

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 17 September 1985

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

HOUSING: TENANTS

Legislation: Petition

The following petition bearing the signatures of 60 electors was presented by Hon. G. E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition)—

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

THAT we fear the Government will introduce tenancy laws similar to those in South Australia. Those laws discriminate against owners of property and diminish their natural rights, thus reducing the number of owners willing to offer properties for rent. This has caused a catastrophic decline in rental housing and a rising tide of tenants in desperate need of a place to live.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Council, in Parliament Assembled, should:

1. REFUSE to consider or pass any residential tenancy legislation until a Select Committee of the Council has undertaken a close study of the impact of such laws in other States of Australia.
2. HAVE special regard for the impact of such laws on landlords, tenants, the supply and price of rental housing and the rights of all citizens to arrange their own lawful affairs without interference from the State.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 149.)

ANIMALS: DOGS

Banning: Petition

The following petition bearing the signatures of 1 290 electors was presented by the President (Hon. Clive Griffiths)—

To the Honourable the President and Honourable Members of the Legislative

Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned Citizens and Rate-payers of the South Perth/Como district sheweth:

That the South Perth City Council's By-law totally banning dogs from Neill McDougal Park (Como), the South Perth Esplanade and Sir James Mitchell Park foreshore is a serious menace to our Civil rights and accordingly hereby request that you reject this portion of the By-law and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 150.)

SPORT AND RECREATION

Square-rigged Sailing Ship: Petition

The following petition bearing the signatures of 18 electors was presented by Hon. P. G. Pental—

TO: The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned pray that the Premier, the Hon. Brian Burke and the Education Minister, the Hon. Robert Pearce, in a time of economic restraint and cut backs on essential services, not waste up to half a million dollars of taxpayers funds on a square rigged sailing ship that will duplicate existing private charter yacht facilities.

Further, that the State Government undertake an accounting study to find out the total cost of construction, operating costs, viability and maintenance expenses before committing taxpayers to an open ended cheque supporting this project.

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

(See paper No. 162.)

PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

Dispute: Urgency Motion

THE PRESIDENT: Honourable members, I have received the following letter from Hon. V. J. Ferry—

Dear Mr President,

In accordance with Standing Order No. 63, I desire to move that the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11.00 a.m. Friday, 20

September, 1985, for the purpose of condemning the Government for its failure to:—

- (1) give public and unreserved support to the orders and decisions of the Western Australian Industrial Commission and the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission directing that the Australian Workers' Union has the legal and long standing right to be engaged upon the mooring and unmooring and shifting of vessels and the rigging and removal of gangways in the Port of Bunbury;
- (2) support the Bunbury Port Authority in its obligations and desire to carry out lawful directions issued by the above Commissions;
- (3) protect industries of the South West and the workers of those industries from the unlawful actions of militant Unions;
- (4) protect local industries and the Port of Bunbury from damage to their previously good international trading reputation;
- (5) stand by its self professed Bunbury 2000 strategy said to give special consideration, benefits and support to the people of that city;
- (6) ensure the Port of Bunbury remained open to facilitate the normal docking and servicing of "USS Towers", a Naval vessel of a friendly nation and long-standing proven ally, thereby—
 - (a) depriving the traders of Bunbury the benefit of an estimated spending power of \$150 000 to \$200 000 from visiting crewmen; and
 - (b) damaging international goodwill between friendly nations; and
- (7) this House condemns the Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Peter Dowding, for his failure to—
 - (a) exercise his Ministerial obligation to ensure the upholding of the law; and

- (b) for callously and irresponsibly disregarding the rights of AWU members to service the Port of Bunbury without interference from militant Unions.

Yours sincerely,

V. J. FERRY, MLC

In order that this motion can be considered it is necessary that it be supported by at least four members standing in their places.

Four members having risen in their places,

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11.00 a.m. on Friday, 20 September.

The purpose of my motion is to allow me the opportunity to exercise my right, as the representative of the Bunbury and the south-west region, to raise a matter of considerable importance to that area.

The Port of Bunbury has been stricken with industrial turmoil for quite some time. The turmoil has come about because the Australian Workers Union has always had the legal right to carry out a number of actions which I mentioned in my letter to the President. I do not propose to read out the reasons I outlined because they will be incorporated in *Hansard*.

As I have mentioned, the AWU has had a legal right to carry out various actions for a long time. I think it was in 1971 that the AWU's rights were formalised by an industrial agreement. However, prior to that date the AWU dealt in many different areas.

I am sure I am correct in saying that the Bunbury Port Authority has had an A-1 record in regard to the lack of industrial disputes over the last 75 years. It has an excellent track record for servicing the needs of the port and, in turn, the port is servicing the needs of industry in that region.

It is a sad state of affairs that the turmoil at the Port of Bunbury has occurred as a result of the Maritime Workers Union endeavouring to take over the role that hitherto was undertaken by members of the AWU.

Notwithstanding that, however, an order was issued by the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission, under the signature of Commissioner G. J. Martin on 18 July 1985, which clearly rejected a move by the Maritime Workers Union to take over a role at the Port of Bunbury which had been customarily serviced by members of the AWU.

The commissioner stated quite clearly in his order of that date that the AWU had the right to engage workers involved with the mooring, unmooring, and shifting of vessels, and the rigging and removing of gangways in the Port of Bunbury.

Similarly a hearing took place in the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and a decision was given on 15 August 1985 by Mr Commissioner Coleman. I think it would be appropriate if I quoted from that decision—

At proceedings held in Perth on 9 August 1985, in addition to the two main parties, a group of interveners appeared and were granted leave to participate in the hearing.

It was stated further—

I have considered the issues placed before me in the proceedings and I find that the action of the Australian Workers' Union in demanding that the Bunbury Port Authority as an employer respondent to the A.W.U. Construction, Maintenance and Services (W.A. Government) Award 1984 comply with the preference of employment clause of that award a reasonable and lawful request and one that should be complied with by the Authority concerned.

It is very clear that the A.W.U. has the award right to cover the work being performed by the employees concerned, and those employees in turn are obliged to join that union under the terms of the preference clause or forfeit their employment to other applicants for employment who indicate their preparedness to so join the A.W.U.

Accordingly I consider the Authority should, without delay, comply with the award provision by ensuring its employees, covered by that award, are members of the A.W.U., save and except for those who may be granted a certificate of exemption from union membership by the Registrar on the grounds of conscientious belief (Section 144A of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904).

BY THE COMMISSIONER:

J. COLEMAN,
Commissioner

Clearly, the rulings from the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission and the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration

Commission have spelt out the legality and the rights of the AWU's servicing of the Port of Bunbury. Notwithstanding that, the Maritime Workers Union has chosen to ignore the rulings of both commissions and it has brought activity at the Port of Bunbury to a halt. At present it is still in a strike situation. There was a strike a couple of weeks ago and after some negotiation and discussions in Bunbury work was resumed for a few days. However, trouble started once more and the port is now idle. The pity of it is that the Government has failed completely to support both the State and Federal commissions' decisions and orders. It has failed to back up lawful orders and to uphold the industrial law.

To its credit the Bunbury Port Authority has given a tremendous amount of energy and dedication to endeavouring to run the port as it used to be run—trouble free. Notwithstanding that, the port authority is at its wits' end trying to bring order into the chaos. This Government has not supported the authority. It has let the Bunbury Port Authority down very miserably and, therefore, it has let down the City of Bunbury, its citizens, the south-west region and the industries in that area.

I quote a letter to the Chairman of the Bunbury Port Authority written by Hon. G. E. Masters, MLC, dated 9 September 1985—

Dear Mr Willinge,

I appreciate the opportunity given to me to talk to your Secretary this morning, and wish to confirm the position of the State Opposition in regard to the AWU/MWU dispute.

The State Opposition totally and without reservation supports the stand taken by The Port Authority in upholding the ruling of the Industrial Commission.

The State Opposition totally and without reservation supports the Australian Workers Union in pursuing its rightful claim of authority and control over its area of influence at the Port of Bunbury.

The State Opposition will defend the stands taken by both The Port Authority and the AWU by any means within its power, and will pursue the matter through Parliament until the law is upheld.

Yours faithfully,

Hon. GORDON MASTERS, M.L.C.,
SHADOW MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

There is no doubt at all about where the Opposition stands and there is no doubt about where I stand, as parliamentary representative of that area; we totally support the industrial system and the action taken by the Bunbury Port Authority. We will do what we can to draw attention to the Government's lack of understanding and spunk in standing up for law and order in the industrial situation at the Bunbury waterfront.

It is appropriate for me to quote some of the public statements made by the Chairman of the Bunbury Port Authority, Mr John Willinge. He issued a statement on 20 August 1985, which read—

The position is that until the Maritime Workers' Union interfered, some 6 months ago, the maintenance workers who attend to mooring and unmooring of vessels were members of the Australian Workers' Union.

On 18th July the WA Industrial Relations Commission dismissed the claim made by the MWU for coverage of mooring and unmooring.

On 15th August the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission clearly directed that the Port Authority should without delay comply with the award provision by ensuring that its employees are members of the AWU.

These two decisions have been flouted by the Maritime Workers' Union and the workers involved in the dispute.

It is now up to the State Government to show who is in charge—The Union or The Elected Government.

That is an indication that the Bunbury Port Authority is at its wits' end trying to conduct the affairs of the port as they should be, but it has been left high and dry by the inaction of the Government which has failed to ensure that militant unions cannot muscle in willy-nilly. The Government has chosen to do otherwise.

As a result of this dispute at present one ship is tied up, loaded at a berth and waiting to sail and has been in that situation for some weeks. It cannot leave the port because no one will cast off the ropes. Four ships are riding at anchor offshore waiting to come into port to service the woodchip and alumina industries. Before another week has passed a further five ships will be due to service industries at Bunbury. If this dispute is not resolved very rapidly nine ships will be held up and this is a most unusual problem for the Port of Bunbury.

The industries affected are the alumina industry, which is vital to the whole of the south-west; the woodchip industry; and the timber industry. At the moment there are no wheat ships whose cargo needs handling but there will be in the fullness of time. The mineral sands industry is at a disadvantage. In competing on world markets it is vital that the suppliers of both mineral sands and alumina be reliable and that is not the case at present because orders cannot be met or shipments made as a result of the industrial dispute.

There are other products like vegetable oils, chemical fertilisers, rock phosphates, sulphur, and petroleum products. All these industries are vital to the south-west region and to Bunbury. There are many employees engaged in these industries. The Government is very keen to blow its trumpet and say it supports industry. Here is one case where the Government should demonstrate very decidedly that it supports industry, particularly in the south-west under its "Bunbury 2000" strategy which is supposed to be designed to help the people of Bunbury. That is not happening. The Government is letting the south-west hang on the end of this industrial dispute. That is simply not good enough.

The people in Bunbury are becoming very angry indeed. They do not need Vic Ferry to tell them what the position is. Everyone knows what the position is.

We see these ships standing offshore at the entrance of the Port of Bunbury. It brings it home to everyone that the State Government is not capable of governing. It is being pushed around by militant unions; I am informed that in the latest dispute even the Seamens Union has been called into the dispute by declining to take out a tug to service the port. Not only is the Maritime Workers Union in the fight, but also it has been backed and supported by another militant union, the Seamens Union.

A member interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: If that is the case, the Australian Workers Union certainly has cause to complain. It has been published in Press statements from the AWU that it intends to take widespread industrial action, particularly in the north-west, if this dispute is not resolved.

I personally cannot countenance further industrial action anywhere, but I do not blame the AWU if it is forced to take this action because the Government will not support that union. How can the Government expect the AWU to lie down neatly and say that it will sell

out the Maritime Workers Union, the Seamens Union, or any other militant union because the Government will not support its rights under the industrial commissions' rulings and decisions? One cannot blame the AWU. It has its rights, but this Government sells it out. The Government has not got the stomach to stand up to the standover tactics.

The Mayor of Bunbury, as I mentioned in this House some 10 days ago, was moved to say publicly that as a local government member, he always felt that local government was the third tier of government. He now says there are four tiers of government. The first tier is the militant union power, the second is the Federal Government, the third is the State Government, and the fourth is local government. This situation is very real in the eyes and minds of people in the Bunbury area. It is against the "Bunbury 2000" strategy which the Government brought in prior to the last election. It was one of the Labor Party's main planks to win seats at the election, but since then one can shoot peas through the Government's strategy because this is another example of letting the people down.

Another problem was the denial of the right for the *USS Towers*—a friendly naval vessel from a friendly nation and a longstanding ally of Australia—to berth at Bunbury when the United States fleet came in a few days ago, because of this industrial action. Because of that action the local traders in Bunbury, through loss of trading with the crewmen and providing stores for the ship, have lost an estimated \$150 000 to \$200 000 in local trade. But more than that, we in the south-west have lost the goodwill of our visiting US naval friends. In the past, naval ships from the United States have been welcomed by Bunbury people, except for a very vocal minority. Those few are very few indeed; the bulk of the people in Bunbury certainly are very glad to welcome our friendly sailors from overseas and I am sure they enjoy the garden of the State in the south-west. It is a good education for them. They can go back to wherever their homes are and report on the south-west of WA and what a place it is—and we hope they report favourably. That international goodwill has now been lost to the people of the south-west. It has been denied by industrial action and that is very sad.

Part of my letter reads—

this House condemns the Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Peter Dowding, for his failure to—

- (a) exercise his Ministerial obligation to ensure the upholding of the law; and
- (b) for callously and irresponsibly disregarding the rights of A.W.U. members to service the Port of Bunbury without interference from militant Unions.

That is true. The Minister has negated his responsibilities to the people of Bunbury, and the industries and employees know Mr Dowding for what he is. He made a mess of his previous portfolio as Minister for Fuel and Energy and the people of Collie almost ran him out of town. They would not put up with him and he was dismissed. Through negative industrial dealing he has let down the people in the south-west, and the people certainly know it. It is another illustration of this Minister being a captive of the militant unions.

We now know that the Minister has now decided not to recontest his seat of North Province in this House and has gained endorsement for the Legislative Assembly seat of Maylands because of militant union backing. He is in the hands of militant unionists and unions who tell him what to do. He is leaving the north for dead and coming down here to the metropolitan area. He is negating his position as a Minister by selling out the people of the south-west. He is also disregarding the rights of the AWU members, and everyone understands that. It is another case of the Government bowing to strong union pressure.

This can be borne out by the public knowledge of what happened in the John O'Connor case. The Government failed in an action by supporting a militant trade unionist. This Minister is doing the same in Bunbury and is bowing to union pressure. The Government of the day is not pulling this Minister into line because it takes the same line. It is supported by the militants, and the John O'Connor case will forever be the flagship that will sink the Government. The people will not forget the actions of the Attorney General and the Government; indeed the Premier is also implicated.

There was a hearing before the Commonwealth commission yesterday and today, and I have just been handed a note to say that the picket line at Bunbury will be lifted and the AWU will continue to cover the port's activities. AWU members will be prepared to release the ship that has been at berth in the port at 8.30 a.m. tomorrow. That is great news notwithstanding that this Government and this

Minister have let the people down. It is on the record. They have not supported the rulings and orders of two industrial commissions. It is not just the State commission; it is the Federal commission as well. The Government cannot deny that, notwithstanding that this arrangement has come out of the commission hearing today.

It supports the right of the AWU to continue the work it has had for a very long time. The problem should never have reached the stage of requiring a hearing yesterday and today. The AWU should have been supported by the Government according to two previous rulings. The Government's inaction has caused all the expense of holding hearings yesterday and today. The work of the port has been held up needlessly all that time, all because of the Government's inaction and the incompetence of the Minister.

I will now refer briefly to a Press item which appeared in *The West Australian* for Tuesday, 10 September 1985 under the heading, "No end in sight to port dispute". I have not seen the statement denied by Mr Dowding and I believe it is worth mentioning here. It reads as follows—

Speaking from Broome yesterday, the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Dowding, said that it would take till November to get a commissioner to settle the dispute.

What a shocking statement.

Hon. Peter Dowding: If that is what it says, it is not correct.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: If so, it should have been denied publicly by the Minister.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I didn't see it. It was not in the editions I received.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The statement illustrates two things: Firstly, the Minister has not been briefed on what is going on, and secondly, he has not been reading the newspapers.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Or the journalists have it all cocked up.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: This item should have been brought to the attention of the Minister. If it is not correct, he should have denied it. I have not seen where he has issued a public denial. Let us assume that the quote is correct. For him to have said this is a dreadful indictment of himself.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I didn't.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The fact is that the commission sat yesterday and today and has now made a decision to settle the dispute. So, either way the Minister is caught. He should have known what was happening. The Minister is incompetent. He was an incompetent Minister for Fuel and Energy and now he is an incompetent Minister for Industrial Relations. He does not know what is going on. He cannot have it both ways.

I have introduced the motion in order to expose the Government for what it is. As a representative of Bunbury and of the south-west generally I am bound to fight for the people of the region and let them know—although it does not take me to tell them—of the incompetence of the Government in this matter.

HON. PETER DOWDING
(North—Minister for Industrial Relations)
[5.04 p.m.]: Just as Hon. Vic Ferry is not serious in moving that the House adjourn until Friday, 20 September, I hardly think he is serious in what he has said today. He put forward a series of propositions that cannot stand up to any sort of scrutiny. He clearly does not understand what the dispute in Bunbury is about.

The dispute is about an issue which the Liberal Opposition wants to provide for every worker in this State. The Liberal Opposition has put out a policy document which invites unionists to choose which union will cover them in a particular job situation. That is exactly the policy which the Liberal Opposition has announced, through Mr Masters and with someone's help—and not someone very bright. The policy statement clearly indicated that the Liberal Party's policy was for workers to have the right to decide whether they would become union members, whether a shop would be a closed shop, and if it was to be a closed shop, which union would cover the workers.

