when the rest of the world is turning to electric rail systems, we are turning to transport systems which use oil, a diminishing energy source;
4. ASSERT that buses will not offer an equivalent service particularly for people with children and babies in prams, shoppers with bulky parcels, for young people travelling to the beaches, and for many elderly people:

We, the undersigned, REQUEST the Government to:

- (a) REVERSE its decision to withdraw the railway passenger service between Perth and Fremantle;
- (b) UPGRADE the system to encourage more passengers to use the trains;
- (c) RATIONALISE existing bus and train services so that they complement each other rather than compete with one another;
- (d) UNDERTAKE immediately steps to investigate the possibility of electrifying the railway system in accord with world trends.

The petition bears 761 signatures. As far as we can ascertain, they are perfectly genuine signatures. The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the House and I certify accordingly.

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

*See petition No. 73.*

### RUBBISH DISPOSAL

#### *Swan Shire Site: Petition*

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [2.23 p.m.]: I desire to present a petition couched in the following terms—

We, the undersigned:

1. Ask that the Helena River and thence the River Swan be protected from noxious leaching by quashing a proposal by the Perth City Council to dump its rubbish on Lot 2 Helena Valley Road, Helena Valley.
2. Ask that the Eastern Corridor Study, made for the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority with enormous public participation, which affords a special status to the Helena River Valley, be fully supported by quashing the proposal.
3. Ask that the Perth City Council be prevented from forcing a rubbish dump on to the Mundaring Shire against the will of that Council.
4. Ask that any deadline imposed on the Perth City Council be lifted to give it a further opportunity to produce an environmentally sensitive and modern solution.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 3 791 signatures and I have certified that 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. 74.*

### ABORIGINES: NOONKANBAH STATION

#### *Mining by CRA and Amax: Petition*

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.24 p.m.]: I have here a petition on an Aboriginal message board, which I understand is the highest form of communication among the Aboriginal people. It is in the Walmajari language and I have a translation of it, accompanied by the following letter—

To: The Member of Parliament  
presenting the petition from  
the people at Noonkanbah Station.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I certify that the English translation accompanying this petition is correct.

I myself am a full blood Walmajari Aboriginal and I have studied with the Wycliffe Bible Translators and the Summer Institute of Linguistics for two years. In that time I have become literate in my own language and have studied translation skills.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Olive Bieundurry.

The translation accompanying that letter reads—

We are sending this letter to you important people who can speak and who are now sitting down, talking in the big house.

We Aboriginal people of Noonkanbah Station are sending this letter. We truthfully beg you important people that you stop these people, namely C.R.A. and Amax, who are going into our land, which is at Noonkanbah.

These people have already made the place no good with their bulldozers. Our sacred places they have made no good. They mess up our land. They expose our sacred objects. This breaks our spirit. We lose ourselves as a people. What will we as a people do if these people continue to make all our land no good?

Today we beg you that you will truly stop them.

Mr O'Connor: Is Noonkanbah a pastoral lease?

Mr DAVIES: I understand it is.

This is most unusual. I do not know whether it has happened before in this Parliament. We

should feel honoured that the Aboriginal people have elected to petition us in this way. I hope all members will have a look at the petition and note its historic significance and the importance of the occasion, and we certainly hope the Government will take some notice of the petition. I present the message board, the translation, and the covering letter.

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

*See petition No. 75.*

## ROAD

### *Grand Promenade-Yirrigan Drive: Petition*

MR WILSON (Dianella) [2.27 p.m.]: I present a petition from 178 citizens of Western Australia in the following terms—

We the undersigned, citizens of Western Australia, wish to express our deep concern regarding the proposal by the State Housing Commission to develop a major new road link between Yirrigan Drive and Grand Promenade in Dianella without providing any opportunity for public comment.

We call on the Government through the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning to ensure that the Town Planning Board provides well advertised opportunity for such public comment prior to any final decision to approve the proposal.

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

The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly and I have certified accordingly.

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

*See petition No. 76.*

## FREMANTLE-PERTH BUS AND RAIL TRANSPORT: DOCUMENTS

### *Appointment of Select Committee: Standing Orders Suspension*

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.28 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable this House to consider a motion "that in the opinion of this House the Government should appoint a select committee to inquire into and report upon the document 'An Analysis

of Rail and Bus Policies for the Perth-Fremantle Corridor', as released by the Friends of the Railways, and the document released by the Government detailing its rail and bus policies."

The urgency of this matter and the need to suspend Standing Orders are apparent and known to every member of the House. For those who may not know why we are moving with this urgency, the reason is that this sitting of the Parliament is likely to conclude this afternoon or this evening. We have had before us in the last several months probably one of the most contentious propositions put forward by any Government in Western Australia for a very long time; that is, to close that section of the suburban rail services between Perth and Fremantle.

This, naturally enough, has aroused a great deal of concern, worry, furore—call it what one will—amongst a great number of people. It is probably true that many of the people expressing concern at this time might not have ridden on that railway for a long time; and perhaps they might not ride on it in the future. However, that is not good enough reason for the Government to maintain the attitude it has adopted; that is, to say quite categorically that the rail service will close on the 2nd September.

I believe the Government should be cognisant of the events that have taken place since the announcement. A number of meetings have been held in Fremantle and Perth. I understand from a recent Press cutting that a meeting was held in Subiaco at which the Mayor (Mr R. V. Diggins) expressed great concern and announced his intention to approach the Government in respect of this rail service. All kinds of statements have been made in all kinds of situations.

Sir Charles Court: Don't think you should leave this to the motion itself?

Mr DAVIES: Is the Premier going to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders?

Sir Charles Court: Yes, you already have an arrangement with the Deputy Premier.

Mr DAVIES: I apologise for any misunderstanding caused by the pressure of work just before the commencement of this sitting.

It is quite obvious there is an urgent need to debate the matter because the Parliament is likely to conclude the present part of the session this day, and if we do not give consideration to the motion now we will not be able to do so until we resume in July or August.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [2.32 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition

discussed this matter with my deputy in my absence. The arrangement agreed to was that in view of the special circumstances this afternoon and the situation with regard to the session, the Government would agree to the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the motion to be discussed. That was agreed to on the basis that there will be three speeches in support of the motion and a response by the Minister; and the three speeches in support of the motion will be made in approximately one hour which, of course, excludes the time the Minister will take to reply. After that the motion will proceed to a vote.

On that basis and that clear understanding, the Government agrees to the motion.

Motion put.

The SPEAKER: Is there a dissentient voice? As there is no dissentient voice I declare the motion carried with an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

#### *Appointment of Select Committee: Motion*

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.34 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should appoint a select committee to inquire into and report upon the document 'An Analysis of Rail and Bus Policies for the Perth-Fremantle Corridor', as released by the Friends of the Railways, and the document released by the Government detailing its rail and bus policies.

I am sorry if there was a misunderstanding with the Premier regarding how this would be handled. I was unable to contact him before lunch, and it was only just as we were entering the Chamber that agreement was reached on the number of speakers. I can only say that the Opposition certainly will undertake to limit the number of speakers to three; however, I have no control over members on the other side of the House. Indeed, whilst we give an undertaking—and I certainly hope members on this side will support me—let me point out that in no way do I wield a big stick over members of the Opposition. However, I am quite certain they will honour the undertaking.

Sir Charles Court: Let there be no misunderstanding that that arrangement was made in good faith.

MR DAVIES: I made the arrangement in good faith, too. I thought the arrangement was that we would discuss the suspension of Standing Orders with three speakers before the motion was thrown out.

Mr O'Connor: You had an opportunity to refute that before the previous motion went to the vote.

Mr DAVIES: I had no intention of refuting it. However, an undertaking was made and I will do my very best to ensure it is honoured.

Mr O'Connor: You seem to be in reverse at the moment.

Mr Pearce: The Minister is hearing in reverse.

Mr DAVIES: If the Premier wishes to lay down conditions I am quite happy to accept them provided we are given an opportunity to air the situation.

Mr O'Connor: I will not take up your time.

Mr DAVIES: Probably no decision made by this Government has been as controversial as the decision to close the Perth-Fremantle rail service. Passions have been inflamed, statements made, meetings held, undertakings given, and marches and demonstrations have been arranged. All this has occurred on a continuing basis since about the end of January.

I believe the sustained interest over this period indicates plenty of people genuinely feel, for what reasons I do not know, that the rail link should remain. Of course, probably much of the feeling could be discounted and put down to sentiment; and probably other reasons could be found for some of the support. I am certain the Premier would be happy to say that probably the protestors have had many professional protestors amongst them. However, I have no evidence of that, although I have not been very close to the campaign.

Some members of our party have been close to the campaign on a personal basis. They have been happy to co-operate with both the unions concerned and with the Friends of the Railways when they have been asked for co-operation. I have not called them into a session or endeavoured to give them any lead whatsoever.

I believe the time has come for us to have a sincere look at the situation in which we find ourselves. Green bans have been placed on work proposed to be carried out. The Government has said, and the Minister has said on the steps of Parliament House, that the closure will proceed on the 2nd September, and a confrontation situation is developing. Many people have written to the Press, including the Minister himself. Many thousands of people have signed the petition—and I will have a few words to say about that shortly. Those people all feel this is a matter of which the Government should take notice. Whether the protestors have used or are likely to

use the rail service is of little consequence; the Government has a responsibility to do what it considers to be best for the State of Western Australia.

From what I have read I honestly believe the decisions made by the Government have been made on quite a deal of wrong information. I believe too strong a bias has been expressed for road transport and that the reasons given by the Government for its proposed action do not hold water when one considers the latest submission.

Despite all that has happened and all that has been said, we have reached the situation where the only things we have to consider are the two reports which are readily available. The first is a 28-page report which the Minister handed to some people who presented a petition to him some time in April.

Mr Rushton: It was a summary of the background, not a report.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister said to them, "Read this"; and if he wants me to call the document a summary of the background, I will do so. It was supposed to be 28 pages of convincing reasons that the railway line should be closed. Now the Minister calls it a summary of the background, and if it will stop the Minister interrupting me, I will continue to call it that if I can remember to do so. To me it is a report. Irrespective of what it is called, it was supposed to contain convincing reasons as to why the Government's decision was correct. If they are said to be convincing reasons that the Friends of the Railways should accept, then I would submit it is only proper that they should be taken away and analysed.

There were no airy-fairy statements made. The Friends of the Railways did what the Minister asked them to do—take the summary of the background away and see what it contained. In having a look at what it contained, they came to the conclusion that there were good grounds for suggesting that some of the recommendations in the summary of the background were not soundly based. Therefore, FOR prepared, at considerable expense, another document. I say quite sincerely that it was prepared at considerable expense. The members of FOR spent many long hours researching the situation with qualified people. I think I am allowed to call this a document. I should be allowed to call it a report. It is entitled, "The Fremantle Rail Service—An Analysis of Rail and Bus Policies for the Perth-Fremantle Corridor". It is a very impressive document. Unfortunately, I received it only on Monday last, and I have not had the opportunity to digest it. I

honestly think I do not have the capacity to digest it, because I lack specialised knowledge in this field. However, there are plenty of people who have the capacity to do so, and they are within the Government department concerned.

We have reached the situation where we have the report of FOR on the one hand and the summary of the background—the 28-page document which is not a report—which is supposed to constitute the Government's reasons for the action it has taken, on the other hand. I am sure the Government will agree that its document—a summary of the background—is a very proper document, and it is soundly based. The Friends of the Railways also agree that their fine document is able to refute accurately and refute adequately in quite a number of instances the case which has been prepared by the Government.

Who will look at these matters? Who for the Government side has said that he will consider the FOR report closely and will give a decision on it after it has been looked at closely? What would that mean? I have been a Minister, and I know how closely one can look at things, and how they can be treated. It means that the people who gave the reasons in the summary of the background will sit down and say, "Of course, the FOR is wrong and we are right." I realise that in due course the FOR will say, "They are wrong and we are right." In that case, we will never reach a satisfactory situation.

I am suggesting that this Parliament should acknowledge its responsibilities. Because of the serious nature of the situation which has developed, the Parliament should take unto itself the responsibility of inquiring into both documents. A Select Committee would be able to call before it expert witnesses. It would be able to call before it the authors of this document—Mr Richard Grounds, Mr Darryl McCaskell, who is a highly respected railway man and who has recently retired as chief mechanical engineer, and Dr Peter Newman of Murdoch University—or one of the other experts. The Select Committee would be able to question those men in relation to the document. The committee would be able to call additional evidence if it so desired. It could also call before it the authors of the 28-page document called "A Summary of the Background" which contains the essence of the Government's reasoning on the question. With those documents before it, the Select Committee should probably come to a reasonable understanding of the situation.

I took great heart when I thought about moving this motion this morning. Having decided on the

action I would take, I looked through the newspaper and I read, "Wittenoom wants talks". A similar situation has developed there. The Government has said it is right, and the Wittenoom committee has said it is right. There are two reports floating around, but no-one is talking to anybody about them. We cannot come to any understanding as to what might happen. When the information that the Wittenoom committee wanted to talk was conveyed to the Premier he is quoted in *The West Australian* as follows—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, said that the Government would consider any request for talks.

It was encouraging to see that the committee now wanted to confer with the Government.

The Government had consistently pointed out that this was the best way to resolve issues of this kind.

For reasons of its own the committee had previously preferred to act differently.

I am unable to give any information about that; but the Premier is quoted as applauding the fact that the two parties want to talk.

Sir Charles Court: Because we have been seeking talks for a long time. They wanted another method.

Mr DAVIES: I am agreeing with the Premier.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister has adopted the same attitude in relation to the railways. The Friends of the Railways have been welcomed by the Minister into his office. He has conferred at length with them, and encouraged them to make a report.

Mr DAVIES: I could not disagree with the Premier. He cannot bait me today. I am in a most expansive mood.

I am saying that the Premier is reported as applauding the need to conciliate—I suppose that might be the word. It is a term that the Premier does not heed when he is dealing with unions. However, he is prepared to applaud it in the Wittenoom situation.

The Premier has said that the Minister has welcomed the FOR into his office on a number of occasions. I acknowledge that also. They are grateful for the discussions they have had. However, neither side has convinced the other. I believe some outside authority needs to have a look at the evidence that is available.

The proper outside authority in a situation of this nature is the Parliament of Western Australia. Under our Standing Orders, we have

the right to set up committees with certain powers. I am sure there are people within the Parliament who would be pleased to give their time to sitting on such a committee between now and when the Parliament resumes at the end of July. If the Select Committee came down in favour of the Government, bad luck for FOR. If it came down in favour of FOR, bad luck for the Government. Surely there has to be somebody who will consider the situation that is now before us, and ensure that everyone is satisfied. All I am asking the Parliament to do is to establish a Select Committee to satisfy everybody.

As I have said, some fairly wild statements have been made. The one that has been most often reported lately concerns the petition. The Minister now says that more than half of the signatures are bogus. I say that is rubbish. I have had a look at the petition, and it is not half of them.

A lot of the petitions that came through my office have had names ruled out because they were indecipherable. We have taken the precaution. However, the Minister presented a petition to the Parliament, and he signed a certificate indicating that the petition was in order. What was he doing? He was signing a false certificate. He now says the petition is not in order. Is he misleading the Parliament again?

