

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [10.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

League Football Matches: Televising

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [10.01 p.m.]: I will not hold up the House for long.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I trust not.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If Mr Wordsworth continues, it may be held up longer.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that the Hon. Mr Lewis disregard the interjections.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will, Sir. In this evening's Press there appears an article about the number of signatures gained by the best football club in Perth on the matter of showing football on television for the populace of this State. At present the commercial television channels in this State, because of a spat over advertising some four or five years ago, refuse to come back into the field of showing Australian rules football on their networks.

We have now got to the stage where the national football competition is coming up, and there will be no replays of those matches on television; and those matches will be of great interest to the people of this State. I consider this is the best place to bring the matter forward in an effort to get the television channels and the WA National Football League back together again so that football followers of this State may have some viewing of national football competition matches, even though it may be delayed viewing. I am sure anyone interested in football would want to see how Western Australian clubs fare against clubs from other States. That is the first thing I ask: that the TV channels and the football league get together.

The whole thing seems to me to be a storm in a teacup. I think it was the matter of the advertising on the fringe of the ovals which started the fight; yet now even the ABC can show that advertising as the cameras swing around the field, so I am sure the commercial stations could do something for football followers.

While on this subject I would say that I deplore the attitude of the ABC as well; because when we have an interstate match at Subiaco, country television viewers cannot watch that match because the football league is frightened it might lose a few bob, or else it fears that near metropolitan people may be able to view it. I think this is very short-sighted because many people want to go to these matches, anyway; and the more people who watch it on television the more the game will be promoted.

I think the last time we had an interstate match here it was played on a Saturday and the club games were played on

the following Monday; and the ABC did not even let bush viewers see the club games on Monday. I believe this is an inconsistent attitude.

While I am on my feet talking on this matter I will put in a plug for several of the Ministers here in respect of the promotion of football. Junior football in this State does not come under the Community Recreation Council, except in respect of a little bit of coaching; nor is it funded by the Lotteries Commission. However, I believe that as it is our national game Governments should take an interest in it and take some notice of what is happening to our juniors. There must be something in the order of 25 000 to 28 000 juniors playing in the city every week, and I was told today that the cost of financing the footballs alone for the first two rounds of football fixtures in one area this year was something like \$850—and that is without the provision of umpires, jerseys, etc.

I hope the Minister for Recreation is able to talk the television stations into giving the people of Western Australia football coverage. I might add that we are the only State in Australia that will not have replays of National Football League matches. This is the old Cinderella bit, and it is caused also by a lack of initiative on the part of commercial television channels in Western Australia.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 26th May, 1976

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

QUESTIONS (84): ON NOTICE

1. TROPICANA LODGE, BROOME *Wages of Employees: Complaint*

Mr T. J. **BURKE**, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is he aware of any complaint to his department regarding wages paid to employees of the Tropicana Lodge, Broome?
- (2) Would he please provide details?

Mr **GRAYDEN** replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

2. LAKE ARGYLE TOURIST LODGE

Letter from B. J. Flynn

Mr T. J. **BURKE**, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is he in receipt of correspondence under date 17th February, 1976, from B. J. Flynn of P.O. Box

167, Broome, W.A., relating to an article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* of 8th February, concerning the Lake Argyle Tourist Lodge?

(2) If so, has he replied to the correspondence?

(3) If not, when is it intended a reply will be forwarded to B. J. Flynn?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes, on 5th March, 1976.

(3) Not applicable.

3. MURRAY DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Restoration of Wing

Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister advise—

(a) what stage of finalisation has been reached in respect of planning restoration of the now unused wing at the Murray District Hospital;

(b) does such planning provide for use of this wing by geriatric patients as well as general patients;

(c) when is it expected that tenders will be called in respect of this work?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(a) Contract documents should be completed late July or early August, 1976;

(b) Yes;

(c) Tenders will be called as soon as documents are completed.

4. AMBULANCES

Metropolitan Area

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) How many ambulances are available to serve the people within the Perth metropolitan area?

(2) How many staff (equivalent full-time) are employed to operate these ambulances?

(3) How many "emergency" patients were carried by the ambulances in the Perth metropolitan area over the last 12 months?

(4) How many miles were travelled by ambulances when an "emergency" situation existed, during the past 12 months?

(5) How many ambulances are available for emergency service between 2200 hours and 0700 hours within the Perth metropolitan area?

(6) What is the surface area encompassed within the Perth metropolitan area?

(7) How many people live within the area specified within (6)?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) The St. John Ambulance Association has 21 general purpose ambulances, plus two coronary care ambulances.

(2) Paid staff—permanently employed, 137.

Volunteer officers—89.

(3) Emergency calls were 14 859.

(4) 318 358 kilometres.

(5) 19 general purpose ambulances, plus two coronary care ambulances.

(6) The area bounded by Yanchep, Mundaring, Armadale, and Rockingham, except for coronary care ambulances which are restricted to a radius of 15 kilometres of the Perth and Fremantle centres.

(7) Perth Statistical Division 787 300.

5.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Visit to Western Australia: Cost

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Premier:

(1) Will he advise the cost, to the taxpayers of Western Australia, of the recent visit to Perth and the North West of His Excellency the Governor General and Lady Kerr?

(2) Does he not consider that this money could have been spent more effectively in re-equipping and manning some of the essential emergency services such as the fire brigade and police forces?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) All travelling expenses and accommodation costs associated with the visit of the Governor-General and Lady Kerr and their staff are at no cost to the State.

If the member is interested in specific incidental costs met by the State in its capacity as a courteous and proper host to Her Majesty's representatives, I suggest the member lets me know the particular items which he has in mind.

(2) No. Firstly because of the principle involved and secondly because of the smallness of the amount.

6. BENTLEY HOSPITAL *Permanent Care Unit*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Referring to question 41 of 8th April, 1976, will the Minister advise when tenders will be called for the construction of the permanent care unit of 96 beds at Bentley Hospital?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

It is not possible to advise when tenders will be called.

This will depend upon the time required to plan the building, which will be at least a year, and the availability of funds.