The facts of this case are that the problem arose on the Bunbury waterfront when 14 men who were employed by the Bunbury Port Authority chose which union they wanted to represent them. That is exactly what the dispute is about and it is exactly the policy of the Liberal Opposition which is to provide that opportunity for every worker in the State.

If members opposite think their policy will not introduce industrial chaos into this State, I certainly do not know what will. The Bunbury dispute has been a good example of the risks

and dangers of that sort of policy. That is precisely the problem that has occurred in Bunbury.

It is not the case that the workers who were employed by the Bunbury Port Authority were being muscled on by a militant union. The fact is that 90 per cent of the men who were employed in the maintenance gang in mooring and unmooring vessels as part of their work, decided they no longer wanted to be members of the Australian Workers Union and so allowed their membership of that union to lapse. They had joined, voluntarily, the Maritime Workers Union. Mr Ferry obviously does not know that basic fact.

This places the Liberal Party in a position of great embarrassment, because that is exactly what Mr Masters wants all workers to be able to do—to chop and change between whichever union they think will serve them better.

Now is not the time to debate the document that the Liberal Party has put out; that is for a time for about another five minutes down the track. We can give it all the attention it needs in that time. The fact is that recommendation 7 of the document reads as follows—

As a first step towards voluntary unionism, employees shall be given the freedom to determine by secret ballot, on a site basis, whether to belong to a union or organisation—and, if so, which one.

That is precisely what the workers at Bunbury did; all but one member of the maintenance gang determined to join the MWU and to allow their membership of the AWU to lapse. That is the fact of the matter and it is a pity that Mr Ferry was not acquainted with that fact before he got up and started to make his assertions. He should know how embarrassing this dispute has been to the Liberal Party, in seeing its policy in action as it were, in seeing members of a union taking up the Liberal Party's offer to choose their own union. He should see what an embarrassment the dispute has been to his party and how it has revealed the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy to be the sham that it really is.

The second point I make is that Mr Ferry has been unable to provide or point to any evidence to suggest that the Government has failed to take any action that it ought to have taken. The Bunbury Port Authority has received advice and support from the Office of Industrial Relations. It consulted the Minister for Transport and me and we gave the auth-

ority the rights that it had to pursue the action as it saw it in the interests of the Port of Bunbury.

We have assisted by holding meetings at which it was sought to hammer out an agreement which would give the parties time to work out the direction in which they wished to proceed.

Members should not forget that the whole time we are talking about the so-called right to choose that Mr Masters wants to see given to every worker in this State. How does one deal with a situation when one gives workers the right to choose and they make that choice voluntarily and want to stick to it? Of course one cannot deal with that by giving them the right to choose and, as the Industrial Relations Commission of Western Australia and the Federal commission have said, none of the workers has the right to choose. The coverage of the work is the right of the AWU and that is the position that was accepted all the way through the discussions. Nothing has been done or said, or could have been done or said, which will take away from that principle in these circumstances. The Bunbury Port Authority has received the advice and encouragement of the Government to achieve the best resolution of the problem in the shortest possible time.

The second thing that must be said is that this Government stands by the industrial relations system in this country; it supports the Industrial Relations Commission of Western Australia; it supports the Federal commission. It believes that like many other systems it is capable of improvement and some reform. It is a fact that I have been critical of the lack of availability of Commonwealth commissioners at short notice when they are required to deal with issues. I have fully supported the submission by the previous Minister (Hon. Des Dans) to the Hancock inquiry that we ought to have a system whereby our State Industrial Relations Commission can exercise dual jurisdiction and thereby facilitate early access to the commission of matters with both Federal and State or Federal or State characteristics.

This Government has given those commissions every support, unlike the Opposition which wants to dismantle the system and put in its place a system which the Bunbury Port Authority dispute clearly reveals will bring chaos to this State. The interesting point is if the Government is so bad and so much in the

grip of militant unionism as is alleged, how is it that we have in this country the lowest strike statistics for 17 years?

Let us look at a few other statistics to see how the country is performing in terms of the Government being in the pocket of militant unionists. I remind members opposite because they have short memories and no doubt desire to forget the growth in employment in Western Australia in the last year of the Liberal Government. The growth for that 12 months was 0.4 per cent. Over the last 12 months we have had the second highest employment growth rate in Australia—the increase has been 4.4 per cent. That is an example of this Government creating the sort of environment where business can get on with the job of ensuring employment for people and get on with production.

If we look at some other issues, such as the inflation rate, I point out that in the last year of the State and Federal Liberal Governments inflation was running at 11 per cent.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections must cease. The Minister is wandering away from the subject matter now. I was prepared to let him proceed earlier, but I think he would agree he is getting off the track.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Thank you, Mr President. I am suggesting that if Hon. Vic Ferry or the Opposition seriously believe this Government is in the grip of any organisation or group of people, they are simply off the track. It does not matter which indicator one looks at—whether an economic indicator; the housing starts indicator; the employment indicator; the fall in unemployment indicator; or simply the strikes statistics; it matters not which indicator one takes, one sees that our performance is miles ahead of that of the Opposition when it was in Government.

It is also utterly absurd for any member to suggest that this Government or any of its Ministers is in the grip of militant unionists when our record stands up so clearly for examination; that is, that we have worked tirelessly to ensure we have a better industrial relations climate in this State. I remind members opposite that they saw during Mr Masters' tenure some of the worst and most bitter strikes in this State's history.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Mr Dans' record is much worse.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Masters and his party were in office during the most crippling strike of the Hamersley iron workers.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I was not the Minister.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I did not say Mr Masters was the Minister; I said his party was in office. The absurdity is that that sort of strike nearly brought the iron ore industry to its knees. It seems the Opposition has forgotten that the iron ore industry has never looked healthier. The incidence of industrial dispute in the Pilbara has been significantly reduced from that which occurred during the period of the Liberal Government until 1983.

Of course members opposite like to ignore the realities. The realities are that strikes occur in one industry or another from time to time. Strikes occurred during the Opposition's period in Government and strikes will occur during ours, but the incidence of those strikes has been dramatically reduced under our Government, and we find employers grateful for the sort of assistance given by my Government in times of industrial dispute.

Hon. P. G. Pental: To John O'Connor!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: A Liberal Government does not care about the level of industrial dispute; it is quite happy to stir the pot. All that Hon. Gordon Masters has been able to do in an industrial situation is to open his mouth and inflame it. They call him "the petrol drinker" because every time he opens his mouth he starts a new fire.

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Even the old fog-horn up the back—

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When I call for order I expect honourable members to come to order and cease their unruly interjections, and not persist. I particularly call on Hon. A. A. Lewis to cease his interjections.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I do not want to labour the issue because I would only be saying the same things again and again. Absolutely no evidence has been produced, and none can be produced, to show that this Government has failed to support the Bunbury Port Authority. If it is suggested that the Government should support the right of individuals to choose which union they want to belong to as the Liberal Party policy suggests, I reject that suggestion. I do so because it will create the sort of industrial turmoil we have seen in Bunbury over the last few days. It is not the sort of principle which will assist in ensuring the con-

tinuation of good relations in this country, nor will it lead to any improvement in those relations.

When I hear Hon. Vic Ferry say that he cannot blame the AWU for threatening to close down the North-West Shelf project because of its anger over the situation, I am frankly appalled. I think that is a disgraceful assertion—absolutely disgraceful. We should expect of Opposition members a great deal more responsibility in the area of industrial relations. Such an assertion signals to me and, I hope, to members opposite, the dangers of following the “mouth” principle; that is, opening and shutting one’s mouth and hoping that something comes out of it. That is likely to do no more than make things worse.

I assure the House that the Government does not intend to conduct the sensitive business of industrial relations by issuing Press statements. We will work tirelessly as we have done on this and other issues to ensure that industrial disruption is minimised. We will not be able to achieve the best endeavours so long as the Opposition puts up policies which are so clearly unworkable and inflammatory and which perhaps encourage people to move to some form of industrial anarchy thinking that the existing systems are to be ignored.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [5.21 p.m.]: The speech we have just heard is typical of what we came to expect of Hon. Peter Dowding before he was in the Ministry. The only difference now that he is in the Ministry is that he yells a little louder. He seems to take it for granted that the authority of the Ministry is such that he should be listened to whether we want to or not; so he just raises his voice two or three decibels. I do not think I have ever been so unfortunate as to have heard such a diatribe of total dishonesty as the Minister just tried to foist upon this House. He knows as well as I do that the fundamental basis of the policy was copied from one which has been used in America for a number of years, one of unionism or no unionism.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They also have one-vote-one-value.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That remark is typical of the Government which always tries to swing away from the subject. It is a part of the total dishonesty approach of the ALP. I am trying to talk rationally about a programme of choice of unionism or no unionism.

The Minister should well know—if he does not he should slide up one seat and ask Mr Dans, who does—that the shop holds a vote under strictly controlled rules. If it votes for unionism, unionism is adopted and the workers become members of the union so chosen. They must abide by the laws which apply to that union condition. Mr Dowding tried to let us imagine with his typically smarmy lawyer tricks that he learnt in the divorce courts, I guess, with arguments between estranged husbands and wives, that no laws applied to it. If it is decided that a shop is to be non-unionist, there are still laws and rules which must be obeyed. That shop is controlled by the laws.

The proposition in Bunbury is a well known demarcation dispute.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is not a demarcation dispute. It is a choice of the individual members to join another union. That is what they have asked for.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is what is colloquially known as a demarcation dispute.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Unfortunately it is not, I am sorry to say.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is. I spoke about it two weeks ago. I fully hoped that by today the matter would have been well and faithfully resolved. It is a matter of which union workers should belong to, whether they should be marked as belonging to the AWU or whether they should be marked as belonging to the Maritime Workers Union. Hon. Peter Dowding has never done a day’s work in his life to earn a living. He has never belonged to a union, unless perhaps to a barristers’ association. I have at least belonged to an industrial union. As a member of a union I have attended meetings and voted at them. I have some idea of what I am talking about. Before the Minister was out of short pants I was actively engaged with union matters. I was chairman of the industrial policy committee of the Liberal Party when the Minister was still in short pants. He was no smarter then than he is now.

The fact remains that the law under which the unionists in Bunbury are operating is that of today, not that of 15 March next year when the Liberal Party will be in power. We will change the law. They are operating under the law as put to this House by Mr Masters and under which there has been such a diminution of industrial turmoil.

Hon. Peter Dowding: So they will all be able to choose to join the MWU, will they? That is what you would like.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Here come the smart Dowding tricks. It is a shame that the Minister is dragging a name which ought to be regarded with some respect through such depths because this smart-alecky stuff that he goes on with does none of us any good. The law applies at present and all the statements appertaining to it have been put out by Mr Willinge. They can be read on page 351 and onwards of *Hansard* of Tuesday, 27 August 1985. The law that these people are supposed to work under today is that administered by this ALP Government, the Burke Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: A very good Government.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: History will tell whether it is a good Government. History will tell whether the Minister is a good one. He has not been a Minister long enough even to have created any sort of reputation; he has created only a bad impression. If he lasts long enough he may overcome the bad impression he has created and actually make a reputation for himself. That will only happen with time.

Mr Ferry laid down the facts of the situation at Bunbury. They were very simple facts. Jurisdiction of a particular job lies with a set union. There have been arguments about who should do it and who should not. This argument does not apply only to that situation. It has probably cost the wheat growers of this State thousands upon thousands of dollars. I am in full sympathy with those people who are interested in that product in view of the problems that have arisen.

Mr Dowding even gave us to understand that disputation in this State had become quiescent. I have in my hand a bundle of papers about a quarter of an inch thick. Each one is a photocopy of a newspaper account of violence in union activity since 1983 when the Burke Government came to power. The headings include: "ETU strike erupts into violence"; "Rebel seeks family safety"; "Diary of a Dispute"; "Police may don riot gear to face pickets"; "Council TLC brace for new clashes"; "Missile gauntlet"; "15 charged over depot incidents"; "Grim turn to garbo strike"; "Unions 'black' councillors as garbage row escalates"; and "Sacked men choke exits". Those headings tell a tale of violence. All that has happened since 1983

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you have the files for 1982, 1981, and 1980?

[Resolved: That business be continued.]

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In my Address-in-Reply speech the other day I made suggestions as quietly and as reasonably as I was able, on the sort of union activity that we have seen recently. Whether there is less of it or more of it is beside the point. That union activity and disputation, coupled with violence, will lead to some very marked changes in the Australian way of life. I believe that, and I believe it is a matter of serious concern to us all. It is not the sort of matter in which any good will be done by the twisting of words or the twisting of the truth which was indulged in with shrieking and wailing by Hon. Peter Dowding. That will not do it any good at all. The flouting of the law of the land and the rulings of the courts by some unionists will lead us into very serious trouble.

I read in the newspaper recently that there are threats by normally peaceful groups to take the law into their own hands. Bunbury is such an example. The disappointment of Bunbury people must have been grave indeed that they did not see visiting American warships. It would have meant a lot of money to traders in the town. That sort of disappointment leads to violence of a different kind, a very ugly kind indeed.

The shrieking haranguing meted out to Mr Ferry by the Minister in charge of that matter, Hon. Peter Dowding, does nothing whatsoever to help the situation. Whether or not the Government could have done anything about it, I think the Minister ought to have made an explanation to the House in rational tones and terms, but he made no attempt to do that. The law is being flouted.

The rulings of the courts which have competence in this matter have certainly been flouted, and I repeat what I said in my speech of 27 August. I am quite certain that if this kind of behaviour continues we will have to take much more serious steps at some time in the history of this Parliament in order to relieve problems of very dire consequence. I do not think any of us want to see that, and I really do believe that when these motions of urgency are brought forward the Government should see that a Minister who can address the matter in rational terms is asked to take the debate.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [5.34 p.m.]: I rise to strongly support the motion and in doing so I draw attention to the Minister's speech which, I

suggest to the House, is about as insincere as his actions have been in this dispute. This attempt to take the attack away from himself and his responsibilities for this dispute are quite despicable in the circumstances.

An Opposition member: But usual.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, typical, of course. The Liberal Party policy discussion paper was either deliberately misquoted by the Minister or he did not bother to read it properly. In that document we say there needs to be a work force of 50 or more; and the decision as to whether to join a union or not, and which union or unions to join, would have to be taken by a work force of over 50 in a workplace, and by the whole of the work force. We are not talking about the whole of the work force in the dispute at Bunbury. There was a deliberate distortion by the Minister of the facts in the discussion paper we presented to the public.

We are talking about the law of the land as it stands today. The law of the land is laid down in this case by industrial commissions, both State and Federal. That is the point we are discussing: The law of the land and the responsibility of Ministers to apply the law of the land. It is quite obvious that the Minister had no intention of supporting the orders and the directions of the industrial commissions, Federal and State. The Minister began by saying that he was not serious about this motion.

Let me assure the Minister and the members of this House, and those listening to the debate, that we are deadly serious. This dispute could have been resolved in a matter of days had the Minister and his Government acted properly in the circumstances. They did not; they refused to accept their responsibility.

I strongly support this urgency motion. The performance of the Minister was absolutely appalling, to say the least. Obviously the Minister has a commitment to the militant union leaders. He laughed when Hon. Vic Ferry talked about it, but it is there for all to see—the facts are there. There was a dispute at Argyle, and the Minister refused to act but went hand in hand with John O'Connor to the Eastern States and they sorted something out there in favour of the Transport Workers Union.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not so, Mr Masters.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: On not one occasion did the Minister stand up in this House or publicly and say that he supported the

Australian Workers Union after the industrial commissions had said that the AWU has the authority in that workplace. Not once!

Hon. Peter Dowding: You know that is not correct.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I challenge the Minister to give one example or reference to where he publicly supported the Australian Workers Union at Argyle. We know he did not. In the Mudginberri dispute we challenged the Minister again to state his position. The industrial commissions said certain things should be done. This Minister stood aside and allowed the meat unions in this State to threaten and hold to ransom shipments and the abattoirs. He also stood aside while the Transport Workers Union again held up the transportation of farm goods. Not one word of condemnation did he say.

In relation to the Borthwicks dispute, this Minister did not bother to get off his backside to go to Albany and sort the problem out, even when the industrial commission had made recommendations. Not once did he make a statement supporting the industrial commission.

In the BLF deregistration, again the Minister buried his head in the sand when his colleagues in the Eastern States said action must be taken. Not once did he rise to support the deregistration of the most militant union in Australia.

And so we come to Bunbury. We all know the reasons for the dispute. Hon. Vic Ferry has given the reasons and has told us what happened. He has explained the way in which the industrial commissions, both Federal and State, have listened to the arguments, come to a conclusion, and given an order—and that order is a law, a direction by the industrial commissions.

The port authority was really left on its own. This Minister and the Government left it on its own to stew and did not help it at all. Not one single public statement did this Minister or his Government make in support of the Bunbury Port Authority. On the other hand, the port authority said publicly and on a number of occasions that it would abide by the industrial commissions' decision and orders. That is what it said: "We will abide by the law." It did, and it got into a lot of trouble for doing so. We know that what usually happens happened on that occasion. The more militant union group, finding the decision was not to its liking, went its own way. It stuck its fingers up and said,

"You can go to hell, we are taking no damn notice of you. It does not suit us and therefore we will do what we want."

On not one occasion did the Minister condemn the Maritime Workers Union and say it was acting against the law. Never did he say, "Behave yourselves. I am supporting the Australian Workers Union." That has been noticed.

Hon. Peter Dowding: How do you know?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let the Minister tell me he has; I challenge him.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are making assertions of fact. Prove it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: On 21 August 1985 the Minister was asked by me in this House whether he would go to Bunbury to meet the unions in the dispute, and the port authority. He said he would go with Mr Grill, the Minister for Transport. We then twice asked the Minister whether he would publicly support the industrial commissions and their orders, the Australian Workers Union and the Bunbury Port Authority, and condemn the Maritime Workers Union for acting illegally. He refused twice in this House to make that statement.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You should have a look and remember.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Not once on any occasion up to this day has the Minister been prepared to make any sort of statement backing the industrial commission's orders and directions. That is the sort of sincerity this Minister has. He stands up and throws around a lot of rubbish about what he has done and has not done, when in fact he has deliberately avoided taking any sort of stand on this issue and has, by that action, supported the Maritime Workers Union in all that it has done.