I say that the Minister misled the Parliament the other night. Now it appears that he is starting to make a habit of it, because he signed a certificate indicating that the petition was in order, as I did on three occasions relating to other petitions this afternoon. I did not say, "I think it is only partly in order." I said it was in order. However, the Minister is now saying that the petition he presented is no good.

I certainly do not accept that half the signatures on the petition are not genuine; but if we do accept that, that means that 55 000 people, on the Minister's own admission, took it upon themselves to sign a petition asking the Government to change its mind. If we leave it at that, I think it still indicates the need for a Select Committee to see what is going on.

If members consider the FOR report, they will see at the front of it a statement by the then Minister for Transport in 1969 saying it would be foolish to pull the railways up. The present Minister for Labour and Industry says in a long statement that we have to keep the railways.

If members look at the back of the report they will see the following: in 1969 Mr Knox said the railways should be left; on the 13th April, 1969, in *The Sunday Times*, Mr O'Connor, the Minister

for Transport and Railways, said to leave the railways there; in the *Daily News* of the 9th December, 1974, there is an article dealing with the fact that many people could not see a pageant because there were inadequate bus services for them. It indicates that the railways can best handle the traffic. The article does not say that, but I am putting my own interpretation of what it was supposed to indicate.

On the 4th September, 1976, the Minister for Transport denied that the State Government was planning to withdraw the Perth-Fremantle railway service. On the 13th January, 1977, Mr O'Connor said the railway line was to stay. On the 16th March, 1977, we see the statement, "A transport plan needed including the railways". That statement was attributed to Mr Shea, the Chairman of the MTT. There has been a complete about-face by the Government on this issue.

The Government has taken the latest information on the matter which has been rebutted by the Friends of the Railways. I believe that organisation is right. A lot of hard feelings will be created as a result of the Government's actions in this matter. We should get together and have a look at the situation. It is no good visiting the Minister's office and talking to him. I believe an outside body ought to arbitrate on the matter and the outside body is Parliament. We would be denying our responsibilities if we did not agree to the motion which seeks to appoint a Select Committee so that the matter may be finalised as soon as possible.

**MR MELVER (Avon)** [2.51 p.m.]: It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Government's decision to close the Perth-Fremantle railway line on the 1st September is not receiving a favourable reaction from the majority of the public of Western Australia. Of course, the objections to the closure of the line are gaining momentum.

I believe the Government and the Minister for Transport have done themselves an injustice as a result of the remarks they have made in relation to the matter. Irrespective of the arguments put forward by the Opposition, the Friends of the Railways, or anyone else, the Government has taken no notice and has not even considered the points of view of other people. The Government has decided the railway should be closed come hell or high water. I do not agree with that type of philosophy. It does not form part of our democratic way of life and it highlights the growing arrogance of the Government.

The Minister has made great play of the false names which have appeared on the petition. Of course, this always occurs when people sign petitions. The executive of the Railway Employees Union of Workers is composed of responsible people and it is in fact a responsible body. I can assure you, Sir, that the petitions presented by that organisation are checked thoroughly. I was aware that this petition was to be presented. I had tried to present a petition previously in relation to the Nanutarra-Tom Price Road, but you, Sir, would not accept it because it did not comply with the Standing Orders. I thought the petition relating to the Perth-Fremantle line would have been presented to me, as Opposition spokesman on transport; but that did not occur and in fact the Minister for Transport presented the petition. The Leader of the Opposition has made a very valid point.

I should like to point out that the executives of the Railway Employees Union of Workers checked the petition thoroughly in order to ensure it did not contain the fictitious names to which the Minister referred in his Press statement. I believe we should forget about that matter. The Minister is sidestepping the major issue which is the opposition to the closure of the Perth-Fremantle line.

When we debated this matter previously in the House Government members dispelled the idea that the Opposition was using this matter as a political gimmick, because a large number of the people who oppose the closure are strong followers of the Government and they have voted for it for a long period of time.

The Leader of the Opposition referred previously to the Mayor of Subiaco (Mr Diggins) and I should like to read in full a Press statement released by the Subiaco City Council. It reads as follows—

A Public Meeting was held in the City Hall, Hamersley Road, Subiaco at 8.00 p.m. on Monday evening the 14th May, 1979.

The meeting was under the Chairmanship of His Worship the Mayor of Subiaco, Mr R. V. Diggins J.P. The meeting was attended by eight Councillors of the City of Subiaco. There were 194 members of the public present who signed the attendance record. Of these persons 40 were resident elsewhere than Subiaco.

I pause there to emphasise that 194 people attended the meeting. If members conduct a meeting in a shire, regardless of the issue involved, it is most unlikely that 194 people will attend. However, this is a very contentious

matter. People are strongly opposed to the closure of the line. I do not believe the fact that 194 people attended the meeting should be cast aside, because it indicates the great interest and opposition to the closure. To continue—

The meeting moved two resolutions:

- (1) "This meeting of ratepayers of Subiaco request Council to vigorously oppose the closure of the passenger railway service between Perth and Fremantle and furthermore the Council be requested to convey with urgency the views of this meeting to the Government and to the media."
- (2) "That this meeting appoints the Mayor of Subiaco as spokesman to convey the resolutions of the meeting to the Government and to the media on behalf of the ratepayers and that this action be immediate."

During the same meeting, three Councillors of the City of Subiaco petitioned the Mayor to hold a special meeting of Council to discuss the proposed closure of the railway passenger service between Perth and Fremantle. A special meeting of Council will be held in the near future to discuss the topic.

That meeting was organised by the council in the Liberal Party stronghold of Subiaco. A large number of people attended the meeting. The people in that area have supported the Government strongly for a long time.

I must be honest about the matter. I am delighted the Government is continuing to adopt this policy, because it will do a great deal of damage to the Government's chances of re-election at the next State election.

The Subiaco City Council is one local authority only. The Perth City Council has spoken in favour of the stand taken by the Friends of the Railways and the joint railway executive both of which organisations favour the retention of the line.

When we moved a censure motion on this issue we heard about the amount of money the closure of the line would cost the Fremantle City Council. However, this Government is not worried about that. It is not concerned about the thousands of dollars it will cost the Fremantle City Council. It is not concerned about the views expressed by the Perth City Council. I believe it is time the Government analysed the situation properly and realised how many people in Western Australia are concerned about the closure of the line.

Yesterday an American scientist said it was idiocy to scrap the Perth-Fremantle railway service. I should like to take the Minister to task for the statement which appeared in large headlines in my local paper, the *Northam Advertiser*, today. This statement said that my remarks on railway matters were absolutely absurd.

I do not believe my remarks are absurd, because what I have said continuously in Parliament since the Government announced it would close the line on the 1st September has been supported not only by the people who are directly affected by the closure, but it has been supported strongly also by thousands of other people in Western Australia. It is political claptrap for the Minister to say in the Press that the statements of the Opposition—and particularly my statements—in relation to the matter are absolutely absurd.

Here we have an American scientist who has greater qualifications than I have saying it is idiocy for the Government to support such a move.

Mr Rushton: Are you quoting the people who are in favour of the closure, or otherwise?

Mr McIVER: I am speaking of the overall situation as it was reported in the Press. I have not read the article fully since the details were phoned through to me.

Mr Rushton: Professor Rose advocated that the action we have taken is right.

Mr McIVER: I will quote the newspaper report in full. It reads—

An American scientist said yesterday that it was idiocy to scrap the Fremantle-Perth railway service.

Dr Kenneth Watt said the public would need the service desperately in five or 10 years.

Dr Watt is the professor of zoology and environmental studies at the University of California.

He is in Perth for a conference of the WA division of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science.

The next statement is most relevant. It reads—

He said that because of the increasing cost of oil the State should be moving away from cars rather than encouraging them.

Of course, that is precisely what the Government is doing in this State. The article continues—



Australians had an incorrect idea of the world energy position and the increased cost of extracting oil from the ground at home.

"People don't understand where the car is at," he said.

The queue at petrol stations in California and Hong Kong—and the associated violence—were part of a situation that would get worse.

At every opportunity which has presented itself during debate, the Opposition has been pointing out that Australians do have an incorrect idea of the world energy position.

Hong Kong and California are a long way from here. However, I heard on the national news today that the Federal Minister (Mr Newman) was questioned with regard to fuel supplies. He said the same thing could happen here, or words to that effect. Surely that is a warning. The Minister has said the Opposition is only playing politics in relation to this matter. The Minister has said the Opposition has no alternative policy, but he has also in his statements actually quoted the policy of the Opposition. I doubt very much whether the MTT has a policy or a route worked out even though we are now getting towards the end of May.

The Government is continuing to make statements to the Press in an attempt to feed the people with a little honey to soothe them and to take off the Government the pressure which it is under at this particular time.

I will refer also to the shocking situation which occurred at the Perth Railway Station this time last week. Last Thursday, while the Minister was trying to get the correct figures for his road maintenance tax legislation, he was not able to answer my questions. Those questions appear on the Notice Paper today. I believe the members of this House should know the situation which is occurring with regard to the Perth-Fremantle railway.

A Government department entered into a contract with a subcontractor—whose name escapes me at the moment—to construct a fence around the western end of the Perth Railway Station. The area is to be the bus bay when the proposed policy goes ahead. Not one railway official, from the top to the bottom, knew about the fencing. When a signaller at the western end of the Perth Railway Station observed the subcontractor and his team working, he saw that they were close to the mainline without a flagman in attendance. They were not only placing their own lives in jeopardy, but also the lives of other people. The signaller rang various people in an

attempt to find out what was going on, but nobody could tell him.

It was not long before the official secretary of the railways union (Mr Hanley)—a most judicious and understanding man—asked the subcontractor what was happening. The fence was being constructed around a signal box and a pole, the light on which illuminated the area at night time.

Not even the traffic superintendent, (Mr Pitsikis), knew about the arrangement, and when he came on the scene he wanted to know what was going on. He is the superintendent for Western Australia, and he did not have any idea what was happening. While Mr Hanley was speaking to the subcontractor, the great arm of the law appeared. It did not appear in the person of a constable, but in the form of a superintendent, a sergeant, and another officer. It seems they had been advised there was likely to be a confrontation, and possibly violence. The police were doing their job and they said, "We cannot have this sort of thing, sir."

It was not long before the work was picketed by the union, and everyone is aware of what happened then because of what has appeared in the Press. I am informing the people of the actions of this Government. I am advised that the senior officers of Westrail did not know what the Government intended to do, and that is a shocking indictment of the Government. The action by the Government could have cost lives.

**Mr Rushton: Rubbish!**

**Mr McIVER:** The Minister may call it rubbish, but he should take notice of the safe working regulations which were not adhered to. The Minister says, "Rubbish"; that is what we get from him and it is indicative of the attitude of the Government. It appears the people of Western Australia are considered to be rubbish. We on this side certainly do not agree or go along with that suggestion.

The Minister has claimed that I was ill-advised, but I challenge the Minister to debate this issue at any venue he would like to name. He can bring along all his figures and statistics, all of which mean so little so far as the true situation is concerned. I will debate the matter at any time he desires.

**Mr Skidmore:** That is taking an unfair advantage of the Minister; he could not debate anything.

**Mr McIVER:** I heard a news item this morning which absolutely disgusted me. I did not get the full text of the message, but perhaps by interjection the Premier will correct me if I am

wrong. My understanding of the news item was that the Premier said the people who were opposing this railway closure should be more interested in freight and passengers. Of course, we have to worry about freight and passengers in the economics of Westrail, but also we have to worry about people. People play a very important part in the economics of Western Australia.

I said earlier—but it is worth repeating—the Government believes that with the closure of the railway the people will patronise the buses. However, many people detest buses, and that is the reason they utilise rail services. They do not like to have to struggle onto buses with children and prams and parcels. Actually what the Government will do by closing the railway is force people to use motorcars to an even greater extent than they do now. There will be further congestion in the city.

If the Government had been sincere since it has been in office it would have co-ordinated the transport system. It would have done something about the MTT operating in opposition to Westrail because of the parallel services provided. However, the Government has done nothing about the parallel services since 1974. It has done nothing to divert the MTT buses and encourage people to utilise the Perth-Fremantle railway.

The Government seems to be concerned only with the drop-off in the number of passengers on the Perth-Fremantle railway, irrespective of the figures we have put forward to counteract that concern. The MTT buses have been running parallel to the railway service for years, and the Government has done nothing about that.

The Government talks about a co-ordinated system, but it has done nothing at all about it. It is a ridiculous situation to have a bus route and a railway line covering the same section and competing one against the other.

All the experts tell us that the oil situation will deteriorate and so more people will have to utilise public transport, whether they like it or not. The only answer to this problem, of course, is to appoint a Select Committee so that the various experts may give us the benefit of their advice. We can hear from economists, senior officials of Westrail, and the public generally. Let us come to grips with the problem that is really concerning the people of Western Australia. I trust the Government will announce that it will appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the decision to close the Perth-Fremantle line.

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool) {3.11 p.m.}: I, too, support this motion. I am very concerned about what has taken place since the Leader of

the Opposition moved this motion. One member who had committed himself on this issue is now very conveniently on the pairs list. Of course, we will not break any agreement we have made in regard to pairs, but we will certainly let the Friends of the Railways know the type of person he is. Of course, we have seen him in action before when he made an accusation last year against a member of the Press. Now he has scuttled off—

**Mr Old:** He applied weeks ago for a pair for today's sitting.

**Mr JAMIESON:** Perhaps the Minister for Agriculture would tell us about the argument he had with the member for Moore just outside the Chamber. The member for Moore has scuttled off in his car.

**Mr Old:** That is absolutely typical of you.

**Mr JAMIESON:** Tell us about the argument, if the Minister wants to be truthful. Do not tell us half the story because we will not swallow it.

**Mr Old:** I tell the truth.

**Mr JAMIESON:** That will be the day. The member was here at 2.15 p.m.

**Mr Davies:** He scuttled away when he thought he would have to vote.

**Mr JAMIESON:** Last night the Subiaco City Council held a special meeting, and it decided unanimously to approach the Government in an endeavour to avoid the closure. I saw in the Press recently that approaches have also been made to other local authorities to obtain similar support. I have not heard of any local authority denying its support. However, if one took notice of the member for Cottesloe, one might assume that the Cottesloe Town Council will not be giving its support, but a local authority will have to answer to the public if it is not prepared to support a move to retain the railway line between Perth and Fremantle.

Over the years many reports have been prepared about our transport system. When the Brand Government was in office, the Nielsen report was presented to it. This report recommended busways rather than the railway line on all services. The Brand Government made no announcement about this matter before the 1971 election, and so the incoming Tonkin Government then considered the report. The Tonkin Government was not prepared to approve of such a change for many reasons, including Dr Nielsen's own statement that we would have to revert to a track system at a future date.

The proposal was referred back to Dr Nielsen with the request that he again advise the

Government of the day. He then modified his original recommendations and the suggestion was that the Perth-Fremantle line should be the only line to be closed. This idea was not acceptable to the public when it was presented to them, and the same response is obvious on this occasion.

The Premier may well be warned of the stance taken by former Premier Brand in regard to the Barracks Arch. On that occasion Premier Brand came very close to resigning, but I do not suppose our present Premier has that same sort of moral fortitude in regard to matters of public interest. Sir David Brand had the right idea at that time and I was on his side although some of his own members were not.