7. BUILDING BLOCKS *Point Samson*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) Is he aware of the constant demand for residential lots at Point Samson?
- (2) What is the Government's intention regarding the future of the residential area at Point Samson?
- (3) Is it proposed that any of the present subdivided land will be made available to people seeking home sites in the near future?
- (4) Is it a fact there are approximately 50 blocks of land already subdivided and available?
- (5) As this area is one of the more delightful spots in this region, is it possible to give some indication that it will be made available for people who desire to retire and remain in the region and have their homes associated with such desirable features prevailing in this area?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Department of Lands and Surveys has registered 17 inquiries since October, 1974.
- (2), (3) and (5) These questions are the subject of review by an inter-departmental committee at the present time. Until its findings are known and considered by the Government, the policy pursued during the term of the previous Government will be maintained.
- (4) There are in excess of 50 blocks of residential land surveyed.

8. COTTESLOE TOWN COUNCIL *Requests for Inquiry*

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he been asked to inquire into allegations concerning the Cottesloe Town Council?

- (2) If "Yes" by whom has he been asked and on how many occasions has such a request been made?
- (3) Did he seek reasons for the request from any person making the request?
- (4) If "Yes" what reasons were given?
- (5) What action has he taken on this matter?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Question by Mr D. Taylor answered on 4th April, 1976.
(b) Two telegrams from Mr Graham Hornel.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) I advised Mr Hornel that he would be required to give full reasons before an inquiry would be considered. The only further response received from Mr Hornel was a telegram as follows:

Council discussion Clerks termination Adams protest resignation high staff turnover gross inequalities distributions and Murphy's threat blocking changerooms necessitate inquiry before elections. Hornel.
- (5) (a) No action taken pending receipt of full reasons.
(b) Information received from Council in response to Mr D. Taylor's question was tabled.

9. WEST PILBARA SHIRE COUNCIL *Complaint of Irregularities*

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he received a complaint from Northern Supplies and Services alleging irregularities in the conduct of the West Pilbara Shire Council?
- (2) If "Yes" will he provide details of the alleged irregularities?
- (3) What action is he planning or taking in respect to the allegations referred to?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) The matter has also been referred to the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations who is investigating the complaints.

10. MOTOR VEHICLES

Faulty Headlights

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Is he aware of any increase in the number of vehicles with faulty lights which show one light on high beam and another on low beam?
- (2) If "Yes" what action is being taken?
- (3) If "No" will he instruct a traffic patrolman to station himself on Wanneroo Road for an appropriate night time period to observe the problem?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) Yes, and this will be extended throughout the metropolitan area, together with the provision of light testing facilities on Wednesday, 2nd June, 1976.

11. TRUCKS

Covering of Loads

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) What requirements are there on truck drivers to cover loads being carried on their vehicles?
- (2) Is he aware of any increase in the number of trucks which are carrying uncovered loads?
- (3) If "Yes" what action is being taken?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) In itself the carrying of an uncovered load is not an offence. Regulation 1610 of the Road Traffic Code provides that:

A person shall not drive a vehicle carrying a load, unless the load is so arranged, contained, fastened or covered that the load or any part of it cannot fall or otherwise escape from the vehicle.

There is an infringement penalty of \$20 provided for this offence.

- (2) and (3) No, but there has been an increase in the number apprehended.

12. MELVILLE CITY COUNCIL

Polling Places: City Ward Election

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is he aware that in the City Ward of the City of Melville only two polling places were designated for the recent council elections?

- (2) Is he also aware that in each of the other two wards that were contested, there were four polling places?
- (3) Is he aware that the Council's decision with respect to polling places in the City Ward seriously inconvenienced many ratepayers living in the Alfred Cove/Myaree part of the Ward?
- (4) If "Yes" what action does he propose to prevent a recurrence?
- (5) If he is not aware of these things, will he please inquire into the situation and take appropriate action?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (4) No.
- (5) Yes.

13.

HEALTH

Meals-on-wheels Centres

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the number of centres that provide a meals on wheels service?
- (2) How many of these centres have—
 - (a) central catering facilities arranged either by or conjointly with the meals on wheels organisation;
 - (b) meals provided by Government facilities, i.e., local hospitals?
- (3) Where are these centres located?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) There are 38 meals-on-wheels services and 14 of these are associated with senior citizens' centres.
- (2) (a) Twenty services, and 13 of these are associated with senior citizens' centres.
- (b) Eighteen services, and one of these is associated with a senior citizen's centre.
- (3) (a) Meals are prepared by or conjointly with the meals-on-wheels organisation at these senior citizens' centres—

Albany senior citizens of Meals on Wheels Inc.,

Bassendean senior citizens' centre,

Belmont senior citizens' social centre,

Bunbury meals on wheels and regional senior citizens,

Fremantle social centre for elderly people.

Harlow Hawthorn senior citizens' centre,

Kwinana senior citizens' centre,

League of home help for sick and aged,
Melville senior citizens' centre,

Senior citizens' welfare association of Victoria Park,
Stirling central kitchen (serves six autumn centres),

Subiaco senior citizens' centre inc., and

Swan districts senior citizens' association inc.

- (b) The only senior citizens' centre supplied with meals from a local hospital is Armadale-Kelmscott senior citizens' centre.

14. MOTOR VEHICLE SEAT BELTS

Effect on Accidents

Mr BLAIE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) (a) Since the introduction of requirement to wear seat belts has there been any change in the injury to accident ratio; and
(b) if so, would he provide details?
(2) (a) Is he aware of injuries requiring hospitalisation caused through drivers wearing seat belts when involved in accidents; and
(b) would he provide details?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) For the Perth Statistical Division there has been a change, but for the rest of Western Australia there is no pattern of change.
(b) The details of the ratio of persons killed or injured to all accidents reported are as follows—

	Perth	Statistical Rest of	All of
Year	Division	State	W.A.
1966	0.326	0.450	0.352
1967	0.304	0.430	0.328
1968	0.274	0.419	0.298
1969	0.299	0.461	0.323
1970	0.306	0.572	0.341
1971	0.300	0.528	0.332
1972	0.268	0.493	0.306
1973	0.251	0.447	0.282
1974	0.212	0.419	0.249
1975	0.219	0.431	0.260

Note: The wearing of seat belts became compulsory as from the 24th December, 1971.

- (2) (a) and (b) In a number of research studies conducted in various parts of the world it has been found that some

vehicle occupants have received very minor injuries from the seat belts they were wearing. However, were it not for the seat belts, it was very likely that those people would have received very severe injuries or even been killed.

15.

POLICE

Debt Summonses: Service

Mr BLAIE, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Can he give an estimate of the cost and man hours involved by police officers in serving summonses for debt?
(2) Does he agree that this duty could be performed by a separate organisation leaving members of the force available for their specialised public duty?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Summonses for debt are served by the bailiff who is an officer of the local Court, not a policeman.