Let me say that the Australian Workers Union has had control of the Port of Bunbury for 20 years under a special agreement. For 20 years there has been no industrial strife. All of a sudden a militant union seeks to gain power in that authority.

Hon. Peter Dowding: They have 14 members, do they not?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The law says that the Australian Workers Union has control and authority in that port.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are talking about the law as it stands today, not as it will stand. If members want to know how it will stand, they should ask the Minister of the day to read our

document thoroughly and then he will not distort the facts. He twists things all the time. There has been a dispute at Bunbury and that dispute has been caused by a group of militant unionists. The courts and the law of the land state that the Australian Workers Union has authority.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), members say I do not know. I suggest they have never read or heard about the industrial commissions' directions, both Federal and State. Have members read those reports?

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course they have not. The order is there that the Australian Workers Union has the authority, and the port authority acts on that order.

The Minister then led a group down there, or he went with his colleagues and they had a meeting with the unions involved. It started off with a shouting and swearing match.

Some of those people could not believe what they were hearing. They could not believe what was going on, and that is a fact. The Minister was one of those who was leading the shouting and screaming. He did not want any peace in that dispute. He was supporting his friends who had put him in the Maylands seat. He is totally and absolutely committed to that. He knows on which side his bread is buttered. They got rid of Mr Dans, and I am sure Mr Dans does not want this job back. Hon. Peter Dowding is using it to effect, regardless of the consequences.

The Bunbury Port Authority has been working under an agreement for 20 years. I suggest Hon. Peter Dowding has been part of an exercise to disrupt that arrangement.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Come on.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: How could the Minister support a proposal which says there should be a separate gang to do the mooring and unmooring? Why can the Minister not stand up and say he condemns the MWU for what it is doing? Its demands would increase the Bunbury port costs by \$427 000 per year. This Minister did not raise a finger. If we know the facts, he has better sources than we have, but he refuses to stand up and say to the MWU that it should back off, obey the Industrial Relations Commission, and let the Australian Workers Union have a go.

He should talk to some of the members of the Australian Workers Union and their leaders to see what they think of Mr Dowding. They are appalled and shocked. They consider the Minister is deliberately going about to destroy and undermine their union and the authority of its leaders.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is pathetic.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister wants to talk to some of them, if they will talk to him now. I suggest they will not.

Hon. Peter Dowding: We have good relations—very good relations.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: With whom does the Minister have good relations?

Hon. Peter Dowding: With the AWU.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister knows the secretary and all the rest of them; let him tell me whom he has good relations with.

Hon. Peter Dowding: All the union, the membership, and the leaders.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He is a humbug of the first order.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is true.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister bumbles along. He knows damned well they will not talk to him. They are disgusted with him. His performance has been a disgrace. He has deliberately gone about undermining a union for a good reason—to further his own political ends.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Not even you believe that!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I can tell you, Mr Deputy President, that that is the fact of the case, and there are many people in this State now who condemn the Minister and all he stands for. Many responsible union leaders will not have a bar of him because of his performance over recent months, particularly in the Bunbury Port Authority dispute. He raves and goes on in this House and he tries to cover his tracks, but he is getting away from the fact that he has upset a very powerful and responsible union, and he has done it for his own purposes and his own political gain.

I wonder where this magnificent union adviser specially employed at very high cost is? This is the adviser to the Premier. I think Hon. Peter Dowding has an adviser or whatever he likes to call him in the industrial relations area. The one I am talking about is Tom Butler. Where was Tom Butler?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you know where he was? He has the building industry back on the road. You could not get it back on the road.

Several members interjected.

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

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Even Mr Dowding does not believe that. He is just a little puppet on a string. There was not one single industrial relations adviser from the Government side.

A Government member: Will you be there?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will be over there, but not in the member's place.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You might be like Mr MacKinnon—in the back.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I can assure Hon. Peter Dowding it happens to us all one day or another, and with the Minister's performance he will be battling even to make the back bench.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Rubbish!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us have a look at the situation. We have a Minister of the Crown who is flatly refusing to acknowledge an order given by the industrial commission. He flatly refused to support that order. That is a fact, because we tackled him in this House and he remained silent.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you remember what I said? I told you I was not going to have you inflaming things. That is what I said, and I will not now.

Hon. Tom Knight: You do enough yourself.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I asked Hon. Peter Dowding whether he supported the Industrial Relations Commission, Federal and State; whether he supported the Australian Workers Union; and whether he supported the Bunbury Port Authority. I believe he is deliberately supporting this situation. All he had to say in this House was "Yes, I do." The one word, "Yes." He refused to use that word, and we know why; because his sympathies were quite clearly in the direction of supporting the MWU.

This has been his background all the way through. Not one single Government industrial adviser had any success, or even went down to look at the dispute. What we have seen, and what the people of Bunbury have seen, is two Ministers. Certainly this Minister had no real care for the town or for the future of that port.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is absolutely untrue.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He would prefer to see the Port of Bunbury end up like Fremantle with disputes, standovers, and high costs. The Port of Bunbury is becoming very successful; it is growing rapidly and it is giving a service which is becoming renowned, not only in Australia, but throughout the world. Ships prefer to use that port rather than Fremantle, so Mr Dowding and his friends decided it was about time to take control of Bunbury port. They devised a scheme for the MWU to move in and try to take over. If they were successful in Bunbury it would have spread right round the coast and given control of mooring and unmooring to the MWU.

Hon. Mick Gayfer has had some experience of mooring and unmooring gangs, though he is probably not keen to talk about it today. I know he is an expert in this area and in the disruptive tactics which can be used.

We are condemning the Government, we are condemning the Minister for his refusal to apply the law and support the law of this land.

That is what it is all about; not all the other rubbish the Minister was talking about. The law provides that certain things should happen; the Industrial Relations Commission said certain things should apply, and all the Minister did was to remain mute in his seat and refuse to take any sort of action at all, except to go down to Bunbury, have a shouting match, and then run away from the dispute and let it resolve itself. Indeed, I think the Industrial Relations Commission probably gave him up as a bad job, as it did the Government of the day.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Mr Masters, I can remember your running away from the scene as Minister responsible.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: This dispute has seriously affected the standing of the Port of Bunbury. It should be able to recover all right, but only through the actions of some local members such as Hon. Vic Ferry will this be achieved. No success was achieved by the Labor member for the area who ran around trying to patch up the dispute, but never at any time, as far as I know, did he condemn publicly the MWU.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Has Mr Ferry assisted in resolving the conflict? Is that what you are suggesting? Run out of puff, have you?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister's performance was abysmal. He aligned himself with those people to whom we know he is totally committed in the future.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.51 p.m.]: I am probably the most uninformed member of this House in the field of industrial relations. However, one of the things of which I can assure Hon. Gordon Masters is that the one place the dispute in Bunbury or a dispute in any other place in this State is not going to be solved is in this Chamber.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It will be solved by a Minister making a statement, well and truly.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It will not be solved in this Chamber, and I commend the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Masters—Hon. Peter Dowding—

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Not until 15 March!

Hon. G. E. Masters: Well said.

Hon. D. K. DANS: —for following Labor Party policy which was well enumerated before we came to Government, with the emphasis on the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes rather than trying to make political capital out of them.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Did the Minister publicly support it, Mr Dans?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Our policy has paid off and, as I used to say when I was the Minister in charge of this portfolio, we endeavoured at all times to get industrial relations off the front page of the newspaper and down to the place where the problems could be solved. Without dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's", that policy has proved to be very successful.

I have been following this dispute very carefully, and if I had the time I could let the House know all the steps that have been taken, chapter and verse, in the right arena to solve the dispute; and that is in the industrial tribunals, both State and Federal. These problems will not be solved anywhere else.

Let me tell members what the dispute is about. Mr Dowding gave the House a very good explanation that was not understood. My very good friend, Mr MacKinnon, said it was a demarcation dispute. It has nothing to do with demarcation; it has everything to do with membership. Those are also the most difficult disputes to solve.

How did the dispute come about? We should not be shy about saying what the dispute is all about. The dispute was brought about because approximately 12 members working for the Bunbury Port Authority became dissatisfied with the service they were getting from the union which covered them. From what I have

read and heard about their treatment on the waterfront, they had ample reason to be dissatisfied. The day has long since gone when men were treated like dogs.

A member: Cut it out.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. Masters: How much were they earning, Mr Dans?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Hon. Gordon Masters asks what they were earning. What has earning got to do with their treatment on the job? It never had anything to do with it.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You ought to resign.

Hon. D. K. DANS: The right approach would have been to go to their union.

Hon. G. E. Masters: The right approach would have been for the Minister and the Government to have declared themselves, but you didn't.

Hon. D. K. DANS: They went along to a certain WA union having some general coverage. I am not saying that the AWU was wrong or right, but those workers exercised their free choice that members of the other side of the House are always talking about. They approached the union and said, "We are not satisfied. Right or wrong, we are not going to continue as we are. We want you to cover us." That was the genesis of the dispute. There were many danger signals long before that situation arose, signals which were conveniently ignored by the people—not those on the board of the Bunbury Port Authority, but those in charge at the job level. These people did not heed the danger signals. Mr Masters keeps telling the Minister what he should or should not do, but not once has he said what he would have done if he were Minister. It is all written here. Does Mr Masters want me to read it to him?

Hon. G. E. Masters: Mr Ferry read out the letter.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not worried about the letter Mr Ferry read out. All it proved to this House was that he could read.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Why didn't your Government declare itself? Why didn't you declare yourself? Because you don't have the guts to declare yourself!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! Order! The Leader of the House.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. I considered raising my voice in order to be heard, but I did not want to do so in case Hon. G. C. MacKinnon got angry with me.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is going a bit squeaky anyway, isn't it? You need a bit of lubrication.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Masters at no stage told us how he would resolve the dispute. Some of the matters he is suggesting of course would have escalated the dispute into every port in Western Australia and probably around Australia, and that is not our policy. Our policy is one of containment, prevention, and solution, a policy which has worked very well.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Did you not send the Industrial Relations Commission—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Hon. Des Dans will be heard in silence.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy President. You are a gentleman of the first order and there are not very many around these days, I might add.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Just a few of us, Mr Dans.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. DANS: The policy that has been followed in this dispute has been the well tried and proven policy that we adopted before we came to Government. I know the matter came before a Federal commissioner today and I believe it will be before him again tomorrow when he will issue an order. That is the law of the land that members of the Opposition have been talking about. Every step, in accordance with that law of the land, has been taken by the Minister through his department.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Two decisions which are the law of the land were made weeks and weeks ago. Mr Dowding refuses to take that law up.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Weeks and weeks ago? Mr Masters cannot help being extravagant.

Hon. G. E. Masters: All right. Do you want the dates?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Weeks and weeks ago? When did the dispute start, Mr Masters?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He wouldn't know.

Hon. G. E. Masters: On 18 July the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission dismissed the claim made by the MWU. Is that not weeks ago, Mr Dans?

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is correct. Was there any cessation of work then?

Hon. G. E. Masters: On 15 August?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Was there any cessation of work then?

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are talking about orders, Mr Dans—your allegations; that is what you are talking about.

Hon. D. K. DANS: No orders were issued then.

Hon. G. E. Masters: On 18 July the WA Industrial Relations Commission dismissed the claim made by the MWU for coverage.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That was an order, was it not?

Hon. G. E. Masters: No, it was a decision, was it not?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Of course that is a decision, but the Leader of the Opposition is talking about orders.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: There is a difference.

Hon. D. K. DANS: All the actions that a Minister is required to take under the industrial law of this country or of this State have been taken. I say without a shadow of doubt that this matter will be brought to some kind of finality tomorrow—not today, but tomorrow.

Hon. G. E. Masters: The order was dated 18 July.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I have a copy of the order here.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Before the suspension of the sitting I was pointing out to the House how this dispute began. I said that the workers were dissatisfied with their conditions and had ideas that they were being badly treated. I said that I thought the right and proper action for them to take was to approach their own union. However, that did not happen. They chose to join another union that, in fairness to that union, has wide coverage in this field.

This is an area that seems to be fairly well divided. For instance, the Maritime Workers Union operates exclusively in the Port of Fremantle. The Waterside Workers Union operates in the Port of Geraldton, and I know how it got there. I recall it was ceded to that union by the Maritime Workers Union. I am not sure which union operates in the Port of Albany. I believe it is the Waterside Workers Union but I stand to be corrected. Again I know the circumstances under which that came about.

Before concluding, I want to say that all the jumping up and down, all the fist-shaking and all the yelling and shouting in this place, will

not go one bit towards solving the dispute. It will be solved in the appropriate tribunal. That tribunal sat today in Perth and I believe it will sit tomorrow. I am not as starry-eyed as some people in this Chamber in thinking that the dispute is over now, and I am not privy to any inside information. I have only the information which appears on the sheet. However, I have said before, both in Opposition and in Government—I am saying it again tonight—that industrial disputes will never be solved in the political arena. Industrial relations have become a political football over a number of years. Once they become a political football, the disputes tend to be exacerbated.

I know that Oppositions and Governments are all manner of things to all men. I am perfectly aware why these urgency motions are moved. Industrial relations is an emotional issue. On many occasions and with all of the yelling and screaming both in this place and outside, the original reason for the dispute is often lost sight of. I have tried to let the House know tonight how the dispute began and of the great difficulties in solving this dispute because of a group of workers who want to exercise their rights as individuals but who cannot, because of the law. Mr Masters said it is the law.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is the point.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is the point. They want to join a union of their choice. They want to do that because that union is capable of getting them better conditions. In other words, the rate for the job in Fremantle is better than the rate for the job in Bunbury. The rate for the job in Geraldton is also better than the rate in Bunbury. Mr Gayfer may know that the rate in Albany is better because disputes do not rear their ugly heads in that area. Of all ports in Western Australia, there is one port at which the rate is not as high as it is in other ports and that port is Bunbury. The problem is as old as Methuselah. However, if workers think that other workers are receiving better conditions, they will go after those conditions. If members think that shipping their wheat out of one port will save them a couple of bob a bushel, they will seek to ship their produce out of that port. However, in this case the law says that is not possible. The solution can be found only in the tribunal.

I took the trouble today to go through the dispute chapter and verse and I will not weary the House with what I found out. All of the requirements were met by the Minister for Industrial Relations. He has exercised great

patience in taking all the necessary steps to seek a solution to the dispute, and, at the same time, not expanding the dispute. The easiest thing to do in a case like this is to make a hero out of one's self. In that case, rather than confining the dispute to the Port of Bunbury, it could have escalated to every port in Western Australia.

I think this urgency motion is a frivolous and ill-conceived motion. It will not go one inch towards effecting a quick settlement of the dispute.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [7.36 p.m.]: I thank Hon. D. K. Dans for explaining this issue to me. I certainly did not think that the Minister for Industrial Relations explained it well enough when he made his speech because he was inclined to shout.

Hon. Graham Edwards: He had to, to be heard over the rabble.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Not at all. Mr Dans was able to quietly explain the issue.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Mr Lewis kept quiet, that is why.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: While I accept the explanation, I cannot help but wonder where the country is going if that explanation is correct. We heard tonight that 12 men who were members of the Waterside Workers Union wished to join the Maritime Workers Union because they were treated like dogs.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said that they thought they were.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Whether they were or not, it has been reported to the House that for them to change will cost the Port of Bunbury \$426 000 a year.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not correct.

Hon. G. E. Masters: To put on separate mooring gangs.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not correct.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is right. That is the evidence.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I think that should have been put to rest if it was not correct. It was raised by the Leader of the Opposition and was not disputed by the Minister in his reply.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I spoke before Mr Masters.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am sorry, the Leader of the House has spoken since. I think that is the sort of thing that needs straightening out. I gather that currently these 12 men are

responsible for maintenance and also do the mooring. It does not take more than 12½ per cent of their time. If they change over and become members of the MWU, more ship gangs will be required and that is how the figure was arrived at.

I do not know whether the figure is correct, but presuming it is somewhere near correct, how will this country get its balance of payments back on line if just 12 men can hold up the port for weeks and have a dispute that could escalate all over Western Australia, as Mr Dans said?

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a real possibility.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Already other unions are trying to stop the export of meat and a dispute over that matter has been foreshadowed.

We are the country with the second largest debt per head of population in the world and the only way we can get our exports back into line is to start trading sensibly. This is the sort of thing we should look into; it is close to home, it is simple, and I presume it is the type of thing that happens all around Australia, which has an effect on the costs we have to meet as exporters.

Members will be aware that we were one million tonnes of grain short in our exports this year and that markets were lost to Australia because grain loading was not available when required and the grain could not be shipped out on time. That cost every wheat grower in Australia, in round figures, \$15 a tonne. Certainly the disputes that take place and the difficulties with various unions play a part in the decrease in exports. This probably leads to a situation from which we cannot recover. The problem at Bunbury is not an isolated case; it probably reflects what is taking place all around the waterfronts in Australia.

I shall speak in the Address-in-Reply debate and refer to the economic position Australia is in and what chances we have of overcoming our problems. However, I feel it is necessary to raise the matter at this time because this is a typical example.

I have been handed an extract of evidence taken at the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission in the matter between the Maritime Workers Union of Western Australia, applicant, and the Bunbury Port Authority, respondent. It reads in part as follows—

The respondent estimated that if its employees were accorded rates of wages and conditions of employment similar to those engaged by the mooring gang of the Fremantle Port Authority there would be a reduction in the amount of overtime and the additional cost to it would be \$426 272 and which would have to be levied against port users.