There have been three major emotional issues while I have been a member of this Parliament. The first was the pool in the park, followed by the Barracks Arch, and now the closure of the Perth-Fremantle railway line. Of course this is an emotional issue. The people of Western Australia want the line retained; this is quite obvious from the number of signatures to the petitions.

What will happen if the line is closed? Monster busways will be constructed, and then the MTT will be paying extra for its fuel under the legislation we passed this week. The Main Roads Department will be called upon to spend money to construct these busways, and so the money will not be available for the construction and maintenance of roads in country areas. It is quite obvious that this will happen.

The Government is making economic decisions every day, and naturally some of these decisions will cost the taxpayers much more than this decision to close the Perth-Fremantle railway line, and perhaps the results will be of much less benefit. However, a number of other things must be taken into consideration. Even as late as last week I was shown a copy of the *Football Budget* in which an article appeared expressing the attitude of the football league to this closure. The league feels that it should have been forewarned before the Subiaco football ground was taken on and it entered into a long-term lease for the Subiaco Oval. As members know, this oval is very close to the railway line, and the rail transport system has proved that it is able to handle the crowds. What thought has gone into the capability of another system to handle these crowds as successfully as Westrail has handled them?

The clear indication is that more people will travel by private vehicles to watch football matches at the Subiaco Oval. Certainly anyone who has attended such a match will agree that the

present situation is bad enough. Thousands of vehicles are parked around the area and this causes many problems to the residents of Subiaco. Statistics show that when a railway line is closed more than half the passengers opt to travel by car rather than by bus.

The same thing will happen in regard to the Royal Show. The number of residents of Claremont who are inconvenienced by show crowds will increase.

Mr McIver: One million people.

Mr JAMIESON: Westrail has proved that it can handle large numbers of people. Probably the closure of this line will not affect the people in my electorate, but it will affect the people who live in the Subiaco, Cottesloe, and Nedlands electorates.

The people who have produced previous reports on our transport system have been restrained by the financial requirements of the Government. This is no way to obtain a good decision. Obviously the present decision was not made with the best interests of the public in mind. The decision was made on the basis of financial convenience. The Government has said, "We will have to cut back here, here, and here, and so it will be necessary to close the Perth-Fremantle railway line."

As I have mentioned time and time again, all the experts agree that eventually we will have to revert to a track system. The member for Avon spoke about one expert, and I heard him making some comments on the radio yesterday. He seemed to think the Government had rocks in its head to consider removing a rail system between two such major centres of population as Perth and Fremantle, irrespective of the financial loss it may be incurring.

Many other aspects of the problem must be taken into consideration before arriving at a decision. The needs of the public must be considered. The Minister cannot just say, "We have a report recommending the removal of the railway. It is no good our trying to do anything. These people are the experts, so let us go along with them. It is less trouble that way. We will not be bothered if we follow their advice." However, the Minister will be bothered, as a recent editorial in *The West Australian* pointed out. It is very dangerous for a Government to ignore the opinion expressed by a multitude of people without providing sound and good reason for not acceding to the people's wishes. Financial considerations have been put forward in support of removing the railway line; however, the Government has not advanced any sound and good reason in support of its argument.

It is on that basis the Opposition feels the matter should go before a Select Committee. Undoubtedly, the committee would examine recent reports on the matter as well as earlier reports, including the Nielsen report, the Wilbur Smith report and, indeed, the modified report of the Director General of Transport (Mr Knox). Even though it has been claimed that on occasions Mr Knox has stated the railways should be maintained, I have never personally heard him say that whenever I requested him to retain the railways.

However, he always agreed with the reports that no matter what we did then, inevitably there must be a return to a rail system of some kind in the future. That is why the Tonkin Government went back on a previous decision and introduced the Perth Regional Railway Act; that is why it commissioned Wilbur Smith & Associates to bring down its report which, as far as I know, is the most comprehensive report ever undertaken into this matter; it cost more than any of the other reports, so I suppose it is entitled to be the most comprehensive.

I disregard the section of the Wilbur Smith report relating to busways; nobody knows quite how that got there. The Government has again changed its mind about this matter. Talks were held behind closed doors and it was suggested it would be financially expedient to install busways and not go ahead and upgrade the railway system. However, the Wilbur Smith report made several recommendations in order of merit, the first two of which concerned upgrading the railways. The busways proposal was quite low on the list, and the recommendation was made on a financial stringency basis.

These are the sorts of problems we want a Select Committee to endeavour to sort out on behalf of the people of Western Australia. It would be able to take evidence from the abundance of people who seem to be experts on the matter. Mr McCaskill seems to know what he is talking about. Like the member for Subiaco and others, I was rather impressed with his comments at the packed meeting at the Perth Town Hall. He has retired, and has no need to get involved in controversy. However, he stood among the body of people in the hall and said that the Government was being very foolish in planning to remove the Perth-Fremantle railway link, particularly in view of the amount of money which recently had been spent on upgrading the system. He said, "I know what I am talking about because I was in charge of the spending of money on this project."

All these things clearly suggest a great number of people in the community oppose the Government's proposal. It is not easy to get 100 000 signatures on a petition. It is all very well for the Minister to make a bald statement that about half of those signatures are not genuine. My leader said that even if 50 per cent of the signatures were not genuine, it is still a large number of signatures. I would say that if 10 000 were not genuine, that still is a lot of signatures—probably a lot more than on most petitions presented to Parliament. With the additional petitions added since there are still over 100 000 people who have clearly indicated their opposition to the Government's proposal to discontinue the railway line between Perth and Fremantle.

This represents a considerable proportion of the total population of Western Australia of about 1.4 million. It is an even bigger percentage when one realises the population of the Perth metropolitan region—men, women, and children included—is about 800 000. The Government must start taking notice of this petition, albeit that there are a number of false signatures by idiots and fools who are prepared to grab a pen and write anything. I have seen this done before; in fact, I have probably done it myself on petitions being taken around by Liberal supporters. It is one of the hazards of asking people to support a petition.

However, there is sufficient indication that a great many people want the Government to maintain this rail link. The people are saying, "We know it will cost money, but let us retain it." A great deal of agitation has resulted from the Government's announcement. Why does not the Government say, "In view of the attitude of the public, the line will be retained"? That was the attitude of the Tonkin Government. When the feelings of those people living adjacent to the line were made known, the Tonkin Government had no hesitation in shelving its plans to close the railway.

There is abundant evidence of the need for an inquiry. It will allow the people of this State the chance to have their say both for and against the retention of the line. Even the Minister could go before the Select Committee, although I do not think he would present any evidence in support of his Government's proposal.

It is interesting that the Government has not followed the normal practice, and chosen to close the railway line showing the worst financial return to the Government. Certainly, there is no clear indication that the Perth-Fremantle railway link is the worst financial performer of our metropolitan lines because the integration of bus

and train travel over recent times makes it impossible to arrive at such a conclusion. A great deal more research needs to be carried out before the true financial position of the line is known.

I do not want to see the money collected as a result of the State Government's levy on fuel allocated to support a massive busway complex. The railways are not supported by those means, but from the privy purse. We should not expect the motorist to keep putting his hand in his pocket whenever the busway runs short of finance. I would rather see the public taxed in another way to provide a better form of public transport. I would like to see the Government install the optimum system available for the benefit of the people of Perth for all time, rather than adopting a piecemeal approach to the matter at this stage in our history.

Undoubtedly we will be sorry for any action taken that is not aimed at the best possible use of public transport in the future. All the comments about oil which have been repeated need not be restressed, although they are important when one is considering this matter. At least we would have a supply of electricity if we had to convert hurriedly the whole of our metropolitan railway system to an electric operation. We could do that within a short time. However, without the rail lines it would take very much longer, and it would be a very costly project.

I suggest that the Government would be well advised to accept the position that there be a Select Committee of inquiry into the matter so that all reports, current and past, could be investigated fully. In that way some final determination could be made, and a recommendation could be made to this House.

I support the motion.

**MR STEPHENS** (Stirling) [3.31 p.m.]: I will be very brief. It would be remiss if I did not indicate where the National Party stood on this matter.

The National Party, of course, is very concerned with trying to restore in the eyes of the public the prestige of this Parliament. I believe that we have to prove to the public that we are more than just a rubber stamp.

**Mr B. T. Burke**: Talk about prestige when people walk out on divisions just to avoid a vote!

**Mr STEPHENS**: The Parliament must be fully informed on the issue before us. One way of obtaining information is to establish a Select Committee so that members of Parliament have the opportunity to make inquiries and obtain the detailed information that is necessary. That is

especially so on an issue as important as the proposed closure of the Fremantle railway line.

The appendix in the submission by the Friends of the Railways on the Fremantle railway service contains comments by various people as far back as 1969. On the 10th April, 1969, in *The West Australian*, Mr Knox urged the retention of the railway. In 1969, in *The Sunday Times*, the then Minister said that rail planning was essential. There is a report from the *Daily News* in 1974 in which the Chairman of the MTT (Mr George Shea) commented on the inability of the transport service to cater for the passengers. So it goes on. There are many occasions when comments have been made indicating the need for suburban transport and the retention of the railways. As recently as January, 1977, in *The West Australian*, Mr O'Connor, the then Minister for Railways, said that the railways should stay. He went on to say that the State Government had every intention of upgrading the suburban railway system. He also said that the Government had given an unequivocal assurance that this would be the case.

If that were so in 1977, it is even more essential that we retain these services in 1979, in view of the energy crisis and in view of the increased cost of fuel.

It is not sufficient for the Cabinet to come forward and say, "This is what we are going to do", and expect this Parliament to follow along blindly. That may be all right for the Liberal back-bench members, but it is not good enough for the National Party. We want all the facts.

**Mr Nanovich**: Did you consult with the Deputy Premier this afternoon, that you were going to speak on this motion?

**Mr STEPHENS**: I did not know that I needed to consult. For the benefit of the member who has just interjected, I say that we were not aware that this motion was to be discussed this afternoon until we heard it introduced by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Davies**: I certainly did not tell him.

**Mr McIver**: Ask him where the member for Moore is. They told the member for Moore, but they did not tell the National Party.

**Mr STEPHENS**: I was saying that if that was the situation as expressed by the leading people in the transport field as far back as 1969, it is even more essential today that we be informed fully about the facts before we make a decision. After all, a Select Committee is only one means of elucidating the facts upon which we can make a decision.

Reference has been made to the member for Moore. Of course, when a man is prepared to besmirch somebody outside this House, it is surprising that he is not here when we discuss a matter like this. He said in this Chamber that he was sorry he was not present when the Labor amendment to the Address-in-Reply relating to transport was moved, because he would have supported it—

Mr Davies: They should put their votes where their mouths are.

Mr STEPHENS: When the member for Moore entered the Chamber this afternoon, the Minister for Agriculture, who is the Leader of the National Country Party, leaned over his seat and obviously asked the member for Moore to go outside, because the next thing that happened was that they walked out of the Chamber. The member for Moore has not returned to the Chamber since that time.

Mr Jamieson: Did he beat him up, or what?

Mr Shalders: The member for Moore asked for a pair weeks ago.

Mr Pearce: If the member for Moore was honest about this, he would not have asked for a pair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Stirling.

Mr STEPHENS: The member for Moore indicated the other night how he felt about the matter. However, he is not in his seat now to say so. It is not hard to believe that he was invited outside and asked to leave the Chamber.

Mr Pearce: There could be another Jeremy Thorpe cover-up.

Mr Davies: Not for the same reasons, I hope.

Mr STEPHENS: With those few remarks, I support the motion.

MR RUSHTON: (Dale—Minister for Transport) [3.37 p.m.]: I will address myself to the official Opposition—the official socialist Opposition—and those who wish to be in the same bed with them.

Mr B. T. Burke: You could not address yourself to an icecream cake.

Mr RUSHTON: I will address myself to the combination of the socialist Opposition and those who wish to be associated with them.

Mr Davies: There is nothing like personal abuse when you want to make friends—especially the Friends of the Railways.

Mr RUSHTON: At personal abuse, the Leader of the Opposition is an expert.

In relation to the motion, there is no case to be made, and it has not been made by the speakers today. No case has been made for the delay in consideration of the question before the House. It is a most serious question, and it has been treated seriously. It has been given consideration for a long time—something like nine years.

As far as I am concerned, the petition is treated very seriously indeed. It has been signed by a large number of very serious and very dedicated people. I do not query for one moment their intention in the matter. I do not argue with the people who have put forward the petition. However, it cannot be said that the petition has been signed by 100 000-plus people.

Mr Davies: You put in a false certificate.

Mr RUSHTON: The signatures could not be proved. They could not be validated in the way the petition has been presented.

Mr B. T. Burke: Why not address yourself to the motion?

Mr RUSHTON: I will be reporting to the Cabinet upon the petition that has been received. I have indicated to the Friends of the Railways that as soon as their submission is received and I have analysed it, I will be reporting to Cabinet upon it. I have encouraged the Friends of the Railways to discuss the situation with me. I have offered them technical advice and help from my own department. They were most appreciative of that. That offer still stands.

I expect we will have further talks about the material FOR have submitted. I will be very happy indeed to do that. As far as I am concerned, they are the only people who have put forward a comprehensive report. I am grateful to them for doing so.

Mr B. T. Burke: And you will ignore them.

Mr RUSHTON: The matter that is surprising is that the Opposition has been found—not senile—devoid of any positive thoughts relating to the matters before us that have to be considered.

Mr Jamieson: You keep saying that and one day you will believe it yourself; that is how stupid you are.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition does not have a policy. It says, "electrification", as though that was a total policy; it is only a segment of a policy.

Mr Jamieson: It is not a bad one.

Mr McIver: It is what everyone else wants.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition has not said how it would handle the matter of patronage or how it would manage costs in this regard. It has not said how it would handle fuel efficiencies or

the planning necessary to cater for such things as the removal of the rail freight from the city.

The Opposition does have a platform of which one point is free transport. Free transport would double the deficits we now have.

Mr Davies: Do not mislead the House again.

Mr RUSHTON: Let us consider the background of this question. Research has taken place over a long period of time; it goes back to 1968 or 1969 when there were important regional rail design groups which put together reports. There was the Perth Regional Transport Study in 1970; the City of Nedlands proposal in 1972; the Bureau of Transport Economics Perth-Fremantle Corridor Study in January, 1973; the Perth Central City Railway Feasibility Study in 1974; the Swanbourne area and West Coast Highway Study; and so it goes on. There has been an extensive number of internal studies done on this question and there has been public debate.

Mr Jamieson: It has been considered on economic grounds.

Mr RUSHTON: The matter has been well thrashed out.

I move now to the Opposition's policy. The Opposition does not have a policy relating to this salient issue.

Mr Davies: Don't keep misleading the House.

Mr RUSHTON: One can refer back to the time the Opposition was in government. In 1972 we saw the member for Welshpool bringing forward recommendations with the introduction of a Bill—the text of which is to be found in *Hansard*—titled the Perth Regional Railway Bill. The Bill was introduced for the purpose of constructing an underground railway through the city; the railway was to be electrified. This idea has been found to be totally “unviable” by those who have been given the job of proving the economics of such a system. One of the purposes of the Bill was to replace the Perth-Fremantle railway service with a bus service. A further intention was to remove the railway line west of Barrack Street and convert the vacated rail right-of-way between Perth and Leighton into a busway.

Mr Jamieson: When did that happen; tell the truth?