In some country areas where it is uneconomic to appoint a full time bailiff, the officer in charge of a police station may act as bailiff by appointment of the Crown Law Department.

For the duties performed, he is paid a fee by the Crown Law Department.

The duties of bailiff are performed in his own time, and do not affect time spent on his normal police duties.

16.

INSECT PESTS

Expenditure on Control

Mr BLAIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What were the amounts spent by his department on the control of each of the following insect pests of agricultural significance for the 12 months ended 30th June, 1975—
(a) grain weevil;
(b) potato moth;
(c) fruit fly;
(d) blowfly?
(2) Would he list each in order of real or potential significance?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) The expenditure costs for fruit fly for the period in question were in the order of \$190 000.

Except for fruit fly, the department was not engaged in specific control programmes in 1974-75. The department is

engaged in research and extension programmes where these insect pests are concerned, but expenditure on pest control is the responsibility of farmers and, in the case of grain weevil, of the grain handling authority also.

- (b) These pests are all significant problems in the industries which they affect.

17. PRISONS

Debt and Family Maintenance Defaulters

Mr BLAİKIE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) For the 12 months ended 30th June, 1975 what was the cost to the State of detaining persons in State prisons for the non-payment of—
 - (a) debt;
 - (b) family maintenance?
- (2) What is the current average daily cost of detaining a person for these reasons?
- (3) Does imprisonment for a period specified by the courts satisfy a debt in lieu of payment?
- (4) What total payments from State funds were made to the families of prisoners detained under each category (a) and (b) of (1) during the same 12 monthly period?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Separate figures are not available for costs of maintaining prisoners of any particular category.
- (2) Current average daily cost of maintaining any prisoner is \$23.18.
- (3) No.
- (4) Separate figures are not available for payments to families of any particular category of prisoner.

18. TRAFFIC

"Stop" Signs: Boyanup

Mr BLAİKIE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) How many motor vehicle drivers were apprehended by the Road Traffic Authority for failing to stop at the "Stop" signs on the North Boyanup road at Boyanup prior to the replacement of signs with flashing lights?
- (2) Of these how many had demerit points recorded against them for the offence?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) From 1st September, 1975, to 30th December, 1975, ten.
- (2) One driver had two demerit points incorrectly recorded and this has been corrected.

19.

FRUIT FLY

Control Measures

Mr BLAİKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are any new baiting materials to be made available for fruit control in the next fruit season, and if so, would he supply details?
- (2) What research has been carried out by his department of fruit fly control during the last three years?
- (3) Would he agree that some control measures which have been in vogue for many years may now be outmoded because of deteriorating financial and limited labour availability situations on orchards and that such measures have had limited success?
- (4) Is he aware that unless more publicly acceptable and effective baiting materials are available there may be pressure to wind up some baiting schemes?
- (5) If "No" to (3), would he indicate his department's reasons for continuance?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) No. However dipterex which is not a new material will be tried as an alternative to malathion on a limited basis.
- (2) (a) Trials with different baiting concentrations and ingredients.
- (b) Surveying and monitoring fruit fly incidence.
- (c) The programme of fruit fly disinfestation in various fruit using fumigation and cold treatment has been continued.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The control measures recommended are soundly based and are still accepted as the standard control measures for fruit fly.

20.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Book Subsidy

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Have all of this year's book subsidies been paid to the parents of high school students?
- (2) If "No" why, and when will they be paid?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) In excess of 60 000 text book subsidy claims are received during first term and processed as early as possible. Over 15 000 cheques have been issued to date, and

several thousand will be despatched over the next week or two. All parents who have submitted a claim can expect a cheque by 30th June, 1976.

21. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

Buses: Replacements

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it not a fact that 100 of the MTT buses are approaching 25 years old and that the Trust has no money to replace them?
- (2) What is he doing about this and for how much longer must the public, particularly elderly people, be forced to travel on substandard buses?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The 100 buses are not substandard. They are nearly 25 years old and bus chassis at that time had very high steps and narrow doors.
The 100 buses will be replaced when finance is available.

22. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Secondhand Car Sales

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is he aware that an imported second hand car racket is operating through private enterprise in Australia?
- (2) Is there evidence of this private enterprise initiative being taken in Western Australia?
- (3) If "Yes" will he provide details?
- (4) If "No" what steps, if any, and when, has he taken to satisfy himself that Western Australian consumers are not endangered by this latest initiative?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) I am aware of press reports on the subject.
- (2) No local activity of this type has been brought to the notice of the Bureau of Consumer Affairs. I believe that the matter is being investigated by the Federal Department of Business and Consumer Affairs on a nation-wide basis.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is maintaining direct liaison with the Commonwealth Department concerned.

23. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Expediter: Engagement

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

Now that the Expediter is no longer expediting, who is doing the expediting or has private industry in the Eastern States decided to expedite itself?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Although I have my doubts about whether this question—containing undoubted ironical expressions—is permissible, I am prepared to repeat in essence what I have already explained by way of an answer to the member:

As there are fewer and fewer complaints nowadays about shortages of supply from the Eastern States, Mr Hodgson's main responsibilities became and are to promote the State's industrial development, ascertain trade outlets for Western Australian manufacturers and act as liaison officer. He is to a much lesser extent busy with expediting orders to Western Australia from the Eastern States.

24.

RAILWAYS

East Perth Terminal: Faulty Plaster

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to his answer to a recent question as to the faulty plaster at the Westrail terminal in East Perth:

- (1) What is the estimated cost to correct the faulty plaster work?
- (2) What methods of correction have been suggested and which of these has been accepted by Westrail and why?
- (3) What arrangement has been made by the contractors with its plastering contractor on that job and what arrangement has been made by the plastering contractor with the supplier of the material as to the sharing, if any, of the cost of the making good of the faulty plastering?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No estimate can be given for the remedial work as the method of remedy has not yet been determined. In any case the cost will not be borne by Westrail.
- (2) No method of correction has been suggested to Westrail. However, this will not be determined by Westrail. The contractors are

responsible in the first instance for remedial work and it is expected that the method adopted by them will be as suggested by the Master Builders Association when it is in a position to do so.

- (3) Westrail is unable to state what arrangements the contractors have made with subcontractors concerning costs of remedial work.