It continued elsewhere in the evidence—

The mooring and unmooring of vessels work was incidental and accounted for only 12 per cent of the total ordinary and overtime hours worked.

That was obviously referring to work presently carried out by the AWU. I think this is a fine example of how 12 men hoping to perhaps better themselves—I presume they will receive perhaps an additional \$2 000 each annually, in round figures, making a total of \$24 000—wish to change from membership of one union to another. This leaves approximately \$400 000 each year that someone will have to pick up for little benefit. This additional cost will not just disappear. It might mean more employment or more gangs but the users of the port authority cannot be expected to pick up additional bills of the magnitude of \$426 000. We shall not be able to carry on with the social services in this country that we are trying to maintain.

Many debates have taken place in this House on the difficulties faced by the rural industry and this situation typifies what is happening. I fully support Mr Ferry's bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I hope it is brought to the attention of all Australians. It is very similar to the abattoir dispute taking place in the Northern Territory. Work has been carried on at Bunbury in this manner and has proved to be quite acceptable. However, just as occurred in the Northern Territory where the men who were killing buffalo were receiving higher pay and were quite happy with the situation, a dispute took place. It is estimated that \$2.5 million was lost in that dispute. How much longer can this continue? I do not believe it can go on for much longer. Perhaps we might be better off when we are all broke and everybody has to get back to work and stop fooling around in this manner.

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [7.45 p.m.]: It was interesting to hear the Leader of the House support his little mate. It also demonstrated the two sides of the Leader of the

House: His blustering and abusive pre-dinner style of speech and his more conciliatory after-dinner style.

An Opposition member: Do you think Phil Smith got hold of him?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not know who got hold of the Leader of the House; perhaps he thought he should have started off in a conciliatory manner. I have had many discussions with the Leader of the House and his Whip about industrial relations and they are very clear and honourable men. Once they start shouting one wonders what they have to hide. The Minister for Industrial Relations got to his feet and ranted and roared, and although, in his double-standard type of way, he wanted to blame the interjections, the tone of his voice when starting was the same haranguing tone with which he started negotiations in Bunbury. I am told that his fellow Minister had to control him.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is nonsense. You should not peddle untruths; it is absolute nonsense.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is reliably reported to me that it is the case, and it was reported by pretty senior people.

The Minister dismissed the people of the Bunbury Port Authority in a cavalier way, completely without thinking of the history of that port authority, the huge job it has had trying to get a number of ships into that port, and the way it has worked to do so. This Government has said that it wants to do something for Bunbury by the year 2000. The way it is going Bunbury will not exist in the year 2000 because the Government will have worn out everything in Bunbury by that time.

The Leader of the House said the Minister was following ALP policy and that that policy had paid off. At a figure of more than \$400 000 which it will cost the people of Bunbury, I wonder for whom that policy has paid off. I think it is a disgrace that unions should fight over bodies.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is not a fight over bodies between unions. It is a fight by some individuals who want to join another union.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Dowding says I am wrong but he did not tell us that in his haranguing reply. Mr Dowding talked about everything else to the extent that I thought you, Mr President, would pull him up for not talking to the motion. That is the feeling I had. He ranged over employment and unemployment figures and inflation rates, which have absolutely

nothing to do with the Bunbury dispute. Finally he got the message from your icy stare, Mr President, that he should stick to the motion. This situation will cost the port authority \$400 000-plus and to the best of my knowledge, apart from when its debts were wiped off, that authority has never been in the black to an extent that would absorb that sort of money.

What does it do to a town like Bunbury when this sort of body-snatching is allowed to go on? When in the negotiations are the unions going to take some notice of the decisions that have been made? Is there one law for the employer and another for feuding unions? It is extremely confusing. We know it is confusing to the Minister because he cannot answer the question. I thought Mr Dans went half-way to answering the question, and if the man who should be the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr McKenzie, would stand up, I am sure that this House would receive the right answer. Mr McKenzie is a man who did not bluster, yell and scream; he was sweet reasonableness all the time, although he was as tough as he was reasonable.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Thank you.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is perfectly all right. I think Mr McKenzie should be sitting where Hon. Peter Dowding is now sitting because at least Hon. Fred McKenzie knew something about the subject and did not beat about the bush. If he had a point, he would put it to the House; but Hon. Peter Dowding has to run for the cover of the grass all the time and he will not give the House answers.

I thought Mr Dans' little contribution after dinner was quite good and conciliatory. I agree with him. I do not think that industrial disputes will be solved in this place, but if the House recollects Mr Dans' comments—and I just repeat this from the top of my head, so it is not verbatim—he said—

I do not give a damn about the law if I do not like it; I will not use it if I do not like it.

He made no attempt to change it, but that is just what he thought of the law.

All the jealousies came out again, and Hon. Peter Dowding followed the same type of line, except that I feel that Mr Dans is old enough to be conciliatory in his attitude and does not thump the table as Hon. Peter Dowding does—when he does anything. Hon. Peter Dowding is not prepared to listen to any other view but his own; but, according to the story I heard, Mr Grill put him down nicely and told

him that he had better behave himself when he was in Bunbury. Mr Grill is the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000" and Mr Dowding had already been given the heave-ho from his previous portfolio by the Collie coalminers' union because of his overbearing attitude.

Hon. Peter Dowding: If you are saying that that is an accurate report of any event in Bunbury, I can tell you that it is false and there is no truth to it at all.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am only going by what everybody in Bunbury is saying. I was not there listening because I am not like Hon. Peter Dowding. I do not eavesdrop on what is going on. I believe that the people who reported to me are fairly honourable people and they wanted the dispute finished. I just do not believe Hon. Peter Dowding has the capabilities required for this portfolio. I think he would probably make a good Minister for some sort of pugilistic sport, because every time he jumps to his feet he wants to thump at something. The referee might have to duck because Hon. Peter Dowding does not necessarily thump what he is fighting.

I am extremely worried about the whole of the south-west. The work that has been put into the Bunbury Port Authority, the work to have grain exported, the work to have woodchips exported, and alumina exported—work that has been going on for year after year by people who have conscientiously tried to build up the tonnage of the Bunbury Port Authority—looks like going down the drain. It does not really matter if it is a strike or if \$436 000 extra is spent because that is enough to put the Bunbury port out of the range of the exporters in the south-west. It will be cheaper for them probably to come to Fremantle.

It worries me that a Government which professes—although it has not done much yet—to be working for the people of Bunbury should be so slack, so abusive and so non-attentive to the needs and wishes of the people of Bunbury, its environs, and the exporters within range of using the Bunbury port. I think this Minister and this Government stand condemned for their attitude. I think that they should immediately get rid of this Minister and put somebody decent like Mr McKenzie in his place.

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [7.56 p.m.]: The course of the debate today has shown the complete justification for moving the urgency motion in respect of the Bunbury

port industrial dispute. Hon. Peter Dowding, the Minister for Industrial Relations, responded with an hysterical and very emotive outburst. He tried to blame the Liberal Party and anyone else but himself for the current problem. As a responsible Minister he should be responsible for all manner of things. His conduct in this House tonight was far from responsible and it reflected his irresponsible attitude to the work that he does as Minister for Industrial Relations. He has been caught out again for a duck. There is no doubt about that. He knows nothing that is worthwhile about the dispute; he was floundering and was caught out very badly indeed. He was ingloriously shamed by his leader who tried to come to his rescue like a battleship trying to protect a little destroyer. That was very evident indeed. Hon. Peter Dowding showed his complete ignorance of the situation of the Port of Bunbury. He tried to bluster his way through without any facts of relevance at all. He has complete contempt for the Bunbury Port Authority—

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not true—

Hon. V. J. FERRY: —otherwise he would have supported it right to the hilt in enforcing the provisions of two previous orders of the State and Federal industrial courts. He did not do that, and the people who are dependent on those decisions, and the industries in the south-west which are dependent on those decisions, were let down. Hon. Peter Dowding was caught out as an incompetent Minister. He has always been incompetent and always will be. By his own admission, his own ineptitude has let the people of Bunbury down, as well as the industries of the south-west down. For that reason, the Government has let down the people of Bunbury and the people in the south-west industries very badly indeed.

Hon. Peter Dowding blames the Opposition for the problem of industrial unrest. What nonsense! As a representative of that area I take extreme exception to the Government's inaction, and, as the representative for the south-west, I will continue to fight the Government all the way.

The Liberal Party in general and I stand very firmly on the question of law and order, and particularly industrial law and order. The Government does not stand firm on that question. We support, without reservation, the decisions and orders of the Industrial Relations Commission. That support was given in writing by the Leader of the Opposition in this House, the shadow Minister for Industrial Relations,

Hon. Gordon Masters, in Bunbury last week; he gave that undertaking in writing to the Bunbury Port Authority to back up our stance so that it is not just a matter of hearsay.

Mr Dowding has made great play of the employment figures for the State. I have quoted unemployment figures for the region before and I am bound to do so tonight, because they nail the lid on the coffin in respect of the Government's record of causing more unemployment in the south-west than there was two years ago. The official CES figures for the Bunbury area in June 1983 revealed 2 556 unemployed. Two years later in June 1985 the figure was 2 731, an increase of 175. All this nonsense about creating employment and protecting industry and trade is shown for what it is; all the Government's promises have gone out the window.

The Government and the Minister try to pull the wool over everyone's eyes on these falsehoods. The Government would like to have more employment in the south-west, but we all know what happened with the smelter proposal. The Premier and the Government pulled the plug on that, and the business people in the region who had geared up in the expectation of increased trade were caught out very badly financially because of the Government's decision. The Government has let them down.

As for Bunbury's employment opportunities, the Government, through its "Bunbury 2000" strategy document, which I have in my hand, stated that the Government would expedite the development of a new power station in Bunbury. We all know what happened to that. The Government directed that it should go to Collie. Collie is still in the south-west, but that does not help the people of Bunbury. The Government's actions show it up to be completely false.

Hon. Sandy Lewis mentioned the damage this dispute has caused to the reputation of the Port of Bunbury. The damage done to trade through the port is very serious; it is serious also for all industries in the south-west. The Government's inaction and mishandling of the dispute is very much working against its own interests in trying to establish, with the assistance of the South West Development Authority, a free trade area. Will this sort of dispute help that idea of a free trade area? Of course it will not. The Government stands condemned for that sort of nonsense.

Mr Dowding was not very truthful, and he does use the truth carelessly at times. He said that I supported the AWU in its threat to stop the flow of north-west gas and petrol supplies to the State. I did not say anything of the sort. I said that I could not condone that sort of reaction by the union, but could understand the frustration of the AWU because of the Minister's and the Government's refusal to support the union, which legally has the right to carry out the authorised work described in official orders. I can understand that sort of reaction by the union when the Government will not support it. It feels it must do something to get the Government to help it. The Government will help the Maritime Workers Union, the Seamens Union, and the Transport Workers Union, and particularly John O'Connor, but it will not support the AWU.

We also had the spectacle of Hon. Des Dans steaming into the debate like a tugboat coming to the rescue of his mate. It was extraordinary. Mr Dans showed that he knew a little more than his beleaguered colleague, but not a great deal more. He said that settlement of the dispute had paid off. We have had two court orders prior to yesterday and today. The MWU has defied those orders, yet Mr Dans says that is all right because they will be settled. How long must we wait before a just settlement is reached? This is the reason I moved the motion. The Government is not backing up the industrial laws of this country.

Mr Dans also said that men were treated like dogs at Bunbury. What extraordinary language; what dreadful language from a senior Minister in the Cabinet, the Acting Premier only a few days ago. How extraordinary that he should use such disparaging terms when speaking about people in Bunbury. He was particularly insulting to the chairman, members, and staff of the Bunbury Port Authority. He stands condemned for that. The people of Bunbury will certainly hear about the words he uttered in this debate tonight. His was a scurrilous attack on the reputations of the people in the area, who are good, decent citizens, people who are good, hardworking Western Australians.

This Government, and particularly the Minister for Industrial Relations, have stabbed in the back all the people of Bunbury and of the south-west because the Government will not take a stand; it is frightened of the militant big boys. It has said that the ALP policies paid off. What a high price is to be paid by the export industry. What a loss of trade will be the result. I wonder what sort of price the Government is

prepared to pay. I wonder how much it is prepared to allow the people of the south-west to pay. Is that what "Bunbury 2000" is all about? Is it just a further impost on the people down there?

I understand that in the sitting of the Federal commission today a number of decisions were made, and I have made a couple of notes. I understand that the commission recognises and acknowledges the exclusive right of the AWU to represent the industrial interests of employees of the Bunbury Port Authority employed on mooring and unmooring and other duties within the port. I understand that the commission also confirmed previous decisions of the Western Australian and Australian commissions asserting that the MWU has no standing to represent the men in industrial matters. The commission's determinations today confirm my stand in moving this motion, despite what the Government says and despite what this inept Minister for Industrial Relations says. The Minister and the Government should take note of the commission and support industrial laws.

I understand also that the commission said that the Bunbury Port Authority was acting within the terms of the award in terminating the employment of people on the grounds of misconduct. Further, the commission has backed up the Bunbury Port Authority in dismissing those people who were not picked to work within the terms of the legal award. The Government has not done that; it has not backed up the port authority.

It should now be obvious that after two weeks of bans down at the Port of Bunbury—bans imposed by the MWU and the Seamens Union—the commission will not be influenced. Still, it is interesting to note that the Seamens Union is sniping around the fringes of this dispute. I am not sure what is going to happen down there. I am not sure about the MWU, particularly in regard to pilots. The Seamens Union could well play a part by calling out its few members who man the tugs. So the port could be back in dispute.

I understand that the Federal commission will reconvene tomorrow at 11.00 a.m. in Bunbury to carry out further determinations. The commission sat yesterday and today and will come up with some determinations tomorrow. I will be interested to see just how much support this Government gives to those determinations. If, in the fullness of time, a

further stoppage occurs at the port—and it may not be far down the track—we will have another opportunity of discussing this matter. The Government can take warning that we will watch with great interest and we will highlight its slackness in handling this particular problem.

It is customary at the end of an urgency debate for the motion to be withdrawn. In the motion I moved today I sought the adjournment of the House until 11.00 a.m. on Friday, 20 September. That is the text of my motion and that is all that needs to be withdrawn. I do not withdraw in any shape or form the subject matter discussed by me or other members today. That remains; we are not withdrawing our condemnation of the Government or the Minister. We are simply withdrawing the necessity to adjourn until 11.00 a.m. on Friday, 20 September.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Employment and Training), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Employment and Training) [8.13 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill proposes to effect a number of important changes to both procedures and substantive rights under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1982.

The most significant proposals of the Bill may be summarised as follows—

- (a) To extend the range of people who may claim under the Act;
- (b) to further reduce the potential for stress on the victim, by providing a discretion in the criminal injuries compensation assessor to determine applications for compensation without conducting a hearing; or, where a hearing is conducted, a discretion not to call either the offender or the victim, or both, as a witness;
- (c) to avoid the involvement of the victim of the offence in recovery procedures under the Act. Recovery will be a matter between the convicted offender

and the Crown alone. This will further reduce the potential for stress on the victim of the offence; and

- (d) to remove from the Act the ability of the assessor to award compensation against a person who has been acquitted of a charge of committing the alleged offence.

I will deal with these matters in reverse order.

Under the 1982 Act, the assessor could make an award of compensation in cases where a person had been acquitted of an alleged offence if he were satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the person acquitted did not have a sufficient defence to exonerate him from liability to pay damages in tort.

The Government, when in Opposition, opposed this aspect of the 1982 Act on the basis that it introduced a civil element into compensation for criminal injuries and was especially inappropriate in view of the informal nature of the proceedings before the assessor. It is proposed that the assessor not be involved in arriving at judgments in respect of civil claims. Accordingly, no application for compensation may be made where the person charged with the offence was acquitted on the ground that no offence occurred.

Compensation will continue to remain available in cases where the person charged was acquitted but the assessor is satisfied that the offence was committed by some other person.

With respect to recovery of compensation, under the 1982 Act, the Crown could recover as a statutory debt any compensation paid in respect of an offence for which a person was convicted. It could also recover by virtue of a right of subrogation against persons who were not convicted but were found by the assessor to have committed the offence. The Bill proposes that the Crown's right to recover exists only in respect of convicted offenders.

This Bill also makes an important change in the procedures by which the Crown seeks reimbursement from an offender. It requires the Under Secretary for Law to make a separate application to the assessor for an order directing the offender to refund to the Crown any compensation paid. Formerly the liability of the offender was established as part of the compensation application. The victim will not be involved in this process at all. This will further reduce the potential for stress to be placed on the victim.

The Bill sets out in some detail the procedures that must be followed in such applications. The Under Secretary for Law and the offender are given an opportunity to be heard with respect to various matters, including the making of the award and the financial position of the offender.

Unlike the 1982 Act, the assessor will no longer be required to give notice of an application for compensation to the offender. This will have the effect of further simplifying the determination of matters in relation to the award of compensation. It will be open to the assessor to award compensation after considering relevant affidavit evidence and without requiring attendance by the victim; again this has the potential to further reduce stress on the victim, particularly in sexual assault cases.

Finally, several changes have been made in the range of those entitled to receive compensation under the Act.

The 1982 Act contained a definition of "close relative" which included a parent or child within the meaning of the Fatal Accidents Act 1959. Because of proposed changes to that Act currently before Parliament, this Bill incorporates the extended definitions which appear in the Fatal Accidents Act. This is a change of form only.

The second is a change in substance by which "close relative" is extended to include *de facto* relationships. A similar change is proposed for the Fatal Accidents Act and the definition in this Bill is in the same terms as the proposed amendments to that Act.

The Bill incorporates substantial parts of the 1982 Act and a number of other changes are made.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Agricultural Products Act 1929 provides, in section 3, for the establishment of three fruit sales advisory committees.