Mr RUSHTON: The underground railway—

Mr Jamieson: Carry it through, Mr Minister; don't tell half the story; be dinkum.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RUSHTON: Give me time. We need to consider what the then Government's intentions

were for the city. We have had the member for Geraldton saying the Labor Party is committed to the city being limited in its growth.

Mr Jamieson: You are not being dinkum.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition wants to put a fence around the city so it will not grow any larger.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: You started to tell the truth; tell the whole story.

The SPEAKER: Order! It seems it might be appropriate that I leave the Chair until 4.00 p.m. Before I do I draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of Mr J. H. Brown, a member of the New South Wales Parliament and the Australasian representative to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. Mr Brown is in Perth to attend the mid-year executive committee meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which meeting is to be held in the Legislative Council Chamber next week. On behalf of the members of this Assembly I extend a welcome to Mr Brown.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.*

Mr RUSHTON: Prior to the afternoon tea suspension I was mentioning that the Opposition is contradictory in its approach. On the one hand it says it wants a high-density, rapid-transit system to serve the city and on the other hand it says it wants a low-density city. Those two options do not go hand in hand.

The Government has the objective policy of keeping the city in the best environmental state for the benefit of the people, based on a policy of decentralisation through the regional centre and the provision of an adequate transport system to regional centres and the whole metropolitan area.

I have mentioned a few of the actions of the Opposition in relation to this matter when it was in Government. I should like to mention a few more. Some of the provisions in the Act which was introduced into Parliament and passed in 1972 by the Labor Government were that the total cost of sinking and electrification of the railways was estimated at \$110 million at 1972 valuation; the railway line west of Barrack Street was to be removed; provision was to be made for a narrow gauge line south of the river; and the erection of a new railway station east of Barrack Street and the demolition of the existing Perth Railway Station was to take place. The total cost of the first stage was estimated at \$450 million. I intend to touch only briefly on that, because—

Mr Jamieson: How about carrying right through and telling the truth.

Mr RUSHTON: I do not wish to prolong the matter.

Mr Jamieson: You tell the truth!

Mr RUSHTON: When the Opposition was in Government it evaded its obligation in relation to the use of Servetus Street as a major road. Members opposite sent the matter off to the environmental people, because they were not prepared to face up to it. As a result, we have had to do a considerable amount of work to return the position.

Mr Jamieson: You know that is incorrect.

Mr RUSHTON: The proposition of the Government to use the railway reserve would provide a certain amount of relief from the impact of traffic on local roads. We have given the option to our planners to use this reserve, in order that traffic congestion may be relieved in the area of Servetus Street, Davies Road, and other similar locations. Our advice is that this is the best way to go about it.

I should like to touch briefly only on a report in the paper which was referred to by the member for Avon and which related to a meeting held at Subiaco. I am glad the member amended his figure from 300, because I am told that about 150 ratepayers of Subiaco attended the meeting. A number of outsiders attended it and the people who telephoned me to tell me about it were disgusted that those who wanted to put forward the opposite view from that which was contained in the report were refused the opportunity to do so.

The Government has a responsibility on any issue to make a decision after full consideration of all the factors, both social and economic, which are involved. This is what the Government has done. The Government has reports which provide a background over the last nine years. The decision has been made after full consideration and assessment. Alternative proposals have been invited.

In summary I should like to point out the Opposition has not made out a case in favour of the motion. In fact, members opposite stand condemned as hypocrites when one considers the actions they took previously. If members read *Hansard* they will see what the Opposition was about.

Extensive research has been carried out. Consideration is being given, and will continue to be given, to the case put forward by the Friends of the Railways. Consideration is being given also to the petition which has been lodged. I have the obligation to report to Cabinet as soon as practical and I shall do so after full consideration

has been given to all the points made in the submissions from the Friends of the Railways.

I have directed already that such consideration should be given and it is being looked at at the present time. I shall submit my recommendations to Cabinet after full consideration of the matter. I shall have further discussions with the Friends of the Railways if they desire. I shall ask them for further data if insufficient information is contained in their submissions. There will be a free interchange of ideas and thoughts on all matters.

The motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition that a Select Committee be appointed to consider the matter is a political gimmick. It has been moved by members who have not suggested an alternative. Members opposite demonstrated what they would do when they were in office, and as far as I am concerned the House should have no difficulty in rejecting the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18	
Mr Barnett	Mr Jamieson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr McIver
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr McPharlin
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr Cowan	Mr Stephens
Dr Dadour	Mr Taylor
Mr Davies	Dr Troy
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Noes 22	
Mr Blaikie	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Clarko	Mr Mensaros
Sir Charles Court	Mr Nanovich
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Connor
Mrs Craig	Mr Old
Mr Grayden	Mr O'Neil
Mr Grewar	Mr Ridge
Mr Hassell	Mr Rushton
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Tubby
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	Mr Shalders

(Teller)

Ayes		Pairs		Noes	
Mr Bryce				Mr Sibson	
Mr Tonkin				Mr Young	
Mr T. H. Jones				Mr Sodeman	
Mr Bertram				Mr Crane	
Mr Hodge				Mr Spriggs	
Mr H. D. Evans				Mr Watt	

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

## BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

### 1. Stamp Act Amendment Bill.



Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.

2. Fisheries Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), and read a first time.

**ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

*Second Reading*

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [4.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that in 1978 this Government ordered the holding of a judicial inquiry into certain aspects of the Electoral Act, 1907-1976. The resultant report and recommendations of His Honour Judge Kay have been tabled in this House.

The Chief Electoral Officer and the Crown Solicitor also reported jointly to the Attorney General and myself on matters concerning questions to be asked of electors on polling day, clarification whether the same electoral roll was to be used at a re-election following a voided election, the validity of proceedings of Parliament and the validity of actions of a Minister involved in a voided election, and payment of costs of a party to a Court of Disputed Returns.

The purposes of the Bill are to implement substantially the recommendations of the report of the court of inquiry and to give effect to those matters considered by the Government to be desirable following examination of the joint report of the Chief Electoral Officer and the Crown Solicitor.

The court of inquiry considered there was a need to re-define the word "native" to "Aboriginal" in terms of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act, 1972, and this is given effect to in the proposals.

It was necessary to clarify the voting qualifications of prisoners and to provide a method of voting. It is proposed that the disqualification from voting will be related to the sentence given to the prisoner and being served by him. The amendment will permit such prisoners as are qualified to vote to do so by postal vote. The present machinery in some instances makes it impracticable for them to exercise this right.

The Bill also intends to ensure that the prisoner's residential qualification is protected while serving a sentence, to include in section 90

an additional reason for applying for a postal vote, and to ensure that the prisoners mail between the Electoral Department and the voter is not censored. These provisions required certain consequential amendments concerning the submission of returns to the Electoral Department by institutions. It is proposed to prohibit canvassing within six metres of a prison.

The Bill proposes to amend the Act so that all claims for enrolment are witnessed by specified witnesses. The persons eligible to witness claims for enrolment are proposed to be an electoral officer, a justice of the peace, a clerk of courts, or a police officer.

**Mr Davies:** That's a nice smack in the eyes for members of Parliament! Don't you trust members of Parliament?

**Mr O'NEIL:** Where necessary, description of the witnesses have been amplified by definition. Under the Bill the signature and designation of the witness will form part of the essentials of a claim.

No provision existed in the Act to make it an offence to persuade or induce an elector to make application for a postal vote. This will be rectified by the proposals.

The Bill proposes to amend the Act to enable the Minister to extend the present portable mobile box system to include any institution or hospital declared to be a special institution or hospital. The Minister also may declare any area of the State to be a remote area which by reason of its remoteness presents difficulties for electors to attend at a polling place. It is proposed that such declared institutions, hospitals and/or remote areas may be visited by electoral officials up to 14 days prior to and including polling day to provide voting facilities for electors in such institutions, hospitals, or remote areas. The Bill includes provisions prohibiting canvassing in certain cases in respect of institutions and hospitals.

Provision has also been made to appoint a polling place in the City of Perth for the benefit of absent voters during a by-election for a province or district.

The area relating to questions to be put to voters under section 119 is included for amendment; firstly, to make it mandatory for the presiding officer to ascertain whether the voter had voted before at the election and, secondly, to allow the presiding officer to formulate questions in less formal language to assist the elector in answering.

Under the Bill it is proposed that assistance which presently may be given to certain disadvantaged electors by electoral officials be

extended to any elector who may request it. The assistance must be given by the official in the presence of any scrutineers present or, if none is present, then in the presence of another electoral official or a person appointed by the elector. For the purpose of rendering voting assistance to electors who request it and to achieve uniformity, provision has been made to extend the authority of the Chief Electoral Officer to issue directions to polling place officials.

The Bill also seeks to repeal the part of the Act relating to limitation of electoral expenses.

With regard to the matters inquired into by the Chief Electoral Officer and the Crown Solicitor, it is proposed to amend the section 119 questions to be asked by the presiding officer to enable him, firstly, to ascertain from an elector who states that he no longer lives in a certain electoral district whether his name appears on a roll for another electoral district and, secondly, to decline a scrutineer's request to ask further questions which the presiding officer considers are unreasonable.

It is proposed to amend the Act to resolve any conflict that, where an election has been declared void by a court of disputed returns, the re-election will take the place of the voided election and those persons whose names were on the roll for the voided election will be permitted to vote at the consequential by-election.

The Bill includes proposals that a court of disputed returns, in addition to its power to award costs against an unsuccessful party to the petition, may in its discretion recommend that costs be paid by the Crown.

An amendment is proposed to section 172 of the Act to ensure the validity of the proceedings of Parliament and of any ministerial action which may otherwise have been in some doubt due to the voiding of an election by a court of disputed returns.

It is proposed also to include as an offence the wilful taking of any ballot paper out of a polling place during polling at any election.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies (Leader of the Opposition).

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

*Second Reading*

**MR MENSAROS** (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to ratify an agreement between the State and Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited. The agreement amends the proviso in clause 9 (1)(b) of the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963-1976.

Under the existing proviso the company is required to pay an additional rental of 25c per tonne on all iron ore on which royalties are paid. This rental would become due as from August, 1981. This date is expressed in the principal agreement as being the 15th anniversary of the date iron ore was first exported.

The amending agreement now before members brings forward that date to the 1st July, 1979. However, the additional rental will be payable only on eight million tonnes in 1979-1980 and 10 million tonnes in 1980-1981.

The company agreed to advance its obligation in this manner because it was conscious of the need for upgraded public roads in the Pilbara area. It had previously contributed \$2 million towards the cost of public roads in the Pilbara.

We have been aware of the social problems that exist in the Pilbara area. These, in some measure, have been brought about by the poor condition of inter-town road connections. The road connections are mostly unsealed and subject to closure during the wet season.

To alleviate this particular problem a five-year Pilbara road improvement programme was drawn up. The \$24 million Pilbara road improvement programme proposed provided for the following—

\$7.4 million to complete the construction and sealing of the Tom Price-Paraburdoo Road.

\$10.6 million to improve and upgrade the road between Nanutarra on the North West Coastal Highway and the Paraburdoo turn-off. This work would include a black top for about 70 kilometres.

\$2 million on the Hardey River Bridge and drainage improvements on the spur road to Paraburdoo.

\$4 million on access roads from Paraburdoo and Tom Price to the future initial highway between Newman and Port Hedland.

Because of the change in Commonwealth policy with respect to the funding of roads, the funding of this programme would need to be from State resources.

The advanced rentals to be paid by Hamersley during 1979-80 and 1980-81 will amount to \$4.5 million. These additional funds will make it possible to bring forward the starting point of the planned work by two years.

Clause 4 of the schedule to this Bill is the operative clause of this amending agreement. In brief the clause provides for—

—the payment of an additional rental on eight million tonnes during 1979-80.

—the payment of a further additional rental on 10 million tonnes during 1980-81.

—the payment of additional rents as set out in the principal agreement from July, 1981. However, during each of the three years following that date 7.7 million tonnes will be exempted from the charge.

The exempted tonnage comprises a credit for the additional rental to be paid in advance on 18 million tonnes plus an allowance of 1.7 million tonnes a year. This represents the present value of payments to be made in 1979-80 and 1980-81 as against the future value in three years after July, 1981. In other words it is the discounted present value—calculated approximately on the long term bond interest rate—of Hamersley's future obligation.

There are other minor provisions which provide for adjustments for the highly unlikely event should the set tonnages referred to be not reached.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

### **GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (PROMOTIONS APPEAL BOARD) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [4.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

When senior industrial relations officers from nine Government departments and instrumentalities met over two years ago as an advisory committee, there was collective agreement on the difficulty in interpretation, clarity, and understanding of the Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act. Because of this, controversial issues had arisen, the solutions of which were not readily acceptable and a review of the Act was considered to be a necessity.

The Act was originally framed in 1945 and became law when it was assented to on the 21st January, 1946. The manner in which some sections were expressed at that time is inappropriate to the changed industrial situation today and causes difficulty in interpretation.

Approval was given some time ago to a revision of the Act and the inter-departmental advisory committee abovementioned set about the task of review.

About the same time the Public Service Board was contemplating a revision of the Public Service Act, and that proposition came to fruition when the Public Service Act, 1978, passed through Parliament in November, 1978. It was proclaimed to come into operation on the 16th May, 1979. One important change it made was to remove from the Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act the appeal provisions for officers appointed under the Public Service Act and place them in the Public Service Act.

A promotions appeal board is set up under the Public Service Act which has as its chairman the Public Service Arbitrator who is also chairman of the appeal board under the Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act. Appeals by Public Service Act officers had formed approximately 50 per cent of the appeals heard under the Act.

A consequential Acts Amendment (Public Service) Act, No. 87 of 1978, passed at the same time, amended the Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act to the extent of transferring appeal provisions for such officers to the Public Service Act.

In its deliberations, the inter-departmental advisory committee found that there were no compelling reasons to warrant an abandonment of the basic framework of the existing appeal system. It was conscious that the present system had stood the test of time and catered for a wider range of employees, more so than appeal systems in other States of the Commonwealth.

The revision, therefore, could be regarded as an overall tidying-up exercise which would remedy the "patching up" and deficiencies which had developed over the years since 1945.

When the committee eventually made its report, I had the proposals circulated to nine workers' unions whose members, in the main, had used the appeal facilities, and as well the Civil Service Association and the WA Trades and Labor Council were sent copies for comment. The inter-departmental committee further reviewed the proposals in the light of the replies received. The Bill now put forward reflects the recommendations.

A fuller explanation of the amending clauses can be given when the Bill is in the Committee stage, but I would like to mention the main changes which are incorporated in this measure. They are as follows—

- (1) The criteria for selecting an applicant to fill a vacancy will alter so that an appeal can be made on the basis of "superior efficiency" alone.

A second ground of appeal now applicable, "equal efficiency and seniority", is to be discarded, although it is within the prerogative of the promoting authority to consider seniority in the process of establishing superior efficiency.

- (2) An amending clause will more clearly set down what is regarded as promotion when transfers occur. For an appeal to exist, the vacancy should provide promotion to both the recommended applicant and an appellant.
- (3) The manner of appointment of the employee's representative on the board, as the current Act stands, has been regarded legally as discriminatory in some cases.

The position will, therefore, be altered to some extent so that the representative will be nominated by the union or unions which are party to the award or industrial agreement regulating the terms and conditions of employment of the vacancy. Alternatives are provided for the employee's representative on the board if there is no relevant union, and for other eventualities.