25. BUILDERS REGISTRATION BOARD

Faulty Plastering Work: Complaints

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) (a) Has the Builders Registration Board decreed or stated that builders must make good faulty plastering work caused by faulty lime;
 - (b) if so, when and where and how was this decree or statement communicated?
- (2) (a) Has the Builders Registration Board stipulated how the said faulty plaster work must be made good;
 - (b) if "Yes" will he provide details thereof;
 - (c) if not, why;
 - (d) if "No" to (a), why?
- (3) How many people, firms and corporations have contacted the Builders Registration Board concerning faulty plaster work caused by faulty lime?
- (4) How many of those who have made contact have had the faulty plaster work complained of made good and by whom and at whose cost?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) The board's position relating to the responsibility of the builder to carry out rectification work has been made public on frequent occasions via the media. Further, the undertakings of the Master Builders Association of W.A. and the Housing Industry Association have, since the inception of the problem, been of acceptance of such responsibility.
- (b) Jointly with the Consumer Affairs Bureau to representatives of the industry on 23rd January and individually on two occasions in *The West Australian*, one occasion in the *Daily News* and once each on Channel 2 and Radio 6IX.

- (2) The board has prepared a document for issue to parties involved with the problem (i.e. owners, builders and plasterers) and for use in conjunction with board directives to carry out remedial works and I request permission to table this pamphlet. Pending the result of tests to painted walls the recommended treatment is confined to unpainted walls at this time.
- (3) The board has received 15 formal complaints from the public. There have also been a number of inquiries by mail letter, telephone or personal calls seeking advice in the matter. The small number of formal complaints is explained by the industry's acceptance of the problem and direct negotiation for repairs being carried out between owner and builder without the necessity of intervention by the board.
- (4) Of the formal complaints attended to, remedial action is either in hand or has been completed by the builder at no cost to owners. The board, however, is aware that many homes have been rectified by arrangement between the builder and owner, again at the builder's expense.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 251).

26. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Free Vote, and Licensing Fees

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

With reference to the Liquor Act Amendment Bill—

- (1) Is his second reading intended to show amongst other things that the Liquor Bill is a Government measure and will be dealt with accordingly and that members of the Liberal Party and Country Party will not have a free or conscience vote thereon, or have some, and if so whom, of the coalition members been permitted to have a free non-directed or conscience vote on all or some of the Bill's clauses, and if so, which?
- (2) What will be the advantage to the people of his Government's move to fix certain licensing fees—which bring in millions of dollars of revenue annually—by regulation and not as now by legislation?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Bill is regarded as a non-party Bill.
- (2) The information can be sought during the Parliamentary debate.

27. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Licensed Premises: Definition

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, why is it proposed that the definition "licensed premises" shall be altered?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question 26 (2).

28. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction: Events of 1975

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, will he describe in detail the events to which he refers and which occurred when introducing liquor legislation in 1975?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The events are recorded in *Hansard* covering the debate on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, 1975, which took place in the Legislative Council on Thursday, the 13th November, 1975, to which the member is referred.

However, the question may be considered inadmissible because it seeks information on a matter of past history for purposes of argument. (*May's Parliamentary Practice*, XVIII Edition, page 329.)

29. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Liquor Consumption: Problems

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, will he list "the associated problems which can be directly linked with the consumption of liquor"?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question 26 (2).

30. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Submissions

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill—

- (a) were submissions requested from all interested bodies and people or authoritative bodies;
- (b) if "No" which ones were not requested?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (a) and (b) No. The identification of all such persons or bodies is not possible.

The Minister endeavoured through considerable media publicity to acquaint the public generally that the Liquor Act was under review. It could be reasonably assumed that every person in the State has some interest in the legislation.

31. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Submissions

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, will he set forth in short form the text of submissions received, or alternatively, table the submissions received but which have been deemed not desirable to meet the immediate needs?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The text of submissions received which the Government has considered worthy of implementation at this time are contained in the Bill.

The collation of all other material for tabling would be a very considerable task, involving officers in several days' work, and is considered not to be justified. Specific information can be sought during Parliamentary debate.

32. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Words of Minister: Interpretation

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, will he define "the various factors which seem to be the guide to our social pattern in this particular regard"?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question 26 (2).

33. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Traffic Accidents: Link with Liquor Consumption

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, will he detail all the evidence which he possessed "where there is a definite link between the driver who drinks to excess and the road toll"?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Statistics indicate that a fairly high percentage of persons driving and concerned in road deaths show a blood alcohol content indicating their driving ability would have been impaired, and this is supported by the report by the Hon. Mr Justice C. L. D. Mears in the report on "The Road Accident Situation in Australia 1975".

34. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

"Pub Crawls": Incidence

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, what evidence exists and in how many cases of patrons proceeding from one hotel to another so as to achieve an unbroken drinking span of four hours, and how many of these were drunk or noticeably influenced by liquor before leaving one or the other of the hotels concerned?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

No statistical inquiry has been conducted.

35. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Trading Hours: Outer Zone

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, why is it intended that premises in the outer zone may have their hours varied by the court whilst this will not be allowed in the inner zone?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question 26 (2).

36. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Decriminalising of Drunkenness

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, does the Government acknowledge that section 129 (1) (d) appears to cut across its recently announced intention to decriminalise drunkenness?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

This question calls for an opinion and, as such, is considered inadmissible. The Minister is not aware of the specific intention referred to.

37. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Section 129(1)(d): Amendment

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, what evidence does the Government have which justifies apparent belief that its proposed amendment to section 129 (1) (d) will achieve the desired result?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The belief is based on the concept embodied in a multitude of Statutes that imposition of penalties achieves a greater adherence to the law.

38. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Riots and Civil Disorders: Incidence

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill—

(a) since 1974 have there been any instances of riot or civil disorder of the kind envisaged;

(b) if so, where, when and what were the circumstances?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

No specific statistics have been kept, but the Government is aware of instances, and as reported in the Press, where violent behaviour has occurred and which give grounds for the Government belief that such a power should be immediately available if necessary.

39. **LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Section 120A: Purpose

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, since a licensee already has the power to close any bar for reason of some pressing emergency or other just cause why is the proposed section 120A necessary?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question 26 (2).

40. **LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Failure to Close Bars

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, have there been cases, and if so, how many and over what period, of licensees neglecting or refusing to close any bar by reason of some pressing emergency or other just cause?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

A study of the Act will disclose that the expression "neglecting or refusing" is not appropriate to the context of the provision.