The role of the committees is to inquire into the size, quality and types of fruit harvested in Western Australia, to assess seasonal demand, and to advise the Minister for Agriculture on any sales restriction necessary to maintain the viability of the fruit growing industry.

In recent years the industry has itself seen a need for market quality regulation and has financially supported a small team of retail trade inspectors. The inspectors administer fruit grading and packing codes, established under section 3F of the Act. The codes provide minimum standards for fruit offered for sale on the local market.

The fruit growing industry believes that this arrangement has proved successful, to the extent that the sales committees do not now formally meet, their role having been largely taken over jointly by the Western Australian Fruit Growers Association, meeting in annual conference, and by the Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council.

At its 1984 conference, the Fruit Growers Association resolved that sales advisory committees be abolished and that their functions and powers be transferred to the Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council. The Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council is not a statutory authority. A slight expansion of its role, to effect the requested amendments, can be arranged administratively.

The Bill provides for the repeal of sections 3A to 3C of the principal Act. Consequential upon the repeal of the sections of the Act providing for the establishment of the committees, it is appropriate to repeal section 3D of the principal Act. This section provides for the Minister to take advice from the sales advisory committees, which will not be necessary if these committees are abolished.

The Bill proposes action which is in accordance with the Government's desire to abolish all unnecessary statutory authorities.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: ELEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 5 September.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [8.20 p.m.]: I was a little concerned the other day at a survey conducted in Perth in which four people were asked to identify the names of the WA and national farmers' industry organisations. A housewife answered, "No idea"; a jeweller said, "No I have never given it a thought"; a salesman said, "The National Farmers Union I suppose, I really don't know"; and a student said he had not idea at all and that he did not follow farming. I do not suppose they should be better informed. After all, there are only approximately 37 000 farmers and graziers in Western Australia out of a population of 1.2 million, there are some 400 000 farmers in Australia out of a population of 14 million. Farming is a long way from the city dweller even though it is just over the hills—in fact, one does not even have to go that far.

If one asks people in the country what union represents the employees on the waterfront, the employees in the electrical trades, the seamen, the clerks, the building employees, the shearing industry, the education work force, or the transport industry I bet one would find that "Mr Country Average" has a better idea of what is going on around him than "Mr City Dweller". I suppose the simple answer is exposure. If the city dweller came into contact with the farming fraternity or was fed media reports of the farming scene, possibly he would be better informed.

Country people, on the other hand, are exposed to all those unions that cover the work force and read the same media as the city dweller, which understandably give emphasis to news where the majority of the population lives or what it believes they would be interested in. I have no real quarrel with that but the survey I have talked about followed immediately on the heels of farmer and country folk demonstrations in each of the capital cities and in the Australian capital of Canberra.

This would make one wonder at what was the use of that series of demonstrations or if they passed unnoticed. The city dweller knows that some bubble took place, and the farmers have now gone over the hills and home. The politicians believe that their platitudes have won the day or put off the day, whichever way they like to look at it. The politicians believe the cockies have gone down their burrows again and, as they are a fairly placid mob, should not give them any more trouble providing the politicians keep talking, forming committees, and more talking and talking.

What of the Australian farmer? He is mainly in the 20 to 45-year bracket, and he is the person who believes that an honest day's work should return an honest day's pay and an honest year's work in his case should return an honest year's pay. He should have enough to live on for himself and his hardworking wife, enough to send the kids to school even though school is sometimes a long haul away. He should have enough to go to town on a Friday and buy the week's stores, have a few beers, and play a little sport in the local community-maintained amenities on Saturday or Sunday afternoon if he is lucky enough to be able to make it. He does not worry about superannuation for tomorrow as he hopes the farm will be the provider. He does not want Government social welfare handouts. After all, his home is beyond the black stump, he built it, and he is not used to begging for his keep, sustenance, or the roof over his head. Nor can he understand anyone who does. He does want a fair crack of the whip and he is getting just a little madder than hell that he is not getting it.

The 35-year olds are saying that their demonstrations are too peaceful and that they have not left their mark. They should not have listened to Crane and Cameron about a peaceful demonstration. They should have turned a few cars over. Perhaps they should have chucked their weight around until they were felt. After all, that is what the other activists seem to do. Why shouldn't they? They have had enough of unkept promises. They have had enough of seminars and experts telling them what they already know. They want action and they want it now.

I was a little amused at the irony of the remark of the President of the Koorda Shire Council who visited China some two years ago on a promotion trip. He had his name tag on his lapel with his occupation under it as "farmer". The Chinese had written their own interpretation under it and when he asked what it meant was told, "Neville Grieve—Peasant". Neville Grieve is sure that this is the way most farmers are heading if the industry keeps going the way it has. There is nothing surer than that the 1985-86 Federal Budget did nothing towards restoring peace and order in the rural community. Unless the State Budget and the September Federal Budget do something about the situation, the Federal and State Governments will have to live with the consequences. At this stage, and with the strong feeling out in the rural community, I would hate to think

what that will be. As Mr Dans said before dinner, it could be that they did not heed the danger signal.

I will not repeat in detail the areas of concern with respect to transport, fuel excise and rebates, fertiliser duties, IED benefits, Government charges and increases on those charges, sales taxes on lubricants and other essential commodities, export inspection charges, cuts in rural adjustment, or high interest and lack of funds, all of which are of immense concern to all the farmers, the graziers, the town businessmen, the workers, and the shire councils. We are all very well aware of these financial barriers and we should make it our job to find out the problem and do something about solving it. If we do not, that problem will visit the large towns and then the cities and bring with it economic chaos and affect the standard of living which dictates the lifestyle of so many who so far are unaffected by the disaster hitting Australia's major export industry and the people within it. Only yesterday Chamberlain John Deere Pty Ltd laid off 100 workers because of the drought and the economic conditions in the agricultural area.

Recently President Reagan of the United States, who hardly in the past could be called the farmers' friend, was heard to remark that the United States has lost its car industry and its steel industry, and he is certainly not going to stand by and lose the farming industry so vital to the economy of the United States. This does signify that the farming crisis of cost versus income is an international as well as a national problem. The thinking that has to be injected into and for the preservation of the farming sector must be given full priority by all Governments of all political colours.

When I look at the magnitude of the present world wheat glut which dictates the meagre returns compared to high import costs that our farmers receive nationally, I realise how fragile and insecure our future will be without some international rectification of the price-cutting and commodity propping that other world exporters are engaged in.

Earlier this year the Argentineans, after a record crop and with little grain storage facilities, undercut the world price of grain in such a manner that it shook the world wheat exporting countries which had large unsold grain surpluses.

The EEC, which subsidises its growers to the extent of about \$2.20 a bushel or \$80 a tonne for wheat, followed Argentina down the trail

leaving the United States of America, Canada, and Australia stunned at their sales at below cost figures and the direct erosion of longstanding agreements. The United States has now indicated that its retaliation could be by way of a sales discount offer called the "Bonus Incentive Commodity Programme" to countries which may be enticed to buy its wheat, but which have been taken over by competing nations by the use of unfair trade practice. Its system is to offer a one tonne free bonus to the purchaser in every four to 10 tonnes, and that will effectively reduce the price ranging from 25 per cent to as low as 10 per cent according to the tonnage discount that may be agreed upon.

On top of this the United States is considering offering financial assistance to countries which have not the finance for such purchases. These likely moves are being watched with dismay by Canada and Australia who are endeavouring to hold on to their somewhat depleted traditional markets.

On the other side of the ledger we have China which has fast become almost self-sufficient in grain, and India whose green revolution has seen the self-sufficiency target reached as planned for, and as described by me to the Assembly in 1969.

As well, we have Saudi Arabia and other countries—some taught by Australia—who are now exporters of grain. In fact, one has only to look to reach the conclusion that the only countries that really want our grain are those that cannot afford to pay for it. Do we in turn blame Argentina which, after all, has a lower standard of living and perhaps lower costs in general than we in Australia, or do we blame the EEC which heavily subsidises its growers? After all, the subsidy which is paid to the English, the Germans, the Dutch, the French, the Italians, and the Belgians means that their peasants have become farmers with their bellies full and, for the cost of about \$A12 a family throughout the EEC, those countries have reached a climate of Government—both national and local—which is stable, without demonstrations and without war which has long been the European recourse of peasant revolt.

Are we to blame the USA in which farm land values—as in Australia—have dropped in the last two years by 50 per cent and whose farmers are in financial straits? They have their silos full of unsold grain right back on the farm with another harvest about to come in. They have millions of dollars worth of barges full of wheat

which are tied up on the Mississippi River with little or no movement out of New Orleans and other exporting harbours to the outside world.

Can we blame Canada which recently opened a large grain exporting terminal on its west coast just south of Alaska to feed grain to the Asian, Malaysian, and Indonesian markets now that their grain out of the east coast is no longer wanted in Europe or the African Mediterranean sector?

Only last week Canada lost a contract for 90 000 tonnes of flour in 1985 to Cuba which has been its traditional market for 22 years. The contract has gone to the EEC, in particular to West Germany; and 180 000 tonnes of flour are donated annually to Cuba by the Soviet Union.

I suppose that nobody can blame anybody, but if this industry is to be preserved, then a support system will have to be found. I am not saying that the direct injection by way of a subsidy—in the EEC of \$2.20 a bushel or \$80 a tonne for wheat, \$1.20 a bushel or \$45 a tonne for wheat in the US, or 37c a bushel or \$13 a tonne for wheat as given in Canada as a transport and interest rebate subsidy—is the answer. I am also not saying that this is the answer or is even possible for a country such as Australia with a small population, but something will have to be done to allow Australia to compete and to keep itself established as a world producer until the problem of overproduction is rectified.

It is well-documented as to what course could and should be taken immediately at Government level. I trust, for the sake of the farming industry, that something better than that which was recently arrived at in the Federal Budget is done and done very smartly.

I listened to the Governor's Speech at the opening of this parliamentary session and I join with other members in this Chamber in expressing our recognition of the fine manner in which he and his wife perform their onerous duties.

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [8.38 p.m.]: I support the motion. I have pleasure in complimenting the Governor for the responsible approach he is taking to his duties within the community.

I raise the question of what is happening to Western Australia. At one point in time WA was innovative and set an example to other States in Australia, but it now appears that it has adopted a wait and see attitude. Let me give an illustration. In 1982, under a Liberal

Government, Western Australia appointed the first neighbourhood watch centre in Bunbury. Only last week, under a Labor Government, the sixth neighbourhood watch centre was opened in Western Australia. On Friday Victoria will open its one hundred and sixty-eighth neighbourhood watch centre and it commenced this practice one year after Western Australia.

Victoria now leads Australia in this area and, as a result, there has been a substantial decrease in the number of burglaries committed in that State. Last year, 7 500 fewer homes were burgled than in the previous year and this has been the result of the neighbourhood watch programmes. Incidentally, a further 10 centres will be opened this week in Victoria.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is a good Labor State.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am asking what happened to Western Australia which led Australia in terms of the neighbourhood watch programmes.

Initially, a report was received from Sergeant King who visited America and New Zealand and recommended to the Liberal Government that it set up a pilot programme.

Let me give an example of what is happening in Victoria because it appears that Western Australians should take note of what has occurred in that State. Last week it was reported in *The Canberra Times* that neighbourhood watch centres resulted in a 66 per cent reduction in crime. The police report released in Victoria showed that as the result of the neighbourhood watch centres there had been a 45 per cent reduction in burglaries and a 30 per cent reduction in crime in a 12-month period. However, this State has six centres only.

The other thing I would like to say about this is that there is a totally different approach. The Police Force in Melbourne receives petitions with an average of 400 signatures daily from people of that State requesting the establishment of a neighbourhood watch. In other words the community is really involved.

The average attendance at the meetings to establish such neighbourhood watches is close to 200 people. Four senior police officers are allotted to the neighbourhood watch. At the recent criminology conference in Brisbane a visiting Canadian professor said the results of Victoria's neighbourhood watch should be on the headlines of every paper in Australia.

What is happening in Western Australia, and why are we not benefiting from the tremendous results of neighbourhood watch when this State was the first to introduce it to Australia? The Eastern States would not recognise that we have a neighbourhood watch at all. They would say that what we have in Western Australia is a PR exercise. In that exercise there have been some good results. In fact I spent some time speaking to the coordinator of the first metropolitan neighbourhood watch centre in East Fremantle. This was established as a result of the initiative of East Fremantle people who said to the police, "Do you want to come with us?" They were prepared to fumble along and do it themselves. They distributed 2 000 pamphlets and went out into the community. They told the story and the police became involved. At that stage it was thought local government would be the best means of promotion.

If one asks how many people in East Fremantle are involved, one would not be able to find out, yet in that district there has been a reduction in crime. I remember reading in the *Sunday Times* some months ago that a person who had been burgling had been caught and the neighbourhood watch identified him.

When one compares the models of Victoria and Western Australia one can see the reason Victoria has had such tremendous success. There is a great difference between the two States. It would be interesting to see the results. One can read an article in *The Sun News Pictorial* of 9 May 1985 under the heading "Neighbourhood Plan Fells Burglars from Victoria". It says burglaries have fallen by 45 per cent and other crimes by 35 per cent in the neighbourhood watch areas since the programme began in March of last year, according to the police.

That was on the occasion of the launching of the one hundredth neighbourhood watch unit. The coordinator in Victoria told me yesterday that there will be 168. The Premier of that State has indicated that in the current financial year another 90 neighbourhood watches will be opened. Victoria certainly recognises the contribution they will make.

Referring to the signatures, if members like to check *The Sun News Pictorial* of 18 April 1985, under the heading "Tight Watch on Crime Pays Off", they will find the report says that the police receive an average of one petition of about 400 signatures daily asking them to set up a neighbourhood watch in a particular area. That was confirmed to me yesterday by the coordinator of neighbourhood watch. The

police have given a priority to this area; they have provided finance and have been able to get companies involved in corporate finance to back them.

One of the reports I read indicates that in Victoria insurance companies are already looking at reducing premiums because certain areas have achieved such dramatic results in reducing the cost of crime. That means there is less to pay out in those areas. In fact the record indicates that another 90 neighbourhood watch programmes would be established in one financial year.

In looking at the difference and trying to discover why Victoria has been more successful than Western Australia, I find it is because the requirement in Victoria is totally different from the requirement in Western Australia. The requirement to have a neighbourhood watch in Victoria is that one needs to have a community demand. As I have shown, petitions are received from 400 people in an area.

The second requirement is that the area is defined not as a whole shire but as 600 homes. Having identified an area, the next criterion is that there must be a crime problem. So once having been asked to set up a neighbourhood watch, the police examine that area to see whether it has a crime problem.

That makes a lot of sense. Why establish neighbourhood watches and use police resources if there does not happen to be a burglary or housebreaking problem? Hence the Police Force in that State has set up a model along the basis of a crime problem, and has defined an area as 600 homes.

Incidentally the attendance at meetings, once it has been decided to set up a neighbourhood watch, is just under 200 people. With 600 homes, there is an average attendance of something close to 200 people. A coordinator is responsible for each 30 homes.

They meet on a monthly basis, and one of the local police officers reports on the crime in the specific area and the type of person the police are looking for; so the local committee is provided with a fair amount of input to disseminate amongst its members.

Taking the comparison of Western Australia, the East Fremantle coordinating committee meets once every six months.

On the results currently being published in Victoria, in terms of our neighbourhood watch, we should examine the model we are using. Already South Australia, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory have adopted

the model of Victoria and have established neighbourhood watches based upon that model which has been so successfully developed.

They have seen that by targeting the area and using their resources in such a way that they can achieve a desirable result.

My first thought was that this type of thing was likely to cause a lot of work. I inquired about the resources and manpower tied up in such an operation and was told that in Victoria it takes something like 18 hours of police time to establish a neighbourhood watch and something like four hours of police time on a monthly basis. Recognising that Victoria uses four police and has a larger population than WA, it is disturbing that the priority in WA has been just to appoint, recently, a coordinator for neighbourhood watch schemes. He is responsible to visit places like Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton and Kalgoorlie, as well as East Fremantle and Gosnells. In going to those areas he is expected to run around to the Apex and Lions Clubs and all similar community groups to try to sell the idea of the neighbourhood watch scheme. It seems that we are doing things the wrong way. Here we are using our resources to go out into the community to tell the people about the scheme and to encourage them to adopt it.

In Victoria, with its successful model and with its statistics about which it can boast, the model adopted was that the police instituted a public programme telling people what the neighbourhood watch was and what they had to do if they wanted to take part. The communities there have gone to the Police Force and clamoured for its help, saying that they want such a neighbourhood watch scheme. They have located all the people interested, and so the Police Force knows that these people will stay with the programme.

The programme Western Australia is working on has a limited life because we have people going out trying to encourage people to set up a neighbourhood watch scheme, regardless of whether a crime problem exists. The real need is for us to get into a programme that is community-orientated, a programme that is wanted by the community, a programme where the people come to the Police Force and ask for a meeting to be called.

It is clear in Victoria that if the police call a public meeting to establish a neighbourhood watch it is called because the people want it,

not because the police tell them they need it. The police take the view that it is up to the people to provide the interest.

We should be involved in a neighbourhood watch programme in Western Australia because we have a State-wide crime problem. Member might have noticed an article in *The West Australian* of 9 September under the heading "Break-ins could be averted, says expert". The article indicated that a break-in is reported in Western Australia every 22 minutes. So, every 22 minutes some home is broken into, which means something like 60 or 70 homes broken into every day. In 1983-84 in Western Australia, 23 731 homes were broken into; the figure for Victoria was 46 404; for South Australia it was 14 435; for New South Wales it was something like 56 000. It is recognised by all the people who are involved in this area of reporting on break-ins that we are experiencing a tidal wave of burglaries. There is no explanation for the massive increase of break-ins throughout Australia.