- (4) The closing date for appeals has at times caused confusion in the way it is expressed and the section will be altered to avoid difficulty and disputation in determining it.
- (5) An obligation currently placed on an appellant to serve copies of appeal forms on the recommending authority will be moved to the secretary of the board to carry out the function of advising the recommending authority of the names of all appellants following the closing date of appeals.
- (6) Acting experience in a vacant position prior to it occurring will be recognised and will be admissible in evidence in an appeal.
- (7) The penalty for lodging a frivolous appeal will be increased.
- (8) An amendment will provide for due regard to be given to the qualifications of a vacant position provided for in a Statute as well as those in an award or industrial agreement, when determining the relative efficiency of applicants.

- (9) The practice of the chairman being able to rule on procedural matters over an appeal, which in practice he does at present, will be formalised.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Skidmore.

### BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Acts Amendment and Repeal (Road Maintenance) Bill.
2. Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### PUBLIC NOTARIES BILL

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [4.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Public notaries play an important part in the life of the commercial community and others whose interests cross international boundary lines.

The history of public notaries goes back to earliest times. They had an important role in trade and shipping. Appointments were first made by the Pope and later in England by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The latter still makes the appointments in many parts of the world, including some Australian States.

Appointees were not always legal practitioners, but now they generally are.

In Western Australia since 1902 all appointments of public notaries have been made by the Full Court of the Supreme Court, on the recommendation of the Chief Justice.

Notaries still have a significant role throughout the world, particularly in relation to shipping and banking transactions, identification of persons, and attestation of documents having international significance.

It is important that their role and functions be understood and their appointments adequately controlled.

The Bill now before the House sets out more clearly the requirements and manner of appointment of public notaries and provides for

the continuation of those who are presently appointed.

It had been intended merely to amend the 1902 Public Notaries Act but, on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel, it was decided that it would be preferable to repeal that Act and introduce a completely new Bill.

This Bill contains most of the features which were contained in the 1902 Act, together with some important amendments to which I shall refer.

All of those persons who are presently appointed as public notaries can exercise their powers in any part of this State. What is now proposed is that there should be two separate categories of public notaries.

The first of these would be general public notaries who would be able to exercise their powers in identical fashion with those already in existence, anywhere in Western Australia. It is proposed that all persons who are currently appointed as public notaries will become general public notaries under this new legislation and that any future appointments of practitioners who practise in the metropolitan area would also be general public notaries.

The second category would be district public notaries who may specify the magisterial district or districts for which they seek appointment and then exercise the same powers in such magisterial district or districts as defined under the Magisterial Districts Act.

This will enable public notaries to be appointed more in relation to the needs of particular areas of the State.

In the event of a person applying to be appointed as either a general public notary or a district public notary, he must satisfy the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court that he meets the various requirements.

One of these is his competence to act as a notary. Another is that there is a need for the appointment.

So as to assist the Chief Justice in his assessment of these and other requirements, it is considered desirable that some formal channel of advice should be available and, for this purpose, it is proposed to give the Attorney General standing under the Act.

The Attorney General may report to the Chief Justice on request, or intervene in any proceedings, and may consult any body of notaries established for such purposes. Discussions have taken place with notaries who are members of the Law Society and it has been

arranged that the society will have available a small group or committee of public notaries for consultation with the Attorney General, should this be required.

It will also be noted that the schedules which appeared in the 1902 Act concerning the certificates of the Registrar and the fees payable on appointment, have been omitted, but the Bill makes provision for these matters to be covered by rules of court.

In this way, the rules can be prescribed more conveniently and with great flexibility.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

### **CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [4.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Coroners Act is an important and essential part of this State's legislation and it is just as important that it should operate efficiently and effectively.

Apart from some consequential amendments resulting from the Acts Amendment (Road Traffic) Act in 1974, no amendments have been made to the Coroners Act since 1960.

As a result of his considerable experience, the City Coroner (Mr W. G. Wickens) has made a number of suggestions which will improve the administration of this Act.

In addition to these proposals, there are several other important amendments proposed to cover inquests where a body is, for one reason or another, unable to be located or recovered, but death is suspected and also, an extension of the jurisdiction of the Coroner to meet problems that arise where the body of a deceased person lies in one State, but the cause of death occurred in another.

The power for the Attorney General to order such an inquest already exists in England in somewhat similar circumstances and was recently endorsed in a report by the committee on death certification and coroners in that country.

This proposal will also require an amendment to the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act and that will be dealt with separately.

The following amendments are proposed to overcome administrative difficulties which have become apparent as a result of experience over a number of years.

The first one is to provide that an affidavit sworn outside the State may be sworn before any person authorised to take affidavits in the place where it is sworn.

The proposed amendment to section 38 deals with an inquest or inquests involving a number of medical practitioners such as a multiple road fatality accident, to give the Coroner the power to summon such practitioners without obliging him to do so where it is considered unnecessary.

Members will no doubt appreciate that in country areas particularly, a practice has grown up over the years of notifying clerks of courts when a person dies. The clerks of courts do not make the decision as to whether a postmortem examination is necessary, but do draw attention to the necessary requirements of the Act.

It is proposed to give these functions of the clerks legal sanction in the Bill by amending section 40.

The power to order a postmortem examination will also be extended to an analysis of any part of the body or the contents thereof.

It will also be noted that section 40 required that any direction to a medical practitioner to carry out a postmortem examination must be in writing before the termination of the inquest.

In practice, it is far more convenient for this to be done by telephone and, in addition, the need may arise to order an examination after the termination of the inquest because of subsequent evidence. It is proposed in this Bill to empower the coroner at any time to direct, not necessarily in writing, that a postmortem examination be made. The regulations will contain a safeguard in order to prevent false instructions.

There has also been some doubt expressed about the application of the Justices Act to proceedings in a Coroner's Court, and it is now proposed to provide in section 42 of the Coroners Act, the relevant wording of section 77 of the Justices Act. This will compel witnesses to answer questions which are considered necessary in the pursuit of justice, but also provide for the usual protection of persons who may otherwise incriminate themselves.

There are also occasions where the Coroner vacates his office for one reason or another when the inquest is only part heard. Circumstances can arise where it would be preferable for another Coroner to continue the inquiry rather than have the whole matter reheard, as happens at present.

This very much depends on the particulars of each individual case, but an amendment to allow another Coroner to continue is felt to be a wise precautionary move to overcome any future problems.

At present, the Coroner has jurisdiction only to conduct an inquest where the body of the deceased is lying within the State. An amendment is therefore proposed to increase his jurisdiction to cases where a person has died outside the State if that person was a State resident, or if death or the cause of death occurred within the State.

The matter of extended jurisdiction has been discussed at recent meetings of the Standing Committee of Attorneys General and agreement has been reached for all States to have similar provisions included in their Acts where this is needed. In the case of the Territories, this already exists.

It could happen that a person who has lived all his life in one State, goes to another State for some special treatment and subsequently dies. As the law stands at present, the Coroner in the State of origin cannot hold an inquest although it may be considered desirable to do so in certain circumstances.

Most of the other amendments in this Bill deal with the suspected death of a person where, although the body has not been recovered, death is reasonably certain.

It should be pointed out that, as the law now stands, an inquest can be held only where there is a body. This often works great hardship on relatives and others, as a death certificate cannot be obtained thereby impeding the winding-up of estates and settlement of personal affairs, including sometimes problems of remarriage.

The law does not at present provide for an adequate resolution of these matters and it is felt that some amendment is long overdue. It is therefore proposed that the Coroner shall have the power to hold an inquest in certain cases where a person is missing or the body cannot be recovered, or has been destroyed. In such events, the Attorney General can direct that the Coroner should hold an inquiry into the suspected death.

It should be emphasised at this point that death could not be presumed where any doubt exists, but there could be, and are, cases such as in mining accidents or drownings where, despite the

absence of a body, death is certain. The Coroner, if satisfied, can certify that death has been established beyond reasonable doubt.

In the event that death is not established to the Coroner's satisfaction, the Coroner would be able to make a finding accordingly; that is, that death has not been established.

It is felt that the need for firstly the Attorney General to be reasonably satisfied that a person has died in such circumstances and, secondly, the Coroner, after proper inquiry, to be so satisfied, will provide adequate safeguards for cases of "faked" deaths or amnesia.

There is a further amendment to which I should draw attention. It is considered appropriate that where a person dies from an injury received in the course of his employment, or by reason of an industrial disease, then a representative of that person's trade union should be permitted to appear in the Coroner's Court with the approval of a member of the deceased's family. The members of the family who may make such a request are referred to in the Bill and provision has also been made to cover the situation where there is no family or they cannot be contacted.

Finally, the existing definition of "building" which defines the place of employment has been changed to bring it into line with the "place" of employment in the new Machinery Safety Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

### **REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [4.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As mentioned during the second reading speech on the amendment to the Coroners Act, this Bill is complementary to the proposal to permit the Coroner to make a finding that in cases of suspected death where a person is missing or the body cannot be found, or is irrecoverable, the

death has been established beyond reasonable doubt.

The amendments proposed to the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act will enable the Registrar General to register the death in the records of his office.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

### **ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA (SWANLEIGH LAND AND ENDOWMENTS) BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), read first time.

#### *Second Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is for a private Act of Parliament which has been requested by the Diocese of Perth in connection with certain lands and buildings, which are known as Swanleigh.

The work of the diocese over many years, in caring for orphans and giving them a firm basis on which to build their future lives, is well known. Since the end of World War II, the number of orphans admitted to Swanleigh has declined and they have been cared for in other ways, such as by placement in foster homes, or by adoption.

The diocese has recognised that an orphanage, as such, is no longer required and considers that it is, in fact, no longer desirable to house orphans in this type of institution. The last orphans left the home in 1976 and the buildings at Swanleigh are now being used as a hostel to accommodate students attending Government educational institutions.

The land on which the hostel stands is subject to a trust that it be used for the purpose or purposes associated with an orphanage. In addition, the diocese is holding funds accumulated over the years which have come from several sources, but which are all to be used only for purposes associated with orphans.

The Bill now before the House has four basic purposes; firstly, to allow the land and buildings at Swanleigh to be used for the purpose of a hostel for the accommodation of students attending Government educational institutions; secondly, to use the balance of the land as

described in the second part of the schedule to the Bill, or the proceeds from any sales, for general ecclesiastical purposes; thirdly, to place the endowment moneys, currently held in trust for orphans, in trust for general child and family care purposes; and fourthly, to make provision for the proceeds of the sale of land and buildings at Swanleigh as described in the first part of the schedule. If they are sold at some future time, the proceeds will be placed in trust for general child and family care purposes.

General child and family care purposes will include the care, maintenance, education and benefit of orphaned, neglected and deprived children and the counselling, help and care of families in difficulties.

The opportunity also is taken to express the appreciation of both this and previous Governments for the work the diocese has carried out in caring for orphans over such a long period of time. Whilst there is no need for such an institution today, it would seem to be most appropriate that the lands and money marked for purposes associated with orphans should now be applied for the purposes indicated. These purposes are not very far away from the original intentions of the trusts.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Skidmore.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier)

[5.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date and hour to be fixed by the Speaker.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.38 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### MINING: GOLD

#### *Leases*

1. **Mr JAMIESON**, to the Minister for Mines:

In view of the concern of the public in Kalgoorlie to get maximum gold production in the shortest possible time, will the Minister give an undertaking to this House that he will not disturb the recent decision of the Warden's Court in reallocating leases on which work requirements under the Mining Act have not been carried out?

**Mr MENSAROS** replied:

This is a semi-judicial responsibility of the Minister who has to consider the file containing the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Mines as and when the recommendation comes to him. I definitely will not give an undertaking which might prejudice my position at that time.

## FUEL: TAX

### *Allocation for Roadworks*

2. **Mr McIVER** to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has any decision been made on how the funds raised from the new fuel levies will be allocated for various roadworks?
- (2) If so, can he provide details?
- (3) Is it correct that two-thirds of the revenue from the levies will be raised in Perth?

**Mr RUSHTON** replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) I do not know the exact proportion, but a considerable amount will come from the metropolitan area.

## FUEL: TAX

### *Revenue: Metropolitan Area and Country*

3. **Mr DAVIES**, to the Minister for Agriculture:

What evidence does he have to support the claim he made at the opening of the Kukerin recreation centre on Sunday 12th May, in respect of the fuel tax, that two-thirds of the revenue from the levy will be raised in the city, but two-thirds of the revenue will be spent in the country?

**Mr OLD** replied:

Although such a statement was made, it was not made by me. To the best of my knowledge, that is the factual situation. I suggest the Leader of the Opposition's source of information should get the facts right.

**Mr Davies**: Are the figures factual?



## MINING: GOLD

### *Leases*

4. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the warden in the East Coolgardie Warden's Court on Tuesday last recommended the forfeiture of seven goldmining leases held by Kalgoorlie Mining Associates Pty. Ltd. on the application of one R. Smith and others on the ground that the leases had not been worked for some years?
- (2) Has the Minister acquainted himself with the application and the decision handed down by the warden?
- (3) When does the Minister expect to make a decision on the warden's recommendation?
- (4) What criteria would the Minister exercise in coming to a decision on the recommendation?
- (5) Would the Minister be prepared to give an undertaking to this House that he will accept the warden's recommendation unless there is some weighty reason to disregard it, other than the safeguarding of the present lessees' interest in the leases?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Not officially.
- (2) No.
- (3) After the recommendation has reached me from the department.
- (4) The usual criteria based on longstanding practise.
- (5) See answer to the question without notice by the member for Welshpool.

## LAND

### *Broome*

5. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

This question was phoned through to the Premier earlier. It is as follows—

- (1) Does he recall last December promising to send Government representatives to Broome to discuss with the local authority the need to release land for both industrial and domestic purposes?
- (2) Can he advise what has transpired in this regard?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The Secretary of the Land Board will be visiting Broome later this year to discuss the release of land with the council.

## GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

### *Willagee Sewerage Connection*

6. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware that State Housing Commission tender 277/99, Willagee sewerage connection, was granted to a firm not employing apprentices?
- (2) Is he aware that the second lowest and unsuccessful tenderer employs three apprentices?
- (3) Is it not Government policy to give firms employing apprentices priority when tenders are allocated?
- (4) Why was this procedure ignored in this case?
- (5) Is he aware that the second lowest tenderer will shortly stand down at least one apprentice due to lack of work?
- (6) Does he favour a system whereby firms subcontract work out rather than employ tradesmen and apprentices permanently?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Due to the infrequent occurrence, and variety of civil engineering works of this kind, the commission has not as yet determined a policy, but the matter is currently under examination.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The present policy of the commission in awarding contracts for new residential construction, as well as for upgrading work, requires both the main contractor and his subcontractors collectively, to have the required number of apprentices.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

### *Beer Prices*

7. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

With regard to my questions 79, 369, and 542 as to why beer prices in Western Australia are so much higher than in any other State in Australia and the Minister's advice that a full inquiry would be held to ascertain the reasons, would the Minister advise what conclusions the inquiry has reached regarding this matter?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for notice of the question. Inquiries by the bureau are proceeding and it is gathering information throughout Australia regarding all factors relating to the price of draught beer, so that comparisons can be made between the price of beer in this State and the prices applying in other States.

Mr Davies: Is that on a personal basis?