41. **LICENSING COURT**

Chairman: Legal Qualifications

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, which people and organisations have represented to the Government the need to appoint a legal practitioner as the Chairman of the Licensing Court?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

This question is inadmissible because it seeks information on a matter of past history for purposes of argument. (*May's Parliamentary Practice*, XVIII Edition, page 329).

Information of this nature can be sought during the Parliamentary debate on the Bill.

42. **LICENSING COURT**

Chairman: Legal Qualifications

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, what is the estimated total additional cost annually to

the taxpayer of the amendment which provides for the appointment of a legal practitioner to become Chairman of the Licensing Court?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Approximately \$8 000.

43. **LICENSING COURT**

Chairman: Legal Qualifications

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill—

(a) has an attempt been made in this Bill to remove the legal complexities said to justify the appointment of a legal practitioner to the Licensing Court;

(b) if "No" why?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(a) and (b) The endeavour has been made to draft the Bill in the simplest possible terms. It is thought that the member would acknowledge that the existence of a legal profession is based on a public need for specialists in legal interpretation.

44. **LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Trading after Live Theatrical Performances

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, is it not a fact that the proposed confinement of drinking hours after live theatrical performances will be a prescription for swill drinking?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Not that the Minister is aware. The Bill proposes an extension of the existing hours.

45. **LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Section 43: Reduction of Distance

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, why is it proposed that the distance of 24 kilometres provided by section 43 should be reduced to 8 kilometres?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

In order to meet the convenience of the public.

46. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Economic Interests of Industry

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, why does the Government say it has concern for the economic interests of the liquor industry when it does not exhibit the same concern in business generally, e.g., for the small corner stores which were and are forced into oblivion by the competition of bigger business enterprises?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

This question is considered inadmissible in that it seeks an expression of opinion. (*May's Parliamentary Practice*, XVIII Edition, page 323).

47. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Policy on Hotel Service

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, is he correctly portraying his Government's policy when he says and I quote: "It likewise believes in healthy competition where service to the public is the major incentive"?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Yes.

48. LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Objections Based on Economic Hardship

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Referring to his second reading speech on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, how does the Government imagine that the Licensing Court will deal with the objections where severe economic hardship is proved?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

By the availability of sufficient legal, commercial and industry expertise within the court. It is not a question of imagination, but of commercial realism.

49. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Faulty Plastering Work

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Has the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs issued statements or circulars to the public as to the faulty plaster work calamity?
- (2) If "Yes" how many and what dates?
- (3) Will he table each of them?
- (4) If "No" why?
- (5) Is it intended to issue another circular on this subject shortly?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Information on suggested remedial treatment has been issued.
- (2) A circular letter was issued in February. The first information bulletin on remedial treatment was issued in March and a further bulletin in April.
- (3) and (4) The papers referred to in (2) are submitted for tabling.
- (5) A further circular letter of advice to consumers is to be issued shortly.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 252.)

50. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Faulty Plastering Work

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What is the estimated number of people, firms and corporations in Western Australia who have and/or are suffering grievous loss and damage because faulty plaster work has been applied to walls and ceilings?
- (2) What powers does the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs possess to act authoritatively in these faulty plaster disputes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) I have no idea of the number of firms and corporations affected by the problem. My officers are restricted to dealing with the matter only in the case of individual consumers. The bureau has been formally notified of the problem by only about 30 consumers. Comment from the building industry indicates that numerous others are affected but no estimate of the total number can presently be made.
- (2) Under the terms of the Consumer Affairs Act, the commissioner may, with ministerial permission, take legal action on behalf of the consumer. It is clear that in the present situation he

could take action against the builder since the only contractual link is between the consumer and the builder. The builder would then presumably take action against the plasterer and the plasterer against the supplier. Obviously any action available to the commissioner does nothing towards establishing ultimate liability for the problem.

51.

PLASTER*Use of Calcium Chloride*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is he aware of the existence of an extract from the Dr Huber (of CSIRO) report concerning the use of calcium chloride in plaster?
- (2) If "Yes" when was that report made?
- (3) Was that report regarded as authoritative and is it still?
- (4) If "No" why?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) My copy is undated, but it is believed to date back to 1954.
- (3) and (4) It may have been authoritative in terms of the problem being experienced in Victoria. However, tests and investigations performed by the Government Chemical Laboratories here have indicated that the cause of the old problem in Victoria is different from the cause of the present local problem.

52.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES*Kalgoorlie: Staff Accommodation*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) If not appropriate now, then after tenders have closed, would the Minister please advise me of the capital moneys to be expended in provision of Community Health Services staff accommodation at Kalgoorlie?
- (2) How many staff will be accommodated therein?
- (3) What will be the status of each such staff member?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes, when tenders accepted.
- (2) 4.
- (3) Public Health field nurses.

53. BETTING CONTROL ACT*Off-course Bookmakers: Licences*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many (if any) off-course bookmakers' licences have been granted pursuant to section 11 of the Betting Control Act, 1954-1970 since the coming into operation of the amending Act 1963?
- (2) How many, if any, such licences are now current, and in what centres are they operative?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Nil. However, three of the off-course bookmaker's licences which were current in 1963 have been renewed annually since then and still remain current.
- (2) Of the three current licences, two are fully operative and one has not operated since February, 1976.

54. PEDESTRIAN CROSSING*Thornlie Square Shopping Centre*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

In view of the deputation to him by the Gosnells Town Council, and the subsequent meeting of a representative of the Main Roads Department with the Gosnells Town Council and myself, regarding the provision of a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing across Spencer Road opposite Thornlie Square Shopping Centre, will he advise—

- (a) when the requested crossing place, together with a pedestrian refuge, will be installed;
- (b) if officers of the Main Roads Department are treating the request from the Gosnells Town Council as one from a minority pressure group;
- (c) whether a major accident occurs at this location before the Main Roads Department will take the necessary action;
- (d) whether he or his department appreciate the improvements in traffic flow between Spencer Road and Connemara Drive that will result from the installation of such a crossing?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) The provision of pedestrian refuge islands has been programmed for 1976-77. Plans were forwarded to the Town of Gosnells on 19th May for their concurrence. Traffic light control is not being proposed by the Main Roads Department at this stage.

- (b) No.
- (c) Action has already been initiated.
- (d) The pedestrian median refuge treatment is being proposed on the basis of convenience and potential safety for pedestrians; the proposal is not primarily intended to increase vehicular flow or speed through the area.