The latest figures provided to me on break-ins in my electorate, covering areas like Scarborough, Trigg and North Beach, between the years 1982 and 1984, show an increase of break-ins of the order of 100 to 140 per cent. This should be of concern to all citizens.

Neighbourhood watch programmes around the world herald a new approach in crime prevention. Certainly we will never be able to put enough policemen on the beat to overcome the problem. In fact, if a policeman walks down your street, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) and notices a person in your yard, it is highly unlikely that he will know that that person is a stranger. That policeman would probably walk past your house while your home was burgled.

But people in the neighbourhood would know that person was a stranger. Therefore it has been recognised by almost every authority involved in neighbourhood watch programmes that they offer Australia, as the programmes do already to many other countries, the best opportunity to provide the community with a basis of looking after itself. The community can become the eyes and ears of the Police Force. We can look after our property and make it more secure.

Among my papers is the example of a woman who looked out her window and saw someone going backwards and forwards to a car. She reported it to the police and a burglar was caught. That is one of the things that is quite

impressive about the Victorian approach. At these monthly meetings the people are taught how to make detailed descriptions of people, how to be more observant and what things they should be on the look out for. There is a report of one person involved in a neighbourhood watch programme having noticed that a vehicle parked outside a house in his street had different number plates on the front and back of the vehicle. He reported it, and that caused a burglar to be caught within half an hour.

Another important thing happens. It is happening in East Fremantle. Neighbourhood watches get people talking to each other. They bring about a situation of something like a country neighbourhood, where people know and talk to each other.

The neighbourhood watch concept offers this State the greatest opportunity to make inroads into break-ins. However, our present priorities are mistaken. We have established one neighbourhood watch every six months, while Victoria is establishing them at greater than one a week.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They have more burglars.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Victoria has one break-in every 10 minutes whereas we have one every 22 minutes. On my calculation, bearing in mind the population of the two States, we have more burglars than Victoria.

Hon. Peter Dowding: He is sorry he asked.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I know, he is not aware of the figures.

It is time we re-examined our model because I believe the neighbourhood watch programme gives the community the opportunity to look after itself and to work with the Police Force in such a way that it brings the police and the community together in a homely way.

At Christmas, most people would ask their neighbours to look after their home if they were going away, and really this is just an extension of that community involvement. Already we have examples of the neighbourhood watch programme working successfully in WA.

The neighbourhood "safe house" programme, which has been extended throughout the State, is successful. It is a simple approach of involving the community in an important area and helping it to look after itself.

Our programme offers us a tremendous chance to improve and to get results. Actually, the community can save some money through this scheme because figures in regard to burglaries indicate an increase from \$71 million to

\$151 million—quite a massive increase for which the community has to pay. In other words, if more thieves are about and a person's insurance company has to pay out the victim will be charged more to insure his or her home.

The reality is that the Victorian approach indicates that this programme can not only catch the thief, but also certainly reduce the number of thieves. A person might turn around and say "Right, if we start a neighbourhood watch scheme in one area, all we do is shift the thief from one area to some other area", but the Victorian experience has proved that that is not the case. Victoria has warned those persons likely to steal or to break into houses that the chances are very good that they will be caught. Their chances of being caught have actually been improved. The results have shown fewer people have been involved in breakings into houses. A couple of examples were given in *The Age* of 5 May under the heading "To catch a thief, keep an eye out for the neighbours".

Hon. Tom McNeil: Is that what you do in your home?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Andrew Rule writes as follows—

In Kew one day this week an alert householder noticed that a car parked outside his neighbour's house had number plates which did not match.

Suspicious, the watcher rang the police. Several minutes later a man was arrested for burglary.

Later the article continues—

A month ago, at Dandenong, a pregnant woman resting near a window, saw a man make repeated trips from a neighboring house to a car. That man will soon appear before court on burglary charges.

Victoria has encouraged people to be, not vigilantes, but more observant of their neighbours' property.

Incidentally, at the start of the Victorian scheme there was a phone-in which involved approximately 3 000 people who demonstrated they were interested in the neighbourhood watch scheme. No wonder they were able to create a model which has set the pace for Australia.

The challenge is for Western Australia to ask: What happened? Why when the neighbourhood watch scheme was brought to Australia did WA get so far behind? Why are we not quickly grasping ideas and if there is a need for refinement and if we can see that some other

State is doing better why do we not quickly send people to examine the model concerned and implement it here? Why are we not giving priority in regard to implementation to police personnel, in terms of finance available, to lessen the incidence of crime and to make homes safer which will also save money in terms of increased insurance premiums?

It appears that this is one of the areas in which the Government has failed. Rather than leading Australia the Government has developed a policy of "wait and see", of "No, we will wait until every other State does it first and once they have all put it into place we will see whether it is any good." Victoria is not waiting to see. The Eastern States are laughing at us, saying that all we have is a PR exercise. Why does not the Government lift its game?

A member interjected.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am certain that footballers would be involved if the member is involved.

The other matter I want to raise which follows the Government's approach of "wait and see" is my disappointment at the answers that I have been provided in this House to my questions in regard to the Government's approach to the community justice scheme.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Tell us about your "wait and see" policy on the marina.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: It would appear that Graham Edwards is going to make a speech.

Hon. Graham Edwards: He sure is. Have we worked it out yet?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I would be delighted to debate that matter with Mr Edwards if he wishes to.

Hon. Graham Edwards: I look forward to it.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The member wants to take us onto another subject which we will come to later. The Government's attitude to the neighbourhood watch scheme and the community justice scheme is, "We will wait for the others to implement it and if it is any good we might adopt it." We still find ourselves involved in domino legislation. In other words, as long as the domino falls in every other State it will fall in WA. Instead of seeing an idea which might improve the situation of the community in WA and grasping hold of that idea and putting it into practice, the answer I received in regard to the community justice scheme was that Victoria was likely to adopt a different approach; although the project has been in operation in New South Wales for five

years; despite the fact that there has been a pilot scheme in New Zealand; despite the fact that approximately 100 to 200 similar programmes can be found throughout the world, we do not want to adopt any one of those examples. We ought to examine Victoria and see what that State did. Victoria set about finding out what the community wanted; it provided a position paper and went out into the community and met the community and thus established that State's formula. It established that there was a need for dealing with neighbourhood disputes by mediation. The desirability of such an approach was established.

Certainly, it was identified that these matters were not suitable to go before a court. Therefore, the people then set about very quickly letting the Minister know that they desired to establish a community justice centre. What was the difference between what Victoria intended to do and the Bill that I presented to this House last year, which the Minister thought was so markedly different? The difference was in the setting up of the committee.

In Victoria large groups of communities are involved, and some are already involved in mediation; there will be community committees rather than one committee being appointed. That is a major difference because we cannot decide whether we would rather have community committees running these schemes or whether we would rather have an appointed committee to run them. We have to wait until Victoria has a three-year pilot programme to find out whether the scheme works.

This "wait and see" policy, I suggest, is disastrous and is holding Western Australia back. The Government should lift its game in that area and should take hold of those things that stand to benefit every Western Australian. If the Government reads the Victorian reports—I have read those reports—and transcripts of seminars and of many different meetings, and refers to the tapes and videos that have been produced, it will see that the outcome was that the community had identified a great need for mediation, for the solving of disputes. It identified that matters were going before the courts which were unsuitable to be heard in court. They were also going to local governments, parliamentary offices, and a range of other services. They all reported that there was a need to provide some method which would not cost an arm and a leg whereby people could be brought together to solve their disputes.

Certainly the success of the community justice centres or community mediation centres not only in Australia but in other countries indicates that Western Australia should move into this area; but sadly this Government says "No, we want to wait and see whether we should proceed in that area." I suggest that that "wait and see" policy is a disastrous one and it is a policy that will not take Western Australia forward. The Government should lift its game in that area.

It is my belief that every now and again people who draw up legislation let their pens run wild because they want to legislate for everything. Recently I was told—I have not checked it out—that a health inspector approached a local mothers' club cake stall in a shopping centre and told the mothers that, under the health regulations, their scones and cakes would have to be wrapped. They were told also that they would have to write the contents of the cakes on the packets. They were told that they would have to indicate the weight of the product and that a date would need to be written on the packet advising the day on which the product should be eaten by. Could members imagine what would happen if those regulations were applied throughout the community?

How did previous generations live? Many of them must have been killed by these cake stalls. As long as I can remember, every time a school, scout group, or any other group wished to raise money, the women baked cakes.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: If it is a regulation you can move for its disallowance.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: There are many regulations and many of them are open to interpretation. I do not have the resources available to me that are available to Federal members. If one misses a regulation one has to move a motion in both Houses. However, I believe that we should axe many of the regulations now in force. I do not think Hon. Fred McKenzie would go to his local P & C stall and tell the people to wrap their cakes and write the contents of the cakes on the packets. He looks healthy and he has probably been eating cakes for a long time.

As I said previously, in large bureaucracies, the people who draw up the legislation let their pens run wild. Very often we in Parliament do not pick up or understand the ultimate effects of many of the regulations which we pass. Many of them impinge upon the rights of the individual and regulate our lives to a degree

that we should now say, "Stop." There is no evidence in many cases that many of the regulations have any effect at all. I would be anxious to find out what illnesses have been caused by those local mothers' club stalls. I would suggest that less illness can be attributed to cakes sold at those stalls than to many of the Government-run kitchens or to the food that members eat in their own homes. Every now and again people are affected because they are sensitive to a certain food. However, most community groups supply good, wholesome cake.

Members will recall that during the week I raised a question about the regulation which came into force on 15 March relating to second-hand clothing. That regulation was updated. If the regulation is enforced it will mean that groups like the St Vincent de Paul Society will be in all sorts of trouble in trying to help the less well off in our community. In fact, I have received a letter from the St Vincent de Paul Society stating that the regulation, if enforced, will make it less able to help the needy. If, for instance, it was helping 6 000 people, under the regulation it would be only able to help 3 000 people. The Salvation Army would experience similar difficulties in terms of providing free clothing to the needy in our community. Those groups earn money from the clothes they sell, money which they use to feed the poor. The Salvo's estimate that they would be required to spend \$220 000 in the first 12 months and to spend another \$100 000 on labour costs.

Anglicare has indicated that it would have to close its stores if the regulation was enforced. Many other groups have also indicated that they would be seriously affected by the regulation.

I believe, however, that the Minister did not intend that the regulation had this effect. I am certain that the Minister for Health had other ideas when introducing the regulation. In question 125 to the Minister I asked whether the regulation had affected the charity health stores selling clothes that had not been dry-cleaned. He said that the Health Department was aware of such cases but that the potential for the transmission of disease was well-established. In terms of the transmission of disease being well-established, I wonder what happens when I visit my local doctor and sit on the same seat which was sat on by someone before me with some disease. We do not make the doctor fumigate that seat. What about a person with a disease sitting on a seat in an MTT bus before me.

Buses are not fumigated between passengers. There have been no examples of disease transmission by bus seats in Western Australia. I phoned New South Wales recently and found that there had been no evidence of disease transmission by second-hand clothes happening in that State either. Health inspectors in that State are permitted to enforce the health regulations. If an inspector visits a place which is selling dirty clothing, the health inspector can order that that clothing be washed or destroyed. He has the same rights as he would have if he visited a place that was selling contaminated or dirty food.

What has happened in this case is unnecessary. I believe that the Minister signed the regulation without having any knowledge of its effects. The people involved in welfare are frightened that a regulation may inadvertently cause them many problems and additional expense. They may not be able to recover that expense to help the needy. I ask: Who will help pick up the tab? The Government cannot afford to meet the needs of these people. The regulation requires that people receive clean clothes. It requires that they be rewashed in hot water with soap. It seems that the Health Department has not heard of Cold Power. It should check up on the new methods of cleaning clothes. The welfare agencies are required to put a notice on every garment or be able to guarantee by a notice in the store that all clothing is clean. However, many of the articles they receive would cost too much to dry-clean. It also requires that other articles such as headgear and mattresses be cleaned.

The other day, while driving along, I listened to an interview with an Aboriginal welfare group. That group sells clothing and bedding to needy Aborigines for a small amount of money in order that those funds may be used to help other more needy people.

Such organisations would be affected by this regulation. Another thing which amazes me is how very easy it is for a regulation to slip through without our attention being drawn to some of the things that are wrong with it. The previous regulation indicated that the penalty for not adhering to the regulation would be \$40. The penalty was removed from the later regulation. I had then to plough through the Act to find out what the penalty is. The penalty for a breach of these regulations is \$200 and \$4 a day. In other words, these charity groups are

such criminals that we have to increase the penalty by 500 per cent to make them come into line.

I suggest that such organisations do not want to break the law. When the matter was brought to their attention they asked the Minister to change the regulation. I hope that he quickly comes forward and makes it possible for organisations which make a major contribution to those on lower incomes by way of cheaper clothing and food donations to continue in their endeavours.

I now raise an issue which I raised by way of a question in the House on 28 August. The question related to the Building Management Authority and the tendering system. I asked—

- (1) What was the name of the person/firm tendering for work at the Kalgoorlie College—Stage 2 and 3 Fixed Furniture?
- (2) On what date were each of the above tenders received and what was the amount tendered?
- (3) Who was the successful tenderer?

The answer provided to me reads—

- (1) to (3) As the formal acceptance of this tender is being reviewed, the Minister for Works has undertaken to write to the member conveying his response to this question as soon as the successful tenderer has been determined.

I asked that question on 28 August. It is now 17 September. I still do not have any answer to that question despite the fact that I am almost certain that the tender had been allocated. It may now have been reallocated, but it had certainly been allocated. Any person in the business could have got the information from the Building Management Authority, but as a member of Parliament I am denied it. As I understand it, the Parliament is here to examine the Government. The Government had to be examined in this area. It appears to me that the Government is creating a problem by not providing factual information. It makes one think that it must have something to hide. By hiding information and showing a lack of preparedness to give to the House factual and quick responses, the Government leads the community to believe that it has something to hide and that the Building Management Authority may not be accountable to anyone for the tender price.

The production of jobs within that tender price may well be correct. That is an indication that the Government should examine the matter and make certain that things are above-board. If what I am saying is incorrect, the Government should provide the information and clear up the matter I have raised. It may be seen in the community that the Building Management Authority is not playing the game fairly and that something needs to be done about it.

In speaking to the Address-in-Reply, I am saddened that in another place debate on the Governor's Speech which up until now had been given a priority has been downgraded. Perhaps I should apologise to the Governor for the fact that one of the Chambers of the Parliament should so downgrade the Address-in-Reply that it did not give it the priority that it should have.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! I do not believe the member should reflect on something that took place in the Assembly.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President, for guiding me in connection with the Standing Orders. I thought it was all right for me to make the comment within this Chamber, but since you have guided me I will adhere to your ruling.

I welcome the announcement of the Government that the flag competition will not go into our schools. I am thankful that very soon after I called for the Minister to make clear his position on the matter, he chose to make that decision and recognised that it was inappropriate to have a competition in schools in connection with any proposal to change the flag. A survey of young people between the ages of 15 and 24 undertaken by the Federal Government indicated that 64 per cent of those young people believed that the Australian flag should remain as it is. Certainly a smaller survey in my electorate indicated that as many as eight in 10 people believe that the current flag should be retained. Therefore it would be quite inappropriate to have groups within our schools developing this debate for a change of flag until such time as the community clearly demonstrates that it believes there should be some change. Therefore, I welcome the decision of the Minister in that respect.

The next issue I raise is that of employment and employment schemes. Some of these schemes are mere fiascos. At a meeting in my area a welfare worker drew to the attention of

the Federal Minister with responsibility for social security schemes, the fact that a person who had recently been placed with an employer under one of the Commonwealth schemes had been advised very quickly after that placement by the employer that the person would be put off because the State Government had offered a number of people on full wages.

According to that welfare officer a competition between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government was developing in this State over which Government's scheme would claim the young person to be employed. When the matter was raised I thought that the Federal Minister would have taken some action. I felt that he should have immediately taken up the matter with the responsible State Minister and seen that in future there was some liaison between the Commonwealth and State departments. He should have seen that the schemes did not trample on each other to the detriment of young people in our State. The young person who gets put off in such a situation is certainly left wondering why he or she has been put off. Such young people are developing skills. They have nothing to sell. When employers exploit the system they should certainly be condemned. In this particular case more than half the people employed were supposedly on Government schemes. Over a period some 94 personnel had been turned over. Therefore it was quite certain that in that situation no young person would be given a permanent job.

The Minister attacked me in regard to this. The matter was raised with a Federal Minister who did nothing about it. It is the type of area in which State schemes should not compete with Commonwealth schemes to the detriment of young people. Rather than spending his time attacking me, the Minister should turn his attention to this matter.

I believe my next point was raised by Hon. Phil Pandal. I refer to the contribution we in this State make to marriage and divorce—certainly in terms of our support for the Marriage Guidance Council.

Let me say at the outset, in case the Leader of the House thinks I am attacking the Government, the grant was first removed under the previous Government. That does not make the situation any better.

In the *Wanneroo Times* of 20 August Liz Byrski under the heading of "Government Favours Divorce", wrote an article which highlighted the great amount of money which

we in this State and country spend on providing services which seem to encourage the breakdown of families. The article in the *Wanneroo Times* of 20 August had this to say—

In the past financial year the Federal Government spent \$1 250 million on divorce and its associated costs.

This includes the cost of the Family Court, legal aid in the Family Court, and supporting benefits for single parents subsequent to divorce and separation.

On the other side of the equation, just \$4.1 million was allocated to marriage support services, a sum which amounts to only 0.3 per cent of the money spent on divorce.

The article goes on to point out that the costs of the breakdown of marriage affect not only the State Government—because it calls upon it for additional funds for low-cost housing and child care—but also the additional cost of marriage guidance is something of the order of \$200 to \$300 per couple.