Mr O'CONNOR: No. Because of the nature of these inquiries and the accounting research required, it will be some weeks before a complete report is available. When it is available, I will notify the honourable member accordingly.

### EDUCATION: STUDENT GUILDS

#### *Meeting with Minister*

8. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Minister has refused to meet the President of the Guild of Undergraduates at the University of Western Australia (Mr Ken Strahan) to discuss student guild legislation, the activities of the Clarko committee and related matters?
- (2) If not, on how many occasions has he met with Mr Strahan to discuss these matters?
- (3) Does the Minister now accept that Mr Strahan is, in fact, the legally elected president of the guild?
- (4) Has the Minister met with, or sought to meet with, the President of the Western Australian Institute of Technology Student Guild, or the Murdoch Guild of Students?
- (5) Did the Minister hold meetings with Mr Strahan's predecessors, Mr Grace and Mr Fitzgerald?
- (6) Does the Minister intend to meet with Mr Strahan in the near future?
- (7) If not, will the Minister desist from attacking Mr Strahan and/or the Guild of Undergraduates in Parliament and in the media?
- (8) Is legislation to amend student guild legislation being prepared?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) As previously indicated, the Government has never questioned the election.
- (4) No.

(5) Yes, when appropriate.

(6) Mr Strahan has been advised by letter that I will meet with him, and with other student representatives, when any legislative changes are determined.

(7) Not applicable.

(8) As previously indicated, all student guild legislation is being reviewed.

### SEWERAGE

#### *Dianella*

9. Mr WILSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Can he say whether there has been any extension to the area designated for sewerage reticulation in Dianella beyond that shown in the board's five-year plan 1978-1983?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) what additional area will be covered in the financial year 1979-1980?
- (3) If no additional areas are to be catered for, can he say why officials of the board have recently advised the owners of Nos. 455 and 459 Lennard Street, Dianella, that their properties will be affected by work connected with sewerage development in the next financial year as it appears that these properties are not located within the Morley 2A area designated for such development?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) An extension to reticulation area Morley 15C is proposed and will be advertised shortly for public comment according to statutory procedures.

### MINISTER OF THE CROWN: PREMIER

#### *Irish Community*

10. Mr TAYLOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Premier passed a derisive remark about the Irish community in Western Australia at the drawing of the WAY 79 Lottery on the 15th May?
- (2) If "yes", what remarks?
- (3) Does he consider these remarks appropriate?
- (4) Is it a fact that he has received a number of complaints from several organisations?

- (5) Is he aware of the contribution of the Irish community to the progress of Western Australia over the last 150 years?
- (6) Will he publicly apologise for his inappropriate remarks?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I can only assume the honourable member has asked this question with his tongue in his cheek or else the leprechauns have got at him. The answer is as follows—

- (1) to (3) It was not a derisive remark, nor was it intended to be; but it was a remark made in the atmosphere of the occasion in a lighthearted vein and would be so interpreted by most people, including the Irish community.
- (4) No. Only one person has phoned me and discussed his personal view. I explained the circumstances, including the fact that the comment I made was only repeating what a respected member of the Irish community had related. I also expressed surprise to the gentleman concerned about his reaction and disappointment and regret that he had reacted as he had.
- (5) I am aware of the contribution the Irish community has made to the progress of Western Australia over the last 150 years and I applaud it and always have done. The Irish community knows my views on the matter.
- (6) See previous answers.

## PUBLIC SERVANTS

### *Justices of the Peace*

11. Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Are public servants, as a general rule, debarred from appointment as justices of the peace?
- (2) If so, for what reasons?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes—except in very special circumstances, in view of the fact that all appointees are now required to undertake, if required, all duties of the office, including court duties. Government employees should not be absent from their official duties for these purposes and, to exclude them

from court duties would conflict with this policy. Also it could be embarrassing for other reasons if a public servant had to sit on certain cases involving the Government, or other public servants.

## HEALTH

### *Meat*

12. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are there any regulations to control the number of days pre-cut and packed meat can remain on display for sale in supermarkets?
- (2) If so, what are the regulations?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) No. control is provided by general requirements of the Health Act.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The National Health and Medical Research Council recommended standard for date marking of food has been approved by the Western Australian Food and Drug Authority Committee and regulations based upon these recommendations are currently being prepared.

## EDUCATION: STUDENT GUILDS

### *Meeting with Minister*

13. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

This is a further question to the one I asked a few moments ago. In part (1) of that question I asked the Minister whether it was a fact that he had refused to meet Mr Strahan and, in part (2), I asked the Minister, "If not, on how many occasions have you met with Mr Strahan to discuss these matters?" The answer given by the Minister to part (2) was, "Not applicable." However, it does seem to be quite applicable. I should like to ask the Minister now on how many occasions he has met with Mr Strahan.

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The member should read the question asked. He prefaced part (2) by saying, "If not, on how many occasions. . . ."

Mr Pearce: And you said you had not.

Mr P. V. JONES: I have not refused to meet him and the member has assumed that, because I have not refused to meet him, I have in fact met him.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES  
AND GAS*Disconnection of Service*

840. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What sum of money, and over what period, owing to the State Energy Commission by a consumer is considered sufficient grounds to disconnect electricity and/or gas supplies?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

There is no set minimum amount below which disconnection procedures will not be taken. Each case is considered on its merits following expiration of the last date for payment shown on the account.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

*National Youth Advisory Group*

841. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) Did the Government make any recommendations to the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs as to any appointment to the national youth advisory group?

(2) If so, what are the details?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) No.

## RAILWAYS

*Cyclone Company Fencing*

842. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Who engaged Cyclone W.A. Ltd. to encircle railway lines, railway signals, railway electricity poles bearing lights to illuminate the main line west of Perth City railway station?

(2) Is this a breach of the undertaking the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transport Trust gave the president and secretary of the joint railway executive that he would have further discussions before any work commenced?

(3) Why were the safety regulations of the railway by-laws not carried out and district railway officers not advised of the work so that safety regulations could have been adhered to?

(4) (a) Why has it been necessary to call police officers onto railway property to supervise the operation of the erection of the fence; and  
(b) who authorised the police?

(5) Is it the Government's intention to utilise the Police force to see that their plans are implemented re discontinuance of Perth-Fremantle line and the building of a freight diversion line via Canning Vale?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) The MTT.

(2) No. On the morning of Friday, 27th April, the Chairman of the MTT paid the secretaries of the Australian Railway Union and the Locomotive Drivers' Union the courtesy of meeting them at his instigation to tell them it was intended to proceed with extension of the bus station by adding an extra platform and that a start had to be made immediately to ensure completion by 2nd September, 1979.

In response to their requests that the work be delayed, the chairman agreed to do this for a short period.

By the following Monday week, the chairman had still not heard from either of the secretaries. Having made continuous efforts to contact them without avail and because it was essential to commence the work early, the chairman allowed the building of a safety fence to commence on Thursday, 10th May.

(3) Safety was in no way impaired in the way the work was carried out.

(4) The Chairman of the MTT advised the Minister for Labour that in view of the background to the matter, he held some concern that the work might not be allowed to go ahead peacefully and the Minister for Labour alerted the police to this concern.

(5) The Government will take such action as is necessary to uphold the law.

## ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

*Power Station: Redbank*

843. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Will he send an industrial officer to Redbank power station to participate in a conference to discuss workers' grievances at the station, and thus aim to prevent a worsening of industrial relations between the workers and the administration?

(2) If "Yes" when?

(3) If "No" why not?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (3) The grievances are being treated by the State Energy Commission as a normal industrial matter, and I believe it proper that the matter be handled in this way. I do not propose to take any specific action.

# "WESTERN AUSTRALIAN OIL AND GAS REGISTER"

## *Purchase and Distribution by Government*

844. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) How many copies of the Lipscombe and Associates publication *Western Australian Oil and Gas Register* have been purchased by the Government?
- (2) What was the cost of purchasing them?
- (3) What was the cost of distributing them?
- (4) To whom have they been distributed?
- (5) Who is the author of the articles in the publication?
- (6) Who decided that the Government should purchase and distribute copies of the publication?
- (7) Was the content of the publication checked for suitability and accuracy by the Government before the decision was taken to buy it?
- (8) If "Yes" to (7), by whom was it checked?
- (9) If "No" to (7), why not?
- (10) Why did the Government purchase and distribute copies of the publication?
- (11) What percentage of the publication's total print-run is the quantity bought by the Government?
- (12) Did the Government undertake to buy copies of the publication:
  - (a) before writing and production began;
  - (b) during writing and production; or
  - (c) after the publication had been produced?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 5 000 copies.
- (2) \$9 200.
- (3) Total costs not available. Copies were distributed by departmental officers at the Offshore Technology Conference, Western Australian Government stand, at Houston, Texas.
- (4) Answered in part by (3) above. Further copies have been forwarded through the department's mailing list.
- (5) Mr Don Lipscombe edited the brochure.
- (6) Department of Industrial Development.

- (7) to (9) The scope of the publication was discussed with departmental officers; thereafter the responsibility for production rested with Mr Lipscombe.
- (10) To promote industry in Western Australia by making the brochure available to the Perth Chamber of Commerce and the Confederation of Western Australian Industry for distribution at the Offshore Technology Conference held at Houston, Texas. Some copies were forwarded to interested oil and gas companies in Australia and overseas.
- (11) Not known.
- (12) The department gave a prior indication that if the publication proved to be of an acceptable standard and price then the department would buy copies.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Inexperienced Junior Workers*

845. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to the answers to question 755 of 1979, does the Government advocate reductions in wages of juniors who work:
  - (a) under awards where they are paid the adult wage;
  - (b) in industries where adult rates must be paid before age 21, as is the case with restaurant, hotel, tavern and transport workers?
- (2) If so, have estimates been made of the amounts or percentages by which the Government believes wages for juniors should be reduced?
- (3) Has the Government ever presented a case to the Industrial Commission seeking a reduction in wages or relatively smaller increases in wages for juniors than adults?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The Government's attitude was made clear in my answer to question 755 of 1979.
- (2) No.
- (3) The present Government has not made such an application.

## ENERGY: GAS

### *North-West Shelf: Work Force*

846. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) In view of—
  - (a) his announcement that 7 000 workers would be trained for the North-West Shelf project;
  - (b) his answer to part (3) of question 2153 of 31st October, 1978, which indicates that the broad

labour requirements of the North-West Shelf will be 6 770 and possibly 7 570 persons, and the on-shore process plant will require 4 500 persons;

- (c) the Minister for Industrial Development's answer to part (2) of question 690 of 1979, which indicates accommodation needs for an expected construction work force in the Dampier-Karratha area of 3 500 in the construction phase, and 500 in the operational phase, will he indicate why he believes that 7 000 workers will be trained when he estimates the total work force requirements as 6 770 or 7 570 taking into account widespread unemployment amongst fully trained workers who will be required for the project?
- (2) Will he explain why no workers are being trained for the North-West Shelf, taking into account his announcement of a programme last November to train 7 000 workers?
- (3) Will he explain how many workers are being trained under other schemes in fields of work which will be required for the North-West Shelf project?
- (4) Will he indicate why he established the labour requirements for the onshore process plant at 4 500 when the Minister for Industrial Development has referred to 3 500 workers in the construction phase and 500 in the operational phase for the Dampier-Karratha area?

Mr O'CONNOR replied.

- (1) It has never been stated that 7 000 workers would be trained. I have said that 7 000 would be required and that the Commonwealth has been asked to assist with training schemes.

On each occasion that questions have been raised in respect of the numbers to be employed or those who will need to be trained for the North-West Shelf project it has been made clear that these have been preliminary and broad estimates of labour and that specific details were not available. This remains the situation, although it is expected that more detailed information will be available shortly.

It is clear, however, that over 7 000 skilled and semi-skilled workers will be required for this project.

Many of these workers will need to be trained as already there are shortages in the skill groups which will be in high demand, particularly in the electrical and metal industry groups.

The National Training Council has estimated that Australia could use 10 000 more tradesmen each year and

as apprenticeship employment numbers have reduced nationally—although not in WA—skill shortages will become increasingly apparent. These results have been supported by surveys of the Metal Trades Industry Association and by the Victorian Industrial Training Commission.

It is also worth emphasising that the North-West Shelf project is one of a number of projects expected and that the 7 000 workers is the estimated number which will be directly employed on the project. This does not include any multiplier effects in employment generally.

- (2) and (3) See answer to question 693 of 1979.
- (4) The figure of 4 500 was based on early estimates. More recently this has been reduced to 3 500, however the SEC pipeline estimated component has increased from the original 550 to 1 110 workers.

It should be clearly understood that at this time no firm precise figures can be fixed.

#### STOCK: LAMBS

##### *Number Available for Slaughter*

847. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has an estimate been made of the possible number of lambs that will be available for slaughter during the forthcoming lambing season?
- (2) Does his department believe that Robb Jetty abattoir will be able to handle all of that kill?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) I am informed the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board has estimated lamb turn off and is currently finalising its slaughtering arrangements with the Western Australian Meat Commission and private abattoir operators.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

##### *Cockburn Council*

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

Further to my question 736 of 1979, I phoned the Cockburn Shire Council and was informed that she had approved on 5th April the writing off of the rates involved by those people who had to move from the Naval Base settlement. In view of this, how does she reconcile

that information with the answer she gave to me in part (1) of that question when she stated that no approach had been made to her in this matter?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

It is true that I have approved the write-off of rates imposed by the council of the Town of Cockburn on certain leases in the Naval Base settlement.

However, I repeat that no approach has been made to me with respect to the separate question of the payment of rate refunds by the council of the Town of Cockburn.

## WATER SKIING

### *Millstream*

849. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have any complaints been lodged with the Harbour and Light Department relevant to people water skiing on the pools at Millstream?
- (2) If "Yes" what action has been taken to ensure that this practice ceases?
- (3) Has the relevant reserve management authority been consulted in this matter?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No.

## LAND: RESERVE

### *No. 25211*

850. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

Further to question 735 of 1979 relevant to reserve 25211, is the Minister now able to give me the answers as requested in that question?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

Visual inspection has been carried out but need for survey could be necessary.

## DRAINAGE

### *Midvale*

851. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

Further to question 758 of 1979 relevant to an overall drainage scheme, would the Minister now advise:

- (1) Has the department informed the Mundaring and Swan Shires that it has accepted the responsibility

for an overall drainage scheme to be known as the Woodbridge/Black Adder Creek drainage proposal?

- (2) If "Yes" how is it that the Minister now states in answer to my question 768 that the drainage within this scheme is a matter for the local authority?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No. Portion of Woodbridge Creek/Blackadder Creek was constituted as a metropolitan main drain under gazettal of 21st January, 1977. The Metropolitan Water Board has not extended the metropolitan main drainage district to include any associated area except that area east of the standard gauge railway in Morrison Road which was gazetted on 22nd September, 1978.
- (2) Not applicable.

## ABATTOIR: ROBB JETTY

### *Effluent Treatment Plant*

852. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

What plans are under discussion by the Government to upgrade the present effluent and offall treatment plant at Robb Jetty to prevent the present pollution problem that is taking place in Cockburn Sound by virtue of the outlet from the abattoir discharging into that sound?

Mr OLD replied:

The general issue of disposal of waste water by industries in the area has been the subject of environmental impact reports. Decisions in relation to these reports have not yet been made by the Government.