55. PAY-ROLL TAX

Alteration of System

Mr McIVER, to the Premier:

- (1) In view of the many submissions he is receiving from the chamber of commerce organisations re pay-roll tax, is it the Government's intention to amend the present system in any form?
- (2) If not, why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) This is a budgetary matter and any decisions in respect of pay-roll tax would normally be made when the budget is framed.

56. SEWERAGE

Northam

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Works:

Will he advise when the approved sewerage extensions will commence in the Doctors Hill area, Northam, and when it is anticipated the extensions will be completed?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Work is scheduled to commence late in July, 1976, on completion of sewer extensions to the State Housing Commission subdivision in the Chidlow-Throssell Street area. It is anticipated that the work will be completed during November, 1976.

57. DENTAL THERAPY UNIT

Swan View School

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When was the dental therapy centre completed at the Swan View Primary School?
- (2) When is it likely to commence operations?
- (3) What has been the delay?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 12th April, 1976.
- (2) Approximately six weeks from now.
- (3) Major equipment supply.

58. CALISTA SCHOOL

Repairs and Renovations: Contract

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) When was contract No. ADQ 7815, repairs and renovations at Calista Primary School, completed?
- (2) What was the original contract price?
- (3) What is the final contract price?
- (4) (a) Has payment to the contractor been finalised;
(b) if not, why not, and how much is still outstanding?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Some minor items remain to be finalised.
- (2) \$28 831.
- (3) Current contract figure is \$29 328.
- (4) (a) No.
(b) Project still not complete. \$3 328 is still to be paid.

59. WATER SUPPLIES

Carnarvon: Commonwealth Funds

Mr JAMIESON, to the Premier:

- (1) What amendments have been made to the submission for Federal Government funds to consolidate Carnarvon's water supply?
- (2) (a) Do these amendments involve an increase or reduction in expenditure;
(b) if so, by how much?
- (3) When is the project expected to be completed?
- (4) What is the estimated cost upon completion?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Since my reply of 1st April to question 77, there have been several developments. A letter has been received from the Prime Minister stating that it is not possible for his Government to consider the question of financial assistance for the Carnarvon and Gascoyne water scheme in isolation from the overall Commonwealth-State financial arrangements. A review of the project has been carried out by engineers of the Public Works Department and, having regard for the funds already spent, consideration is being given to completing the project using State funds only.
- (3) 1981.
- (4) At today's costs, \$6.8 million.

60. STATE FORESTS

Yellow Tingle: Area and Cut

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the estimated—
 - (a) area over which yellow tingle grows in Western Australia;
 - (b) total volume of existing stands of yellow tingle in Western Australia?
- (2) What has been the level of cutting of yellow tingle in each of the past three years?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) (a) Yellow tingle occurs only in mixtures with other major tree species. Because of this it is not mapped as a specific forest type. However, it is known that the area over which yellow tingle is established in State forest in Western Australia is no more than 25 000 hectares. An additional unmapped area of private property north of Walpole also contains yellow tingle.
- (b) Approximately 400 000 m³ of yellow tingle exists on State Forest. This is in live trees over 10 cm in diameter at breast height.
- (2) Year; Amount.
 1972-73; 13 m³
 1973-74; 1 568 m³
 1974-75; 1 581 m³
 1975-76 (10 months); 1 773 m³

61. PINE PLANTATIONS:
PRIVATELY OWNED*Receiverships*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Will he list the private firms in Western Australia which are involved with the establishment and management of pine plantations?
- (2) Of these, does he know if any is/are in the hands of an official receiver and, if so, which one/s?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) A list of the private firms in Western Australia which are involved with the establishment and management of pine plantations is contained in the Report on Pine Forestry Investment Companies in Western Australia compiled by the Bureau of Consumer Affairs and Forests Department. This was tabled in Parliament on 11th May, 1976.

The list relates to registration details held at the Companies Office as at 15th October, 1975.

- (2) No. There is no continuous check on such information by the Forests Department.

62. *This question was postponed.*

63. RAILWAYS AND BUSES

Services from Armadale

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What would be the likely cost per trip (return) of providing a rail passenger service from Armadale to—
 - (a) Tredale;
 - (b) Byford;
 - (c) Mundijong;
 - (d) Serpentine?
- (2) What would be the likely cost per trip (return) of providing a bus service from Armadale to—
 - (a) Byford;
 - (b) Mundijong;
 - (c) Serpentine;
 - (d) Jarrahdale?
- (3) What would be the cost per trip (return) of providing a connector bus service from Serpentine railway station to Jarrahdale?
- (4) Was the rail passenger service to Byford discontinued from 29th March, 1976, and if so, why?
- (5) Has passenger demand for travel from Armadale to Byford ever required that two buses be despatched at the same time?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (5) The information requested by the member is not readily available and will take some little time to collate. I will forward it to him as soon as possible.

64. FERTILISERS

Phosphate Ingredients: Investigation

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Further to the answers given to my question 21 on 20th May—
 - (a) could he request his department to carry out a comprehensive series of experiments at south coastal locations where trials with rock phosphate in the past indicated that these materials had a potential place in our agriculture;
 - (b) if there are objections to this suggestion could he detail reasons?

- (2) (a) Are any organisations in Western Australia able to calcine Christmas Island "C" and "D" grade rock phosphate;
- (b) what would be the price per tonne of this process to manufacture Calcipon 500 or Citrophos 500?
- (3) (a) Are any organisations in Western Australia able to grind rock phosphate to a high degree of fineness;
- (b) can this finely ground product be granulated or pelletised to enable more satisfactory distribution;
- (c) what would be the price per tonne for carrying out these processes?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) A comprehensive series of trials to evaluate the various grades of rock phosphate is in progress on a range of soil types in a number of rainfall zones. Much of this work will be applicable to south coastal locations.
- (2) (a) None is known to be equipped for this process.
- (b) This information is not available but would obviously depend on throughput.
- (3) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes, but availability to plants will be reduced.
- (c) As for 2 (b).

I would suggest the honourable member may like to confer with officers in the department on this matter.