In this State the Marriage Guidance Council has had no contribution from the State Government to its operating costs since 1982-83. Prior to that the council received \$20 000, and up to 1983-84 it received a contribution of \$8 282 to a loan repayment for its building.

In an article on the cost of marital breakdown, Jim Crawley, the director of the Marriage Guidance Council, pointed out that the present divorce rate is such that we will soon be in a situation where 40 per cent of all marriages will end in divorce.

He was indicating that there is a great demand for marriage guidance. He went on to restate the point made by Liz Byrski that in the current financial year the Commonwealth Government will spend \$1 250 on marital breakdown.

He indicated the success of the Marriage Guidance Council approach is such that 70 per cent of all clients report a positive outcome. Therefore it can clearly demonstrate that it is saving the Government the cost of this service to the community. In fact on page 6 of his article he said that marriage counselling is not only effective, it is extremely cost-efficient. He said the cost of divorce and supporting parents benefit is now such that if the Marriage Guidance Council of Western Australia helps only three per cent of the 1 700 clients who seek its services each year to avoid separation and so

avoids meeting the supporting parents benefit for the year, then the council has saved the Commonwealth Government more than the total grant it receives for the year.

In other words, there is no reasonable doubt that the Government would save several dollars for every dollar it spent on the Marriage Guidance Council.

Mr Crawley closed this report by trying to bring home to the community and to his audience that if we do not take an interest in this area, we will have to increase our costs across a wide range of services. One thing is sure, he says: The present rate of marital breakdown is a luxury Australia simply cannot afford. Perhaps we must look to the churches in Australia for a reassurance of political priorities.

It appears to me that there is a need to look at some of these priorities. A comparison of what is provided by other States in Australia shows that New South Wales provides \$75 000 from the Health Department's funding for its community education work. In Queensland \$21 000 is granted to the Marriage Guidance Council from the general purpose grant. In Tasmania \$8 500 comes from the general purpose grant to the Health Department. In the ACT \$8 000 is provided from the general purpose grant. In South Australia the Marriage Guidance Council has a grant of \$100 000 to run a programme to train people to assist with human relationship problems.

I notice that the State Minister defended the State Government against the charges made in the *Wanneroo Times*. What was pointed out was that he missed the point that most of the services to which he referred were catering for people after the breakdown. The purpose of the Marriage Guidance Council is to attack the problem before the breakdown. Certainly if a higher priority was given to funding and looking after an organisation such as this, the community could benefit. Therefore I join with those members who ask the Government to re-examine its priorities in terms of funding because of the tremendous benefit the Marriage Guidance Council could be to Western Australia.

I have been an interested visitor to some of the technology displays recently. The Minister for Technology has been talking about how business should grasp hold of new technology. As a member of Parliament I go round some of the departments and it amazes me that we have the gall to say to the business community that it should take hold of this new technology.

In the local police station I saw the sergeant bashing out a report on a manual typewriter. It took a long time to get electric typewriters for members of Parliament. The resources available, even to parliamentarians, belong to the last decade. It amazes me that we do not set the pace. What we are saying to industry is, "Do what we say, not what we do." Our Parliamentary Library has taken a long time to grab hold of some of this technology and provide information which has been available to some Parliaments in Australia for some time.

Some years ago when visiting Brisbane I was able to obtain up-to-date information on the position of Bills and amendments in that State more quickly than here where information is still manually extracted. We are not finished with the massive printing of the electoral roll, and members do not have a database available in their offices to check a name.

We can go through a system whereby every week we receive from the Electoral Department undated information regarding people going onto the electoral roll. If someone were to come into the office requesting information about new enrolments, we would end up having to go through records for 15 to 20 weeks in order to check whether the names of these people had been added to the electoral roll. When that sort of information comes in we should have it at our fingertips. It seems to me that we could utilise a lot of the new information technology to deal with this matter if we were really honest in our intention to deal with this particular problem.

Hon. Sandy Lewis made reference during his speech to a letter that he received from the Association for the Blind regarding the amount of money that was spent in this State on books for the handicapped. The Association for the Blind report noted that in Victoria the Braille and talking library currently receives 50 per cent of its annual operating costs from the Victorian State Government, although it has some problems. When one compares this State with other States, one finds that in South Australia, for example, there is a \$3 million overall budget for services to the blind and one-third of this amount is an unconditional grant from the State Government which could be used in libraries or in nursing homes. The Victorian State Government has increased its subsidy from three per cent to five per cent, and it has made a \$30 000 grant to the Royal Institute for the Blind in addition to the grants made to the Braille talking library. However,

Western Australia has a \$3 million budget for services to the blind, and the State Government provides \$49 000 in unspecified grants. In other words, 28c per handicapped person. It seems to me that the Government should examine seriously the representations that have been made on behalf of the Association for the Blind. It appears that in some of these areas this State is moving behind the other States in recognising what should be done.

Recently I made a call for the Police Force to start putting foot patrols into shopping centres. I received an indication from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services that the police already include shopping centres on their foot patrols. As part of that exercise, and because that request had been made to me on a visit to a shopping centre, I then took the step of speaking to the people in my district shopping centre about the visits made by the police to their shops. I found out very quickly that although the Minister thought that the police were regularly visiting the shopping centre, many of the shop owners in the centre indicated that such visits were infrequent. They indicated a number of problems that they experienced, particularly during Thursday late night shopping.

There are certain limitations within the law which prevent people being able to deal with some of the problems that arise. It seems to me that it is time for the Government to examine the problems that shopping centres face and some of the constraints they have when dealing with the unruly element in society, the members of which come into the shopping centres and cause problems for some of the people there. Certainly on my visit to Warwick Shopping Centre the owners of shops in that centre indicated that they would be pleased to see more police in the shopping centre, particularly at times when they were inundated by large groups of people, such as Thursday nights and Saturday mornings. Some of the problems the people pointed out would probably require this House to examine ways in which to tackle the problem.

There is a problem in terms of dealing with not only the need for more police, but also in dealing with the different categories of problems. There are two basic problems. The first is loitering and minor disruptions. I received a letter from the property consultants for the Whitford City Shopping Centre from which I quote as follows—

Unfortunately it is a sign of our times that the behaviour of those youths who loiter in and around shopping centres, par-

ticularly on Thursday nights, detracts from the pleasant environment that the customers should be entitled to.

This behaviour generally is not sufficiently serious to involve the Police and the courts. Those causing the problem are usually aware of this and know just how far to extend their aggravation to customers, Management and Staff.

Examples of the behaviour are:

- (i) Swearing at each other or at shoppers.
- (ii) Passing derogatory remarks about the obesity of shoppers, so that the remarks are easily heard by those in the vicinity.
- (iii) Utilising seating for hours on end preventing use by bona fide shoppers.
- (iv) Intentionally dropping litter and food.
- (v) Chasing each other around the malls usually shouting at the same time.
- (vi) Purposely gathering in doorways and ignoring requests by customers to move.
- (vii) Spitting on people from rooftop carparks.

In the loitering/minor disruption type of incident, Management and the Police are loathe to act. An impasse is often reached when the Management (on behalf of the Centre's owners) advise the offending parties to leave the Centre. Frequently this is met with a refusal and the Police are then called. Depending on either the forcefulness or degree of caution displayed by the officer the matter is either temporarily resolved by the offender leaving or alternatively the establishment loses face because the offender disregards the Police and remains in the Centre. As the Centre does not have recourse to a higher authority, Police and Management have to back down, to the satisfaction of the offender and his peer group.

It therefore follows that foot patrols, while having a salutary effect on the general public, are ineffectual when hard core trouble makers are present.

The second matter to which the letter refers is that of vandalism and petty theft, and it reads as follows—

Although costing each centre thousands of dollars annually, fortunately the damage to the Centre's property does not directly affect the public. However, the cost

involved must eventually filter through to the customers. Vandalism to customers' property also occurs, mainly to vehicles.

Examples are as follows:

- (i) Hitting stones into carparks with a baseball bat or kicking stones against vehicles.
- (ii) Removing badges from motor vehicles.
- (iii) Graffiti on internal and external walls.
- (iv) Throwing shoppers' trolleys off rooftop carparks.
- (v) Throwing bottles leaving broken glass on sidewalks.
- (vi) Breaking or defacing lights, signs, etc.
- (vii) Smashing plate glass windows.

As vandalism and theft are both offences, Police patrols would be effective both as a deterrent and in the prosecution of crime.

The third matter to which the letter refers deals with the most serious offences, and it reads as follows—

Examples of more serious offences are:

Assault, theft of, and from, motor vehicles, dangerous driving.

These matters, although more serious, are not as difficult to deal with as the Police generally have sufficient powers in these circumstances. Foot patrols, and, in the case of driving offences, mobile patrols would reduce these offences.

Again, as for vandalism and petty theft, Police patrols would be a deterrent.

To sum up and in answer to your letter we advise that, while we have seen very few foot patrols in the Centre, any Police presence is most appreciated as Centre Management's task particularly on Thursday nights is frequently untenable. There is no doubt more attention should be given to the reduction of anti-social behaviour in shopping centres.

This letter indicates some of the problems that the shopping centre is experiencing. The letter goes on to give illustrations of cases that created problems. It appears to me that two things need to happen. Firstly, we should transfer the foot patrols that are in the city centre to similar regional shopping centres, and we should maintain the same police presence. Secondly, we should examine the problems that

are associated with the shopping centres to see whether we cannot provide some help, because I believe these centres are crying out.

The shopping centres are having some difficulty in handling this situation. It is a question of law and order, and therefore we must accept the responsibility for doing something about it.

I want to refer now to the scaremongering attack recently by the Government in my area in relation to a claim about privatisation. The Government argued that people in the northern suburbs were likely to be locked in their homes and unable to move because a Liberal Government was likely to privatise the MTT. The Liberal Party has not said that that body will be privatised; we simply raised the question of privatisation. Since then, however, the Government has started scaremongering in my area.

To say that one intends to privatise does not mean that people will be locked in. It may be decided that some sections of the MTT, such as that which washes the buses could be privatised. Privatisation could take any one of 50 different approaches. I suspect the present Government in a weak moment might decide that the buses could be washed by a private contractor if it found it was cheaper. That is a privatisation approach. Even if we went further, the privatisation approach adopted elsewhere indicates there has been no loss of services to people. Let us look at other parts of Australia. From time to time I go home to see my mother in Victoria. I take a train and when I get off the train I use the same ticket, which I purchased from a Government service, to hop onto a private bus which connects with the train. Victoria is a Labor State and it has private buses, and it does not lock up the people of Melbourne. I did not find anyone there saying that those bad people, the private operators, cause any particular problems.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We had all private buses at one time and they begged the Government to take them over.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am talking about the scaremongering in the Press recently by the Labor Party. It was designed to put fear into people's minds about things which do not exist.

There are examples in other parts of Australia which indicate that even if an approach was made for private operators to take over certain sections of the MTT, it would not lock people in. A private operator might say he would like to run a minibus between two shopping centres. What is wrong with that? One often finds the MTT would say "No" to such a

proposition, but it may be that a private operator who owns the bus and works for himself can bring about such a service.

Let us look at New South Wales where there are both private and Government buses. I suggest the recent interpretation of privatisation by the Government is nothing less than scaremongering. It is increasing as we move closer to the election.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Perhaps you should tell us what you are going to privatise before the election, and then we can cut it out.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am pointing out that we have not said what we would privatise in relation to the MTT, but the Labor Party had said that our proposals will lock people in their homes. It does not lock Victorians or people in New South Wales in their homes.

Hon. D. K. Dans: So you are going to privatise the MTT, are you?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: It is interesting that the Leader of the House has woken up.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is right. You are going to make them pay.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The reality is that the Leader of the House cannot give the facts. When he cannot find an argument he creates a fear campaign. The Government is frightened because there are examples in other States which show privatisation is working quite well.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I commend you for letting us know that you are going to privatise the MTT.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am quite happy for the Leader of the House to make his own speech but he should not put words in my mouth. He can check what I have said in *Hansard*. I am not claiming we are going to privatise anything. I am saying it was irresponsible of the Labor Party to use fear tactics on the aged people in the northern suburbs.

The reality is there are tremendous examples of this type of operation elsewhere in Australia which are working for the benefit of the people. If I took the Leader of the House's own portfolio I might find some areas in which privatisation could be involved. Let us talk about the Government Printing Office. I have not heard that the Government has ceased to use private operators or private companies to do some printing for the Government Printing Office. Is the Government going to cut that out? I suggest that privatisation to a degree already exists in the operations of the printing office.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We have a private casino out there, too.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Let us have a few more examples.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You tell us what you will privatise and I will say whether you are right or wrong. Your leader has not had the intestinal fortitude to say, "We will privatise this, but not that."

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Our leader certainly has not gone around making irresponsible statements as the ALP has done. It is quite irresponsible to create that type of fear in the community. It is about time the Government accepted its responsibilities in that area and stopped scaremongering.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you getting frightened, Mr Wells? Tell us about the marina.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: It is interesting that the Leader of the House has decided to bring up the marina. Perhaps he can tell me whether it is being built by day labour or by private enterprise.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not know what is happening to the marina.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The Leader of the House asks me to talk about the marina and he does know what is going on.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not responsible for it. We are using contractors.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Those contractors are private firms, are they not?

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is right.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Would the Leader of the House not say that that is privatisation?

Hon. D. K. Dans: No, that is not privatisation. You should understand what privatisation means. Tell us what you are going to privatise.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. Dans: It will cost you your seat.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the honourable member ignore all the interjections and address his comments to the Chair. There seems to be an awful lot of people getting involved in this.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: It is quite refreshing to have the involvement of the Leader of the House during a speech on this important topic.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It may well be refreshing, but it is out of order. I suggest to the honourable member that he cease to entice the Leader of the House to interject.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Far be it from me, Mr President, to entice the Leader of the House to make interjections. I trust that he will obey that ruling.

I accept that, in terms of the development of political parties, we each go out and argue a philosophy, but I am concerned at the manner in which some members try to create fear in the minds of people.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You never do that, of course.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I would be quite happy for the Leader of the House to bring an example before the House. I do not go around creating fear. I check my facts and certainly, in that area, I have the facts. There were examples elsewhere in Australia.

I draw the attention of the House to a question I raised with the Government in connection with our traffic speed laws. It appears to me that the Government has been dillydallying and does not know what to do. It does not seem able to make a decision.

If one visits my electorate, north of Hepburn Avenue on Wanneroo Road there is an 80 kilometres an hour sign. Just past Hepburn Avenue is Waldeck's nursery, a business. In fact, right along Wanneroo Road there are a number of businesses. Further on there are crossings to the Wangara industrial area, and houses backing onto Wanneroo Road. In one area there is a children's crossing sign. However, it has been accepted that that area is quite safe to travel at 80 kilometres an hour. If one goes elsewhere, such as the Roe Highway, the speed limit is 90 kilometres an hour. On Gnaragara Road one can travel at 80 kilometres an hour initially, and further out at 100 kilometres an hour.

However, on a freeway which was designed, certainly at the outer extremities, for travel at around 130 kilometres an hour, or so I am told by engineers, we are allowed to travel at a maximum of only 80 kilometres an hour. This freeway has no access to driveways, it has no crossings, and certainly it has no children's crossings. The designers have gone to a lot of trouble to make certain that the best safety standards are incorporated in the freeway.

In Western Australia we have the advantage that the major part of that freeway was designed after—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The very audible conversation that is just about drowning out the speaker on his feet should cease.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The design of that freeway benefited from all that had been learnt from other States. It has quite long distances enabling one to see around bends; it has a pull-up lane; it has all the safety features. In fact, all the reports we read in this country and overseas indicate that the number of accidents—driveway and intersection accidents and others—has decreased as a result of freeways.

It has been some months since I made a request of the Government to review the matter of speed limits, and the Government has dillydallied around and not yet made a decision. I suggest it is time it reached a decision one way or the other. The Government cannot have it both ways. Either it is safe to travel at more than 80 kilometres an hour on some roads but not safe on the Mitchell Freeway, in which case the Government had better change the signs on the rest of the streets in the metropolitan area which are currently limited to 80 kilometres but are classified as less safe than Wanneroo Road; or the Government should declare Wanneroo Road able to be safely travelled upon at more than 80 kilometres an hour. The limit of 80 kilometres on the freeway was imposed when it was just a short freeway and there was no necessity to have a higher speed limit. In fact, in the crossover section in the area just out of the city there is no provision for a pull-up lane and so that area should perhaps never have a limit of 100 kilometres an hour.

For some time prior to my making the call for a revision of those speeds I had discussions with a number of people. I had read engineers' reports in this State and other States that indicated there were safety problems related to accidents involving tailgating and people not running at a constant speed.

Recently I received a copy of a report relating to a survey conducted in my area from Emerson Richards, who is a qualified traffic engineer with the City of Stirling. He wrote to the Labor member for Whitford in connection with the Mitchell Freeway speed limit. This was not at my request but a copy was provided to me which I wish to quote as follows—

I noticed recently your small questionnaire regarding speed limits along the Mitchell Freeway.

I write to you as a citizen but also as a qualified Traffic Engineer with experience in these matters.