## WATER SUPPLIES: RATES

### *Non-payment*

853. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

Relevant to my question 786 of 1979 dealing with water services accounts, will the Minister consider discontinuing the present practice of the disconnection of water services as a means of making consumers pay moneys owing to the department, in view of a possible inherent health risk?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:  
No.

## RAILWAYS

*Advertising Signs*

854. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question 784 of 1979 relevant to the erection of advertising signs on railway property, would he advise:

- (1) How many signs have been removed from railway property by Australian Posters Pty. Ltd. between the Guildford station and the Midland station over the last 12 months?
- (2) Although some signs have been removed, other signs have been erected. What is the actual amount of advertising space that has been lost by the removal of some signs and the erection of others in the locality nominated in (1) above over the last 12 months?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Three signs have been removed and a further three unauthorised signs are to be removed.
- (2) No advertising space was lost in this area.

## LAND: NATIONAL PARK

*South Coast*

855. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) On 20th October, 1976, the State Cabinet endorsed the recommendation of the Environmental Protection Authority concerning the creation of a south coast national park. Would he now advise, has the South Coast National Park been proclaimed?
- (2) Has any logging taken place within the defined boundaries of the proposed park since Cabinet's endorsement of the recommendation?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what is the locality of such logging?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) An area of 13 hectares, as shown on the map tabled herewith, was cleared in 1978 as a salvage operation resulting from the Boorara fire. There has also been a limited amount of salvage work carried out in the proposed south coast national park as the result of cyclonic activity where logs have obstructed access roads and fire tracks.

*The map was tabled (see paper No. 181).*

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

*WA Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd.*

856. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has the W.A. Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. carried out a feasibility study on the establishment of a pulp mill within 130 miles of Manjimup, as required by the Wood Chipping Industry Agreement Act (section 19), initially due in May, 1976?
- (2) If "Yes" when was it submitted and when will it be made public?
- (3) If "No" when is it now required to be submitted?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The feasibility study was submitted on 28th April, 1978. It contains confidential commercial information and accordingly will not be made public.

## HEALTH

*Medical Services: Commonwealth Contribution*

857. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he seen reports that the Australian Government is considering a recommendation to lower its contribution to the cost of medical services from the present 40%?
- (2) Will a reduction lead to increased medical insurance costs for those now covered?
- (3) Will a reduction increase the consumer price index?
- (4) What action has he taken to request the Australian Government not to reduce the present 40% contribution?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) to (4) The question of the extent of the contribution by the Commonwealth Government to the cost of medical services is entirely the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government and the State has not been nor is it likely to be approached on this matter.

## PRISON: FREMANTLE

*Inmates: Mental*

858. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Adverting to question 309 of 1979 concerning a submission from Peter Williams of Fremantle Prison, what action has been taken following consideration of this submission?



Mr O'NEIL replied:

The general matters raised in Mr Wilsmore's submission are relevant to the WA Law Reform Commission project on "Criminal Proceedings and Mental Disorder" to whom, I am informed, a copy was sent.

The Government awaits the commission's report.

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

The decision by the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board and the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre Trust to charge for parking at the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre was made in order to control the available parking spaces at that centre and thus ensure that only persons who have genuine reasons to utilise the parking facilities do so.

## HEALTH EDUCATION COUNCIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Request by Health Education Council*

859. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) When did the Health Education Council write to him seeking legislative change as presented in the Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill 1979?

(2) Will he table the correspondence?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

(1) At the request of the Health Education Council, the information was conveyed to me at a meeting with the Chairman of the Health Education Council on 2nd October, 1978.

(2) Not relevant.

## HEALTH

### *Broome Aboriginal Medical Service*

860. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it a fact that the Broome regional Aboriginal medical service has applied for financial assistance from funds made available through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs?

(2) Has his department supported the request for financial assistance?

(3) If not, why not?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) I understand that the medical service treats all patients and is not confined to Aboriginals. It is a private practice funded on a fee for service basis. The department's relationship with the practice is the same as it would be with any other private practice in the Kimberley.

## HOSPITAL

### *Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre*

861. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

What is the justification for the introduction of parking fees at the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre?

## HEALTH

### *Microwave Ovens*

862. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Are persons using microwave ovens exposed to radiation?

(2) If so, what are the upper and lower limits of radiation?

(3) What regulations exist governing the use of microwave ovens?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

(1) Users of microwave ovens are exposed to microwave radiation only if malfunction of the safety devices permits leakage of the radiation.

(2) The upper limit recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council is a power density level of 5 milliwatts per square centimetre at any point 5 centimetres or more from the surface of the oven. There is no lower limit.

(3) None.

## EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

### *Morley*

863. Mr WILSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the reticulation bore at the Morley Senior High School has been out of action for some time and that this, combined with continuing dry weather, has left lawn areas, including the two school ovals, in a very poor state?

(2) Can the Minister confirm that funds will be allocated for the repair of the bore in the next financial year?

(3) If "Yes" to (1) and (2), can the Minister give an assurance that repairs to the bore will be treated as a matter of urgency as soon as funds are available?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) A report was received on 30th April that the bore was out of action. The system was inspected and on the 11th May the problem was located and corrected. Watering of garden areas and ovals has been possible since that date.

## TRAFFIC: RTA

*Loadometers*

864. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is it fact that the hi-way loadometers used by the heavy haulage section of the Road Traffic Authority when conducting roadside checks on trucks, measure the weight on each axle?
- (2) Is he aware that the weighing-out facilities at quarries and other establishments allow for trucks to be weighed only in whole, so that possible overloading on one axle cannot be ascertained?
- (3) In view of the possible anomaly which arises as a result of action being taken against drivers for overloading per axle when established weighing facilities do not provide for such checks, will he have the situation investigated in order to ensure that truck drivers who may be affected are receiving fair treatment?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Weighing facilities at loading sites vary. Some provide axle weighers and some provide a weighbridge. Most weighbridges can be used to assess axle weights fairly accurately.
- (3) The Government is not responsible for private weighing facilities provided at quarries or any other loading sites. Legislation provides a tolerance applicable to the mass ascertained on vehicle axles, and this, coupled with administrative tolerances, ensures that truck operators receive fair treatment.

## HAIRDRESSERS

*Industrial Training Advisory Committee and Apprentices*

865. Mr HERZFELD, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Further to question 753 of 1979:

- (1) Has an apprenticeship officer been appointed to the men's hairdressing trade under the Apprenticeship Regulations (1972)?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) when;
  - (b) what is his/her name;
  - (c) is he/she also the apprenticeship officer for the ladies' hairdressing trade;
  - (d) is he/she a qualified hairdresser in both men's and ladies' hairdressing?

(3) When were annual practical examinations abandoned for the men's hairdressing trade?

(4) What were the reasons submitted by the Industrial Training Advisory Council in recommending the discontinuance of annual practical examinations for hairdressing apprentices?

(5) (a) Is it a fact that the Industrial Advisory Board for the hairdressing trades has recommended the reintroduction of annual practical examinations;

(b) if so, when was this recommendation made?

(6) Is it a fact that representatives of the men's and ladies' sections of the trade as well as the union on the Board are of the opinion that standards attained by apprentices has seriously deteriorated since the abandonment of annual practical examinations?

(7) Do his advisers give any credence to these opinions?

(8) Is he in a position to advise when the Industrial Training Advisory Council will make a recommendation on the matter?

(9) Will he arrange to advise me when a decision is made on the matter and the reasons for the decision?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) 1973.  
(b) Mrs M. Keating.  
(c) Yes.  
(d) Mrs Keating is formally qualified in ladies', but not men's hairdressing.
- (3) 6th February, 1978.
- (4) The Western Australian Industrial Training Advisory Council considered that annual practical examinations were not necessary.
- (5) (a) Yes.  
(b) 14th August, 1978.
- (6) Several members of the board have expressed the view that standards attained by apprentices had fallen in recent times.
- (7) The Western Australian Industrial Training Advisory Council is aware of the views expressed by this board.
- (8) This matter is currently being considered by the Western Australian Industrial Training Advisory Council.
- (9) Yes.

# GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

## *Basketball Facility at Derby*

866. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

Regarding Government order number 309595 for the construction of a basketball facility at Derby:

- (1) How much is to be paid to the contractor by the Government?
- (2) When was the contractor's account first rendered?
- (3) Has the account been paid?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), when?
- (5) If "No" to (3), how much longer will it be before the account is paid and what is said to be the reason for the delay?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) \$22 458.
- (2) The contractor's first progress payment of \$15 000 was requested in late November 1978 and the second payment of \$6 908 in March 1979. The balance of \$550 represents normal retention moneys held until final completion of the contract.
- (3) The first progress payment has been paid but not the second.
- (4) The first progress payment was made in December 1978.
- (5) The second progress payment is now in course to the Treasury Department for the issue of a cheque.

The second progress payment request contained an anomaly that necessitated it being referred back to Derby for clarification. Upon return in mid-April, scheduling difficulties prevented payment being arranged until now.

# FERTILISER

## *Seaweed*

867. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that a Japanese company, or any company, is interested in harvesting seaweed along our coastline in order to manufacture fertiliser?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" has an application for lease been filed; and  
(b) where is the area of interest?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) My Department of Industrial Development is not aware of any such interest by a Japanese or any other company.

# HOUSING

## *Kimberley Region and Pilbara*

868. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What was the initial allocation of finance for construction of State Housing Commission homes in the Pilbara and Kimberley for the 1978-80 period?
- (2) Has there been any change in the intended programme?
- (3) If so, what is the nature of the programme serviced by the funds now available?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The initial programme for the two-year period 1978-80 in the Pilbara and Kimberley was 492 units at an estimated cost of \$17.9 million.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The programme has been increased by 79 units at an estimated cost of \$2.5 million. In addition, 40 units scheduled to go to tender in January/March, 1980, will now be put to tender in June, 1979.

I would add that this is the biggest building programme ever undertaken by the commission in these two areas. An effort is being made to bring waiting times for State Housing Commission tenants in the north to parity with waiting times in the south.

Mr McIver: I know why you cannot get a house in Northam.

# ROADS

## *Northern and Great Northern Highways*

869. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the total expenditure on the following road projects:
  - (a) upgrading and sealing of the Great Northern Highway between Meekatharra and Newman;
  - (b) upgrading and sealing of the North West Coastal Highway between Carnarvon and Port Hedland?
- (2) What is the expected expenditure and/or funds allocated, the programme and nature of work to be carried out on the following roads:
  - (a) Port Hedland to Broome section of Great Northern Highway;
  - (b) new South Hedland access road;
  - (c) Pannawonica access road;
  - (d) Paraburdoo to Tom Price road;
  - (e) Nanutarra to Paraburdoo road;
  - (f) Newman to Paraburdoo/Tom Price road?
- (3) What stage has been reached with the corridor study for the Great Northern Highway link between Newman and Port Hedland?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) (a) \$18 828 933;  
(b) \$30 824 332.
- (2) (a) Estimated cost to complete the construction and sealing is \$30 million on the basis of present day unit costs. It is anticipated that black top (primed surface) will be completed by early 1981 and the final seal coat during the 1981-82 financial year;
- (b) work is currently in progress to construct and seal the new access. The plan provides for realignment of part of the North West Coastal Highway and Finga Street in the light industrial area and the total estimated cost is \$935 000. It is envisaged that the work will be completed by the end of August this year;
- (c) work has started on the first stage construction of the access road on a new shorter alignment. Proposal provides for the clearing and light formation on the new alignment with gravel sheeting of some weaker sections. The estimated cost of this work is \$550 000 and is scheduled for completion by mid-September this year. Subsequent upgrading of the road will be dependent on Cliff's requested requirements and financial contribution in accordance with the Iron Ore (Cleveland Cliffs) Agreement;
- (d) current planning envisages completion of construction and priming between Paraburdoo and Tom Price during the 1980-81 financial year, with seal coat to be completed in the 1981-82 financial year. On the basis of present day unit costs, the estimated cost of the outstanding work is \$7.4 million;
- (e) planning provides for the upgrading of the road over the next five years commencing with the 1979-80 programme, including construction of bridges over several of the major creeks and rivers. Commencement of sealing of the road is envisaged in the latter part of the five year programme. This work would involve an expenditure of some \$12.6 million during the five-year period on the basis of present day unit costs;
- (f) a formed and gravelled road link between the Paraburdoo-Tom Price Road and the future alignment of the National Highway is envisaged within five years but no estimate is yet available. The location and timing of this work is dependent on the final decision

between the State and Commonwealth regarding the location of the National Highway.

- (3) The investigation has been substantially completed and the report for submission to the Minister for Transport (Commonwealth) is now in course of preparation.

Seven alternative routes have been examined and it is anticipated that agreement will be reached with the Commonwealth for the development of one of these alternatives as the National Highway alignment through the Pilbara.

## ROAD

### Eyre Highway

870. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did the Main Roads Department construct a water point for travellers on the Eyre Highway just outside of the Norseman township but within the Norseman town area last year?
- (2) (a) If so, what was the date of the construction; and  
(b) the estimated cost thereof?
- (3) Is it fact that the Main Roads Department failed to consult with or notify the Dundas Shire Council of its intentions prior to the construction?
- (4) (a) If so, is that failure the normal policy of the Main Roads Department; and  
(b) is such policy encouraged by the Government?
- (5) (a) If it is not the encouraged policy of the Government, was a formal apology made to the Council;  
(b) if not, why not;  
(c) if an apology was made could the Minister specify the correspondence?
- (6) Since the construction, has the said council objected to the watering point and requested its removal?
- (7) What action has been taken by the Main Roads Department or the Government on the lastmentioned request?
- (8) Is he aware that the construction and placing of the water point cuts across and runs completely counter to long standing plans by the council drawn up in conjunction with the Department of Tourism for the construction of a comprehensive rest centre for travellers and tourists in the Town of Norseman for which the Department of Tourism has already committed \$40 000 and the Dundas Shire Council \$20 000?
- (9) Is he aware that in spite of the fact that a "no camping" sign has subsequently been erected at the water point, there still needs to be constant policing to

prevent people camping at the spot, creating unsanitary conditions, littering the area and despoiling the area for the purpose of obtaining firewood and other reasons?

- (10) If the Minister is not aware of the last-mentioned situation, will he undertake to either make himself aware or cause enquiries to be made into it?
- (11) (a) Would he be prepared to order the removal of the water point as requested by the council; and  
(b) if not, why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes, but isolated from any residential development.
- (2) (a) Commenced 18th December, 1978, and completed 19th December.  
(b) \$2 767.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) (a) and (b) No.
- (5) (a) and (b) Yes;  
(c) letter to Acting Shire Clerk, Dundas Shire Council, from Secretary, Main Roads Department, dated 8th January, 1979.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) "No Camping" signing undertaken and a barrier fence erected around the perimeter of the parking bay.
- (8) Yes. I am now aware that there has been a recent commitment of funds by the Government.
- (9) and (10) Yes. Regular policing of the area is carried out by Main Roads Department staff and Road Traffic Authority personnel as part of their normal duties and to date there has been little evidence of fouling, littering or despoiling of the area or of over-night camping.
- (11) (a) and (b) The decision to provide a watering point was taken following an approach by the Royal Automobile Club and in view of experience to date, it should be retained and the position reviewed when the council's proposed tourist facility in Norseman is established and operating.

#### EDUCATION: SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

##### Norseman

871. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What improvements and additions have been made to Government schools in Norseman in the last seven years?
- (2) When were the improvements and/or additions effected?