65. LAPORTE TITANIUM *Effluent*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) How much money has the State Government expended on treating and disposing of the effluent from Laporte Titanium at Bunbury in each of the years 1960 to 1976?
- (2) What departments were involved in the expenditure and how much of the total was spent by each?
- (3) How much of the funds were expended on—
 - (a) capital items; and
 - (b) recurrent items?
- (4) What was the source of funds for these payments?
- (5) How much was expended in installing the pumps for pumping the effluent in—
 - (a) 1974;
 - (b) 1975; and
 - (c) 1976?
- (6) How many experimental pipelines have been installed to pump the

- effluent from the western bank of Leschenault Estuary out to sea?
- (7) What was the cost of each pipeline?
- (8) How far out did each of these pipelines extend?
- (9) What depth of water was the end of each pipeline in?
- (10) For what periods was effluent pumped through each of these pipes?
- (11) How much effluent has been piped through each of these?
- (12) What are the dimensions of the present pipes?
- (13) Has the Government made any decision on whether the present experimental pipes will be replaced by a permanent pipe?
- (14) If it has made a decision, what will be the dimensions of the full size pipe and what quantity of effluent will be pumped through it?
- (15) What is the estimated cost of installing the permanent pipeline and what operating costs are anticipated?
- (16) What does the effluent consist of?
- (17) What was the reason for seeking an alternative to the seepage pond system formerly in use?
- (18) Is there any plan or proposal being considered by the department to pump the effluent to the Mandurah end of Leschenault Estuary and from there to the sea, and if so, can he provide details of the plan or proposal?
- (19) How long did the pond system of disposal operate for and how much effluent was disposed of in this manner?
- (20) What aspects of the present disposal system most concern the department?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (20) The information is not readily available and the member will be supplied with the answers to his questions by letter.

66. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Building Blocks at Bunbury

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How much vacant SHC land has the commission sold or otherwise disposed of in Bunbury in the last three years?
- (2) What were the terms of each sale or disposal and who were they to?
- (3) Are there any plans for the sale of vacant residential lots in Bunbury by the SHC in the next three years?

- (4) What lots are involved and where are they?
- (5) What will be the conditions of sale including price?
- (6) Will the sale be to homeseekers only or will developers and builders be able to buy lots?
- (7) Is it proposed to have a condition requiring the purchaser to construct a home on the lot within a certain time?
- (8) Will persons be able to buy more than one lot each?
- (9) What services and facilities are connected to the lots?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) No vacant land has been sold in Bunbury in the last three years.
- (3) Yes. The Commission is currently preparing for the sale of some forty residential lots on the western severance of the Withers Estate.
- (4) The lots involved are served by Minninup and Westward Roads and Jacaranda Crescent.
- (5) The conditions have not been finally determined but will be generally similar to those which apply to the public scheme or project developers scheme. Price has yet to be assessed.
- (6) Both private individuals and builders will be able to acquire land for the purpose of erecting a residence.
- (7) Yes.
- (8) Private individuals would be restricted to one lot per person, however builders would be able to acquire more than one lot provided they met the rigid conditions of the project developers scheme.
- (9) All lots will be fully serviced including sewerage.

67. **BUNBURY AND KWINANA
POWER STATIONS
Precipitators**

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is it true that the power station at Bunbury is required to obtain a licence or permit each year to enable it to continue emitting so much ash and smoke?
- (2) What alternative methods are being considered for the reduction of the ash fall out from Bunbury power station?
- (3) How many experimental precipitators are in use, and for how long have they been operating?

- (4) Are the results from the experiments intended for use in installing full scale precipitators at Kwinana only or for Bunbury also?
- (5) Has any decision been made to install full scale precipitators at Bunbury as yet?
- (6) What types of full scale precipitators are being considered?
- (7) What is the anticipated total cost?
- (8) When are they likely to be installed?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Consideration is being given to the possibility of electro static precipitators or bag house filters.
- (3) There is a single experimental precipitator pilot plant operating at Bunbury which has been in operation for approximately two months.
- (4) Results of precipitator tests will be used to establish the correct size full scale precipitators at Kwinana and will permit precipitators to be considered as one of the alternatives for improving dust emission at Bunbury and elsewhere.
- (5) No decision has yet been made to install precipitator or other dust collecting equipment at Bunbury.
- (6) The alternatives being considered for Bunbury are electro static precipitators and bag house filters.
- (7) No estimate is yet available on the costs involved.
- (8) A decision has not yet been made regarding installation.

68.

ARBITRATION ACT

*Law Reform Commission
Recommendations*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) When did the State Law Reform Commission deliver its recommendation on amendments to the Arbitration Act, 1895?
- (2) Has any action been taken on its recommendations?
- (3) When can we expect a bill to be introduced incorporating the amendments proposed by the commission?
- (4) Is the Minister aware of the costs and delay involved in arbitrations at present, especially in the building industry where standard conditions require two arbitrators, one to be a member of the architects institute and one of the master

builders association, and especially if the dispute arises in the country?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 18th January, 1974.
- (2) and (3) The subject of arbitration with a view to introducing uniform legislation throughout Australia is at present under study by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

The committee is considering reports on arbitration submitted by a number of State Law Reform Commissions, including the W.A. Law Reform Commission, with a view to reconciling the recommendations. It is a subject upon which uniformity throughout Australia is necessary.

- (4) No.

69. PUBLIC SERVANTS

Metropolitan Area and Bunbury

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) What was the highest number of public servants employed by the State in each of the years 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975?
- (2) How many of these were employed in country areas and how many in the metropolitan area?
- (3) What was the total number of public servants employed in the Bunbury municipal area in the years 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975?
- (4) In what departments were they employed, and how many were there in each department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised when such information as is able to be ascertained has been collated by the Public Service Board.

70. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Bunbury: Poles in Driveways

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has he seen press reports of the problems experienced by some SHC residents in Bunbury of having SEC poles placed in the middle of driveways?
- (2) What was the cause of this arising?
- (3) What remedial action is proposed and when is it proposed to be taken?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A misunderstanding on the location of the driveways with respect to the poles.
- (3) Poles are to be relocated as soon as practicable.

71.