I am in favour of the speed limit being raised to 100 kms/hr along the section of Freeway north of Osborne Park for the following reasons:

1. The Freeway has a design speed of more than 100 kms/hr.
2. There are adequate shoulders and breakdown lanes.
3. The speed limit is the maximum speed at which people can drive and does not imply the need to drive at this speed if traffic or weather conditions dictate otherwise.
4. It is desirable that the Freeway be made more attractive to through traffic to maximise its use and lower traffic volumes on other roads that have residential frontages.
5. There is no evidence that increasing the speed limit to 100 kms/hr will increase the volume of traffic that travels in excess of this speed. Indeed, the MRD studies have shown that the number of very high speed vehicles may decrease.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You are referring to north of Osborne Park? Do you support that?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Yes, certainly. I think one needs to examine the southern part as well. I accept Mr McKenzie's interjection that in looking at the freeway the Government should look at the total extent of the freeway. The same would apply once one got over the Narrows Bridge because lanes are provided to accommodate traffic. That is what the road was designed to do. My request was not aimed at the northern area particularly, but I ask that the complete freeway be reviewed. There is good ground for us to consider increasing the speed along the freeway. We need to remember that already in this State we have roads that have been designed not only for the metropolitan area but also outside the metropolitan area that do not have the same safety levels. If we check the records in terms of accidents they have a high accident rate whereas a freeway is able to handle the volume of traffic which lowers the numbers of accidents. That is quite impressive and it is certainly in our interests to maximise the use of the freeway, particularly as it moves further north and further south. There will be great distances and a greater speed limit will

enable a larger number of people to use the freeways, and if we do not relieve pressure other roads are likely to be involved.

I trust that the Government will very quickly make a decision in terms of the establishment of an acceptable speed for the Mitchell Freeway. I do not suggest I am a specialist in this area; I am a representative of the people who has gone out to those people who are specialists.

I am told by the specialists that the speed on that freeway can be increased within the safety limits. It was designed for vehicles to travel at 130 kilometres per hour. I am not suggesting that the limit be increased to that speed because the safety factor will need to be considered when the freeway is extended.

I am aware that all Governments will claim credit for this freeway, but it was mooted some time ago. As Federal and State funds have become available, money has been committed to this freeway. Neither this Government nor the previous Government committed funds beyond the resources available at the time. The public would like many roads upgraded and new roads built, but the Government does not have the funds available.

The Liberal Government gave priority to this freeway and I understand that all members who have represented the area, whether Liberal or Labor, have pushed to ensure that the freeway was established earlier than was intended. They had good reason to do this because of the advancement of the Joondalup area—a concept which was developed under the previous Government. The rule was that the area would not be developed until an adequate road system and freeway had been established.

Hon. Graham Edwards: What sort of record did you have?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am rather sad to hear the comment by Hon. Graham Edwards. Normally his comments are sensible, but when he is looking for a cheap statement he makes stupid remarks.

The freeway may well open up the northern areas, but there is a desperate need for the early establishment of the Joondalup court and police complex. This complex was considered well before the present Government came into office. Finance was not committed to the project by this Government or the previous Government. However, the complex is required as soon as possible because the

Warwick complex is at present carrying the load for the northern areas. I suggest that an early decision be made.

I am of the opinion that Government services could be decentralised within the metropolitan area. The Government is the employer of the largest number of people in the metropolitan area and it is high time it gave consideration to establishing in the suburbs large sections of the Public Service that would not be dependent on city offices in terms of need for services.

I find it sad that the Main Roads Department adopts an unusual attitude in regard to signs on the freeway. It appears that its practice is not what is required by the public, but what it desires. I was under the impression that the Main Roads Department offered a service to the people of Western Australia, but that does not appear to be the case.

Over the last six months a debate has developed between the department and myself over a method that could be adopted to include the names of suburbs, as well as street names, on freeway signs. The department has quoted many sections of the Australian roads standards to me and I have quoted other sections to it to show that what I propose is possible because a similar system has been adopted in other parts of Australia. Surveys have indicated that people believe that the names of suburbs should be included on freeway signs. In a recent radio talk back show which took place over 30 minutes, 90 per cent of the callers were in favour of the inclusion of the names of suburbs on freeway signs. If the Main Roads Department and the Government were to accept this practice they would overcome the problem that has developed in regard to industrial centres at Osborne Park and Balcatta. Despite the fact that in answer to a question in this House the Minister indicated a sign would be erected on the freeway to direct drivers to the industrial centres of Osborne Park and Balcatta, it has not been sited in a proper position. The sign has been erected at the end of the ramp and I do not know how one can say that it is situated on the freeway.

The Minister recently wrote to me and said that his department had erected the signs which had been requested over the last two years by the Stirling City Council and that people were now given an indication of where the Osborne Park and Balcatta industrial centres were situated.

I accept the argument that we should not have too many signs on the freeway. However, if that is the case I suggest that the existing signs should be upgraded to incorporate the names of suburbs.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Can they be incorporated like the numbering of highway signs around Australia?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I welcome a highway route numbering system in this State. It has been carried out in other States and many travellers will welcome such action because it not only provides a simple method for providing information for travellers who are travelling great distances, but it also allows them to make better use of the road systems without having to refer to complicated maps. In Victoria the north-south major routes are numbered with even numbers and the east-west major routes carry odd numbers. It may well be that a reversal in the numbering system will apply to signs in Western Australia. I am sure that such a system would be welcome to all Western Australians.

We do not welcome the head-in-the-sand approach taken by the Main Roads Department. It believes that it does not matter what the people want, they will get what it gives them. I suggest that in the beginning the freeway was an extension of the roads system, but that it has now grown. Therefore the Main Roads Department should take notice of the people and upgrade the signs on that freeway.

Recently a person phoned me in connection with the taking of a sick child during the night to Wanneroo Hospital. Anyone who has been to Wanneroo Hospital and driven along Joondalup Drive knows that is not a well-lit road. There is a fair amount of bush along the side. The person taking the sick child to the hospital in the urgency of the situation overshoot the turn-off, which had only a small sign. I suggested to the Minister that he consider upgrading that sign among others. He recently wrote back and indicated that the department was prepared to upgrade the signs on the main roads of Wanneroo Road and Marmion Avenue but that the shire had responsibility for signs on minor roads. I suggest to the Government that a hospital creates a certain need and that signs for that hospital should come under the control of the Health Department. It may be that the department needs to liaise with the Main Roads Department or the local council, but the need for the signs did not exist before the hospital was created. Therefore there

should be no additional charge to the rate-payers of a particular area. The hospital created the need for signs and should therefore ensure that they be put in the correct places.

The Main Roads Department is responsible for the signs that are on the main roads, and the council is responsible for those on minor roads. The hospital is the meat in the sandwich. It has to ask those two authorities to put up particular signs. It seems to me that it would be much tidier if the Government got its act together and made the Health Department responsible for signs that are needed for its hospitals.

I raise the need for us to examine the problem with respect to posties and dogs. Recently in my electorate a number of people have had their mail stopped for some time because of a report from the postie that a dog chased the postie on his motorbike into a dangerous area. Members might think it is quite funny not to get their mail. I wonder what would happen if the mail was not delivered to Parliament House because some dog interfered with its delivery. Hon. Mr Lewis says that nothing would happen. I suggest that some members might get quite irate, as did some of my constituents when there was a disruption to their mail service. I understand that there used to be a time when a fine could be imposed on anyone who interrupted delivery of the mail.

It seems that local government was unable to act because it could not catch the offending dog. Thus Australia Post cut off the mail to a number of people in the Carine area. The Government should have talks with Australia Post and sort out the matter before disruption to mail services spreads over the State. Australia Post is starting to take seriously the problems associated with dogs. The only way for it to get its message over is to cut off the mail. If the mail is cut off in your area, Mr President, your telephone will start ringing. People will complain about the matter and want to know what you will do about it.

The Government should sit down with Australia Post to work out a sane approach because people should not be inconvenienced by major interruption to their mail service. By the same token, the postie who delivers the mail should not be attacked by dogs. There are a number of examples of such attacks.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Surely people have a responsibility to keep their dogs locked up.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: That is right. I am outlining what happens when they do not do so. It is easy to say that dogs are the responsibility of the local council. In this case the council could not act. Australia Post would then cut off the mail service to a whole street or suburb. Would the member then stand by and say that the dog should be kept locked up? The price of living in a community is that sometimes a solution must be seen in terms of the interests of the majority of people. I suggest that if Hon. Fred McKenzie does not do something about it in his area he is likely to find that the postman will take action some day. The problem will be on the Government's head.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: The responsibility is with the people to take to task those who do not keep their dogs locked up.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I have no argument with that. I merely ask what is to be done when people do not accept their responsibility. That is the problem.

In connection with Australia Post, I believe we should also examine the approach taken in Victoria whereby Australia Post and its union members are currently taking part in a pilot project to care for the handicapped and aged in their area. Australia Post employees have been briefed to be on the lookout for telltale signs that may indicate that there are some problems.

In the event that mail has not been removed from the post box or that there are any indications that the person might be in strife, the postie has a telephone number which he can ring to advise that someone may be in difficulty. The postie is provided with the names of people who may need this kind of assistance. In view of the fact that the metropolitan area is traversed every day by employees of Australia Post, I suggest that the programme may have potential for WA. A pilot programme has been introduced in Victoria and is operating in conjunction with Australia Post and the unions. This scheme is worthy of examination to ascertain whether it could be used in Western Australia. I discussed the scheme with the coordinator of neighbourhood watch who feels there may be some potential for introducing it in the neighbourhood watch area where it could be of some assistance. If, after examination, it is found to have potential, it should be adopted by the Government.

Last night I attended a function to which many members of Parliament were invited. The Reverend Alan Roberts mentioned to the

audience that he had a large stack of apologies from those who could not attend, which in the main came from members of Parliament. Last night the life education units project was launched by the North of Perth Rotary Club and the Wesley Uniting Church. The programme is worthy of examination by the Government, and if it reaches expectations, it deserves Government support. I understand that it is aimed at adopting a different approach towards the drug problem by helping young people to become aware of what happens to them and their bodies. It uses modern technology to demonstrate in very graphic ways to children some of the effects of drug abuse in the hope that it will make those children better able to handle the pressures to use drugs with which they are faced. Caravans are used to demonstrate the films and discussions.

The Reverend Ted Noffs, who comes from the Eastern States and has spent many years working in Kings Cross handling people with drug problems, spent some time during the evening describing the trial and error period that has been undergone. He said that he found it necessary to expand into this area because no other service provided the same message for young people. A number of life education units are in existence in New South Wales, and the New South Wales Government has accepted responsibility for subsidising the scheme by 50 per cent of the cost of establishing the caravans used. I understand something like 50 000 young people go through each caravan. It was visualised that Perth may need four caravans for ongoing use in terms of this health awareness programme which helps to provide young people with more information and knowledge that might equip them to survive in this world in which there are people who peddle drugs and seek to make young people dependent on drugs. I trust that the Government will give serious consideration to providing some funds in that area.

I return to the point from where I started; in some areas we can say that the Government has done the right thing. I welcomed the decision by the Minister for Education in connection with not allowing the debate over changing the Australian flag to be carried on in schools in Western Australia. However, in a number of areas the Government needs to lift its game. It should examine community justice centres and neighbourhood watch, adopt a more responsible approach to Government and stop creating fear tactics in the community.

It needs to take a responsible approach in terms of being leaders in the development of community facilities. I challenge the Government to examine some of the issues I have raised because Western Australia could benefit from some of them if, once again, it will put

WA in the forefront and let it lead rather than follow the other States.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. I. G. Pratt.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRANSPORT: SHIPPING

Stateships: Container Trade

108. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What percentage of the container trade handled by Stateships is generated by the east-west operations of the commission?
- (2) Which Western Australian ports are currently serviced by Stateships?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Sixty-one per cent.
- (2) Bunbury, Fremantle, Port Walcott, Broome, Koolan Island, Wyndham, and other ports on inducement cargoes.

109. *Postponed.*

ENERGY: GAS

Pipeline: Dongara-Perth

110. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the Dongara-Perth Natural Gas Pipeline commonly called Wang pipeline.

- (1) Did Westrail raise any objections when this pipe was planned and ultimately installed in the Guildford-East Perth Railway Reserve?
- (2) If "Yes", what were those objections?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), how and by whom were the objections, if any, overruled?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) No. Approval for construction of pipeline was conditional upon compliance with the Railways of Australia code.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

ROADS: FREEWAYS

Speed Limits: Review

112. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

When will the Government be announcing the outcome of its review of the speed limit on our freeway systems?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The Government is currently giving consideration to a report on the speed limit on the freeway system. When this is complete a decision will be announced.

ROADS: FREEWAYS

Speed Limits: Submissions

113. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

Further to question No. 56 of 28 August 1985—

- (1) Who made the submission on freeway speed limits?
- (2) What action has been taken on this submission?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The Main Roads Department after consultation with the Police Department.
- (2) The recommendation is currently receiving consideration by the Government.

CHEMICALS: AMMONIA-UREA PLANT

Bunbury: Incentives

121. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) What incentives have been offered by the Government to ensure the establishment of an ammonia and urea plant in the Bunbury area?
- (2) When might the project be established?
- (3) How many workers are expected to be engaged on construction work?
- (4) How many workers are expected to be employed when the plant is in production?

- (5) Where will the plant be sited?
- (6) Has an environmental impact study been done on this project?
- (7) Is the study available for public examination?
- (8) If not, why not?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The Government is giving every encouragement to the development of the proposals for the establishment of an ammonia-urea project in Bunbury and at other sites in Western Australia. As part of the normal process of commercial negotiations various matters will be discussed in order to ensure a project which is economically viable and conforms to the Government's policies.
- (2) A world-scale ammonia plant would take about three years to build.
- (3) If such a plant were to be built in Western Australia, it is expected that the construction work force could peak at about 1 200 persons.
- (4) Similarly, such a plant could be expected to employ about 150 persons on an ongoing basis.
- (5) No decision on where such a plant might be sited has been made at this time, but a number of sites have been under consideration.
- (6) No, not at this stage.
- (7) and (8) Not applicable.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Children: Sexual Abuse

126. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Does the department keep any figures on the number of sexually abused children in WA?
- (2) If so, has there been a significant increase of such cases in recent years?
- (3) What numbers were reportedly the subject of sexual abuse in—
 - (a) 1984-85;
 - (b) 1983-84;

- (c) 1982-83;
- (d) 1981-82; and
- (e) 1980-81?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes, in conjunction with other agencies through the Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Child Abuse, which is an advisory body to the Minister for Community Services.
- (2) Due to the increased focus on this problem both at a State and National level and greater encouragement and support in reporting such cases, there has been a consequent increase in the numbers. The following figures represent referrals which have necessitated intervention and therapeutic support by the various professional agencies.
- (3) (a) 1984-85—figures not yet available;
- (b) 1983-84—373;
- (c) 1982-83—180;
- (d) 1981-82—166;
- (e) 1980-81—limited figures available.

INSURANCE: STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Promotions: Budget

127. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the advertising and promotional budget expended each year by the State Government Insurance Office?
- (2) Which agency or personnel advise the SGIO on such promotional or advertising material?
- (3) Is the SGIO satisfied that its advertising and promotional budget is being spent to best advantage?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) 1983-84—\$791 000
1984-85—\$1 066 000.
- (2) Marketforce Pty Ltd.
- (3) Yes.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Patronage: Increase

128. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it correct that there has been an increase of 15 per cent in patronage of Metropolitan Transport Trust buses in the northern suburbs?
- (2) If not, what is the increase?
- (3) How many customers does this figure represent?
- (4) What was the cost to change the service in the northern suburbs that is attributed to attracting these new customers?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes. Patronage in the northern corridor has increased in the vicinity of 15 per cent. As the member would appreciate, patronage does fluctuate from day to day.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Checks taken before and after the new services were introduced showed a net increase of some 450 passengers per weekday travelling from the areas served by Karrinyup and Warwick bus stations towards Perth. Coupled with additional local increase of 50 passengers daily, this indicates an increase of about 500 customers per weekday in the northern corridor, or around 5 000 trips per working week.
- (4) The net cost is in the vicinity of \$200 000.

ROADS

Funding: Decrease

132. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the decrease in real terms of funds recently allocated to roads in Western Australia?
- (2) What are the amounts provided for roads in WA from the various sources as compared with the similar amounts for the previous 12 months?
- (3) In dollar terms what are the figures for (2) above in 1985?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The decrease in real terms of the value of funds allocated to roads in the financial year 1985-86, compared with 1984-85, was 3.6 per cent.
- (2) Amounts allocated to roads in WA have been as follows—

	1984-85	1985-86
	(\$ million)	
Road Grants		
Australian Land Transport Programme	101.017	98.200
Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme	47.525	50.200
Vehicle licence fees	57.900	59.600
Fuel franchise levy	44.000	45.904
Overload permits	0.425	0.535
Loan funds	4.000	11.000
Sale of property and rents	1.525	1.500
	256.392	266.939

Note: The total revenue in 1985-86 represents an increase in dollar terms. If an inflation rate of eight per cent is allowed for in 1985-86 compared with 1984-85 the funds available will have declined in real terms by 3.6 per cent as indicated in (1) above.

- (3) As given under (2).

CRIME

Bench Warrants: Failure to Appear

135. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

What action, if any, is taken where a person served with a bench warrant fails to appear in the court to which he is summonsed?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

A bench warrant may issue if a person who has been summoned, or bailed to appear in court, fails to do so. The bench warrant is not served, but operates as an authority for police to arrest the defendant and take him before the court.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Extension Scheme: Jerramungup

136. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Was interest paid on contributions paid to the CES Extension Scheme, Jerramungup 12579 Hollands Rock due to delays in the provision of wooden posts?
- (2) Was interest paid on any extensions under the package deal arrangements?
- (3) If so, on what grounds?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, on West River and Holt Rock-Varley schemes.
- (3) Shortage of wooden poles.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Motel: Margaret River

139. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Tourism Commission buying an equity in—or has it bought an equity in—the Captain Freycinet Motel in Margaret River?
- (2) If so, what is the value of the equity?
- (3) Is the Tourism Commission considering any similar investments in other motels or hotels in Western Australia?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$200 000.
- (3) No.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Staff: Working Conditions

140. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Will the Minister provide a list showing the claims for improved working conditions lodged by each group of employees in the State hospital system and also indicate the fate of each claim?
- (2) Will the Minister also indicate the name of the union or association which represents the industrial interests of each group of employees referred to in (1) above?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) This information would take many hours to collate and the resources are not available for allocation to this task.