- (3) (a) What was the cost of the improvement and/or additions; and  
(b) what was the source of funds for same?
- (4) (a) Is there a plan for the general upgrading of schools in Norseman; and  
(b) if so, when was it drawn up?
- (5) Has all of the abovementioned plan been implemented, and if not, why not?
- (6) (a) Is it intended to replace the existing Bristol classrooms at the Norseman High School;  
(b) if so, when is it intended to be done;  
(c) would the action be taken within the next two years?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) (a) Six classrooms and library/resource centre;  
(b) six classrooms and upgraded administration area.
- (2) (a) 1974;  
(b) 1974-75.
- (3) (a) Tender price \$414 253—States Grants Act;  
(b) tender price \$495 911—States Grants Act.
- (4) A general development plan for the school was prepared in June, 1973.
- (5) No. Funds have not been available for the work.
- (6) The school is listed for major work including a new home economics area, change rooms, showers and toilets in the proposed 1979-80 building programme. The need to demolish the Bristol classrooms and to provide additional classroom accommodation is being investigated at present. It is anticipated that the proposed work will be undertaken during 1980.

#### HOSPITAL

##### Norseman

872. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What improvements and renovations have been done to the Norseman District Hospital over the last five years?
- (2) (a) When were the improvements and renovations carried out; and  
(b) what was the cost thereof?
- (3) (a) Is there a plan for further improvement, additions or upgrading of the hospital; and  
(b) if so, when was the plan drawn up?
- (4) (a) How much of the aforementioned plan has been implemented;

- (b) if part or all of it has not been implemented, the reason why?
- (5) What future plans does the Government have for the improvement of the hospital?
- (6) Has the Government received representations for the addition of men's and women's geriatric wards to the said hospital?
- (7) By whom were the aforementioned representations made?
- (8) (a) Does the Government intend to take any action in respect of the representations; and  
(b) if so, what action?

Mrs Craig (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) and (2) (a) and (b) In August, 1975, a contract for repairs and renovations to the staff quarters was let at a cost of \$31 736. Work was completed in March, 1976. In June, 1977, a contract for a major repair and renovation and remodelling programme to the hospital was let at a cost of \$293 375. Work was completed in June, 1977. This work included a major internal re-arrangement of services.
- (3) (a) Yes;  
(b) a preliminary scheme was prepared in October, 1978.
- (4) (a) None;  
(b) unavailability of funds.
- (5) As in (3)(b) when funds are available.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) Mr J. F. Grill, M.L.A., on behalf of the Norseman Branch of the Australian Pensioners' League.
- (8) (a) and (b) These representations are being considered and a reply will be sent to the Member.

#### TRAFFIC: OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

##### *Control of Vehicles (Off-road areas) Act*

873. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) With respect to the Control of Vehicles (Off-road areas) Act passed by Parliament in 1978: which of the under-mentioned periods of time at this stage seems most likely to approximate the time the Act might be proclaimed:  
(a) one week;  
(b) one month;  
(c) three months;  
(d) six months;  
(e) 12 months;  
(f) never?

- (2) Is there any likelihood that the Act will not be proclaimed but that the Act will be resubmitted to Parliament in an amended form?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Between one to three months.
- (2) No.

#### EDUCATION: SCHOOLS

##### *Annual Levy on Parents*

874. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When, in a State primary school, the principal requests an annual contribution/levy from all parents towards the cost of additional school amenities, under what regulation, if any, is such a request authorised?
- (2) Is the decision to request such a contribution/levy influenced by any Government or departmental requirement, recommendation and/or suggestion?
- (3) Is the payment of any such amount so requested by the principal in any way compulsory?
- (4) Can any action be taken by the principal against any pupil/parent who declined to pay such contribution/levy?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Regulation 56 and Item 6.05 of the Teachers' Handbook and Administrative Instructions.
- (2) and (3) No.
- (4) No, except that if the amenities fee were used for extra curricular activities, e.g. excursions, buses to carnivals, etc., it might be expected that students who had not participated in the amenities fund would be asked to contribute for the special activity.

#### FIRE STATION

##### *Rockingham*

875. Dr TROY, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of installing a permanently manned fire station at Rockingham?
- (2) What would the annual recurring costs of such a station be estimated at?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Between \$200 000 and \$250 000.
- (2) Estimated at \$300 000.

## GOVERNMENT ACHIEVEMENTS

*Document*

876. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government is again preparing a large document outlining its alleged achievements since taking office?
- (2) Is it a fact that the document will deal with matters going back to 1974 and that it is scheduled to be produced in October?
- (3) (a) What is the estimated cost of the document; and  
(b) can he give the House an assurance that the cost will be substantially less than the cost of \$11 each incurred in the production of 1 000 copies of the Government's previous sort of document *Policy and Performance*?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No. The Government is not preparing any document concerning "alleged" achievements. It is, however, compiling for the information of the public, a record of its actual achievements. I hope the Leader of the Opposition has no objection to the public being informed of what its Government is doing. It is likely that the publication will be substantial, because the Government's achievements are substantial.
- (2) The publication will detail the Government's achievements since 1974. No date has been fixed for production and distribution.
- (3) (a) and (b) No firm estimate has as yet been sought. It is anticipated that, after allowing for inflation, the cost will be about the same as for the publication of a document with similar intentions prepared by a previous Labor Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, and to which he contributed.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

*Carnarvon Transport Co-operative Ltd.*

877. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that officers from the Department of Industrial Development in company with officers from the Treasury and the Transport Commission went to Carnarvon to assist with the formation of the Carnarvon Transport Co-operative Ltd.?
- (2) Was this assistance and subsequent help from these officers and departments provided at no cost to the co-operative?

- (3) Was an announcement made during the early stages of the formation of the co-operative that a Government guarantee would be made available?
- (4) Is it a fact that the co-operative was successful in using the announcement of the Government's intention to provide a guarantee, in order to raise further funds through the banking sector?
- (5) Was the Government guarantee delayed because the co-operative requested the funds be made available in respect of a transport terminal at Perth rather than at Carnarvon as originally requested?
- (6) Is it a fact that the Government further assisted the co-operative by having the Industrial Lands Development Authority provide land at Kewdale on favourable terms for the development of a Perth terminal?
- (7) Has the Government now finalised the arrangements in respect of a Government guarantee and made \$60 000 available in this way to the co-operative for its Carnarvon terminal?
- (8) In view of the answers to questions (1) to (7) above, is there any basis in fact for a statement in a letter to the Editor of the *Northern Times* (3rd May edition) from Mr C. W. Tuckey that "This (the formation of the transport co-operative) was done without any Government financial assistance. Although it was often promised it was never forthcoming."?
- (9) Is Mr Tuckey still a director of the Carnarvon Transport Co-operative Ltd.?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Officers from both the Department of Industrial Development and Transport Commission visited Carnarvon on 5th September, 1974 to attend discussions with a local committee organising a transport co-operative and advise and assist them.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. The announcement to provide the co-operative with a Government guarantee was made on 5th December, 1975, 12 months after the incorporation of the co-operative.
- (4) The Government guarantee did enable the company to borrow funds of \$60 000 from the R and I Bank in addition to borrowings which had already been obtained as a normal banking risk.
- (5) No.
- (6) Yes, Industrial Lands Development Authority provided land for the co-operative as it does to other industry under conditions which are more favourable than commercial purchase of industrial land.
- (7) Yes.

The SPEAKER: Part (8) of this question seeks an opinion. Therefore, I rule that part out of order.

Mr MENSAROS:

- (9) Mr Tuckey is currently understood to be a director of the Carnarvon Transport Co-operative Ltd.

#### WATER SUPPLIES

##### *Warren-Lefroy Water Advisory Committee*

878. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Under what Statute was the Warren-Lefroy water advisory committee established?
- (2) On what date(s) was/were regulations relating to the operation of this body gazetted?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Regulations 1941.
- (2) 2nd December, 1941.

#### LEGAL AID COMMISSION

##### *Flying Lawyer Scheme*

879. Mr GRILL, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is it a fact that the legal aid scheme run by the Law Society of Western Australia instituted a flying lawyer scheme?
- (2) Is it a fact that the flying lawyer scheme was designed to make available a legal practitioner in country towns not frequently visited by practitioners in private practice and to give advice for \$5?
- (3) Is it a fact that the Legal Aid Commission requested the State Government for specific funds to enable the scheme to continue?
- (4) Is it a fact that the Government through Treasury refused to provide such specific funds?
- (5) Is it a fact that since May 1978 or prior thereto no flying lawyer under the Legal Aid Commission has travelled out of Perth?
- (6) Does the Government regard it as important that people in isolated communities should have access to a legal aid lawyer?
- (7) If the answer to (6) is "Yes" what steps does the Government propose to fund the Legal Aid Commission to make available this service?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.
- (4) Yes, but the request only covered the balance of this financial year.

- (5) No, the flying lawyer service to be conducted was run by the Legal Aid Commission from 26th June to the 10th July, 1978.

- (6) Yes. In fact by briefing private practitioners the Legal Aid Commission extends legal aid to people in isolated communities. Financial constraints this financial year precluded the continuation of the flying lawyer scheme which provided preliminary advice.

- (7) The estimates for the coming financial year submitted by the Legal Aid Commission to the Commonwealth and State Governments include provision of funds to re-instate the flying lawyer scheme. These will receive consideration in accordance with normal practice.

#### RAILWAYS

##### *Meekatharra-Mullewa*

880. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that a section of the copper aerial telegraph wire linking stations on the Meekatharra-Mullewa railway route has been unlawfully removed?
- (2) If so, has there been any action taken or investigation mounted to apprehend the wrongdoer?
- (3) Is it a fact that tenders have been called for removal of this Westrail facility?
- (4) Does his department believe that the publicity given to the availability of this material for public tender was advertised widely enough to attract national interest?
- (5) Was there a proper assessment made as to the cost of employing contractors to recover the line as a Public Works Department project, and make it available in job lots?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The police have been notified at Geraldton and Meekatharra and enquiries are continuing.
- (3) As advised to you by letter on 2nd April, 1979, Westrail is negotiating the sale of its interest in the telephone line between Mullewa and Mount Magnet to Telecom (Australia) who also have circuits on this line. Public tenders have been called for the sale and removal of the telephone line between Mount Magnet and Meekatharra.

This information has also been given to the local shires.



- (4) Tenders were advertised extensively in this State and in addition, tender documents were simultaneously sent to some 44 firms, some of which were located in the Eastern States.
- (5) Westrail had no further use for the copper wire and on previous experience where tenders have been called by Westrail for the removal and stockpile of the wire, significant losses have occurred. To achieve the best possible financial return to the State, the wire has been offered by public tender on a "sale and removal" basis.

- (8) A brochure of this kind and in these circumstances does not require the identification of the author and printer.

It is both desirable and essential that there be a document of this kind in respect of any Premier when he is travelling out of the State—and, in fact, requests are made in advance by many of the people, governments and organisations with whom appointments are made, and who assume such a brochure automatically exists.

The same applied to a former Labor Premier under whom the member served.

# MINISTER OF THE CROWN: PREMIER

## *Pamphlet*

881. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

Referring to his answer to my question without notice of Wednesday, 9th May, concerning a pamphlet entitled *Hon. Sir Charles Court and Lady Court*, is he able to provide the following additional information:

- (1) How much has been incurred in printing costs for the pamphlet?
- (2) Was the Government Printer responsible for printing the pamphlet?
- (3) If "No" to (2), who was responsible?
- (4) How many copies were printed for distribution?
- (5) Have the bills for printing and/or distribution of the pamphlet been forwarded to the Liberal Party, or the Premier for personal payment, or a State Government Department?
- (6) If the bills have been forwarded to a State Government Department, which one have they been forwarded to?
- (7) Who wrote the pamphlet?
- (8) Why did the author and the printer not put their signatures to the pamphlet?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$2 406.40.
- (2) No.
- (3) Harry Mills Advertising.
- (4) 2 400.
- (5) A department.
- (6) The Premier's Department, as the department for which the brochure was required.
- (7) The Premier's Department.

# PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

## *Civil Service Association: Claim*

882. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) When will a decision be made in respect of a claim by the Civil Service Association for an 8% salary increase?
- (2) Will the decision of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to grant special allowances for the Special Division of the Public Service be taken into account in assessing the claim currently before the Public Service Board?
- (3) Why has the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal granted increases outside wage indexation guidelines, whilst the Public Service Board has refused to do so in the past, on the grounds that State Government policy is for strict compliance with the wage indexation guidelines?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The Civil Service Association has several claims filed seeking general salary increases of the order of 8 per cent or higher. They are—
  - (a) A claim lodged on 2nd September, 1977, in respect of Administrative and Clerical Officers in the State Public Service.
  - (b) A claim lodged on 2nd September 1977, in respect of officers employed in the General Division of the State Public Service.
  - (c) A claim made on 7th September, 1977, in respect of officers employed in the Professional Division of the State Public Service.
  - (d) A claim served on 17th January, 1979, on Nedlands College, Churchlands College, Graylands Teachers' College, Claremont Teachers' College and Mount Lawley College in respect of all salaried non-academic staff employed by the councils of those colleges.

The claim referred to in paragraph 1 (a) was amended by the association on 5th October, 1977. An answer to the association was provided on 3rd November, 1977, which was repeated and amplified on 21st April, 1978, after a number of conferences between the Public Service Board and the association. A further amendment to this claim was received by the Public Service Board on 27th December, 1978, and an answer to the latest amendment will be provided to the association this month.

The claim covered by paragraph 1 (b) was answered by the Public Service Board on 1st May, 1978.

The Public Service Board answered the claim referred to in paragraph 1 (c) on 3rd November, 1977.

The claim referred to in paragraph 1 (d) comes within the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Commission whereas the other claims are subject to the jurisdiction of the State Public Service Arbitrator. Answers on the claim in respect of the colleges were filed with the Industrial Commission on 7th February 1979. The Industrial Commission commenced hearing the claim on 10th May, 1979, and the hearing will resume on 30th May, 1979.

- (2) I understand that these allowances have previously been taken into account by the Public Service Board in assessing the remuneration of senior officers not subject to the jurisdiction of the tribunal and therefore are of no relevance to the claims for salary increases referred to in (1) above.
- (3) I do not agree with the member's claim that the tribunal has granted increases outside wage indexation guidelines.

My understanding is that the tribunal has been meticulous in its efforts not to go outside the guidelines.

## ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

### *Power Station: Shark Bay*

883. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Was Mr T. Hargreaves sacked by the State Energy Commission from Shark Bay power station because of "unsatisfactory administrative arrangements"?
- (2) If so, why were the arrangements unsatisfactory?
- (3) Does his sacking relate in any way to his action in bringing the State Energy Commission before the industrial magistrate's court?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) Mr T. Hargreaves' contract for services to operate the Shark Bay power station and electricity undertaking expires on 18th May, 1979. It will not be renewed because he is not deemed to satisfactorily represent the commission's interests in the area.
- (3) No.

## ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

### *Power Stations: Northern*

884. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has his attention been drawn to possibly unsafe working conditions in State Energy Commission power stations in the north of this State?
- (2) If so, will he investigate these allegations?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Leader of the Opposition is obviously referring to matters which have been raised by the unions as part of a log of claims. The matter is being handled by the State Energy Commission as a normal industrial matter and I would not propose to take any specific action.