SCHOOL

Westwood Road, Bunbury

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has a decision been made to build a new primary school in Westwood Road, Bunbury?
- (2) If so, when was this decision made?
- (3) Was this the original site selected by the department?
- (4) If it was not, what was the site originally selected?
- (5) Is the new site nearer to Minninup Road or Parade Road?
- (6) What is the area of the site?
- (7) What area will be available for recreation when the school reaches maximum size?
- (8) What is the proposed starting date for the new school?
- (9) What is the proposed opening date for the new school and will it be in time for the opening of the 1977 school year?
- (10) How many children are expected to be enrolled in the first year and in what grades?
- (11) What are the estimated enrolments in each grade for the new school in the years 1978 and 1979?
- (12) Have the boundaries for students yet been defined between the new school and the existing Adam Road Primary School?
- (13) From what area will students be drawn for the new school?
- (14) In view of the development of new housing areas adjacent to Newton Moore High School and to the east and west of the school, is the new school expected to significantly reduce the overcrowding at Adam Road Primary School?
- (15) Will any students for the new school be drawn from—
 - (a) Gelorup;
 - (b) Crosslands;
 - (c) Hastie Street;
 - (d) Hakea Crescent;
 - (e) Trusty Street?
- (16) Is there planned to be a pre-primary centre at the new school at any time, and if so, what will become of Birralee No. 2 kindergarten?
- (17) Is it intended that the new school be designed in such a way so as to enable the local community to make full use of its facilities out of school time?

- (18) As the school area appears to be on top of a hill will the new school be without playing fields for a number of years like the Eaton Primary School?
- (19) Why was a site in such close proximity to Adam Road Primary School chosen?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) During the formation of the 1976-77 school building programme.
- (3) No.
- (4) South of Westwood Street and west of Parade Road.
- (5) Minninup Road.
- (6) Approximately 4 ha.
- (7) The usual area available for a normal sized primary school.
- (8) Tenders are expected to be called on Saturday, 5th June.
- (9) The new school is scheduled to open on 7th February, 1977.
- (10) 170 in Years 1-5.
- (11) Predictions of the year by year enrolments for future years are not made since the number of students will be dependent upon the rate of residential growth in the area. This growth will be closely monitored.
- (12) Boundaries have been defined but have not yet been gazetted.
- (13) Children living in Hudson Road (southside) and south will attend the new school.
- (14) Yes.
- (15) (a) to (e) No.
- (16) Yes. Birrallee No. 2 will be able to cater for children in the younger age bracket.
- (17) The Education Department welcomes use of its school facilities by the local community. As a consequence, the school will be available for the local community.
- (18) An oval will be developed concurrently with the first building programme, dependent upon the availability of water.
- (19) It is not considered that the sites are unduly close to each other.

72. UNDERGROUND WATER RESERVE AREA

Jandakot: Bores

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it so that the Metropolitan Water Board requires certain technical and general information

from residents within the Jandakot water scheme area with regard to bores put down or proposed to be put down?

- (2) If "Yes" would it not be considered reasonable that the Board respond by providing some technical information to those residents within the area who may currently be sinking a bore in the general vicinity of one of the board's bores?
- (3) Is he aware of an allegation that such a request was made by a resident within the scheme area but such request was refused?
- (4) If "Yes" to (2) would he require the Board to so co-operate with residents who may seek such general information?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes, for the purpose of issuing a licence pursuant to section 57G of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act.
- (2) and (4) As a service, the board provides information on ground-water levels and depth to water on request.
- (3) No.

73. LESCHENAULT ESTUARY

Water Level

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the Public Works Department aware that the water level of the Leschenault Estuary in the area near the new Preston River mouth is rising to higher levels than before the construction of the new harbour?
- (2) Is it true that the rate at which the tides in Leschenault Estuary now rise and fall is faster than before the new harbour was constructed?
- (3) Is the PWD aware that as a result of the above the trees, grass and other plants on the estuary foreshore are dying off?
- (4) Is the PWD aware that the trunks of some trees that have now fallen over float through farm fences at high tide doing damage to them?
- (5) What remedial action, if any, is proposed?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (3) The Public Works Department is not aware of any significant changes in the tidal and flood characteristics of the Leschenault Estuary as a result of the construction of the new harbour and all evidence available indicates that no significant change has occurred.

- (4) No.
 (5) No remedial action is indicated.

qualified psychiatrists, clinical psychologists and supporting professional staff.

74. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Beer Prices

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What is the percentage of alcohol in Swan lager?
- (2) What are the recommended retail prices for beer sold in glasses in Bunbury?
- (3) How is this price broken up in percentages between—
 - (a) manufacturers costs;
 - (b) manufacturers profit;
 - (c) Commonwealth taxes;
 - (d) State taxes;
 - (e) freight;
 - (f) middleman's profit;
 - (g) middleman's costs;
 - (h) hotelier's costs;
 - (i) hotelier's profit?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) I am advised that it is approximately 4 per cent by weight.
- (2) Pony—25 cents; glass—33 cents; middy—43 cents. These are retail prices based on average costs and are issued by the Australian Hotels Association as a guideline only. The association no longer recommends the retail prices.
- (3) The details of price breakup in percentages are not available to me.

75. FOCAL UNIVERSAL ACTIVITIES

Investigation

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) If the Minister has not already done so, would he be good enough to read the further story in the *Sunday Independent* of 23rd May, 1976 regarding Focal Universal, and advise if he is able to institute an inquiry into the company's activities?
- (2) If the Minister agrees, what would be the nature of the inquiry?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will read this. Mental Health Services has no legislative powers to investigate organisations such as Focal Universal.

Any person who complains of an emotional disturbance allegedly arising out of participation in any activity associated with this or any other organisation, can refer their problems to Mental Health Services. These persons will receive every assistance from

76.

BAKERIES

Bunbury

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many bakeries operate in Bunbury?
- (2) Which of the bakeries—
 - (a) bake bread on Saturdays;
 - (b) deliver bread on Saturdays?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Four.
- (2) (a) All four.
 (b) Rendell's Acme Bakery and Bunbury Bakery.

77. STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Public Relations, Publications, and Information Officers

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Further to his answer to question 25 of Wednesday, 5th May, with respect to advertised positions with the State Energy Commission—

- (1) When is it anticipated that a decision may be made with respect to the appointments of—
 - (a) public relations officer;
 - (b) publications officer;
 - (c) information officer?
- (2) Has a decision been reached with respect to any one of the above categories, and if so, which ones?
- (3) Have any of the applicants for any position been advised of the delay in reaching a decision?
- (4) If "No" would he not agree that it would only be courteous to so advise applicants?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) It is anticipated that a decision will be reached in the near future.
 (b) Appointment will be made after the appointment of the public relations officer.
 (c) See (b) above.
- (2) No.
- (3) and (4) All applications were acknowledged and those who have inquired have been officially advised that there is a delay with the appointments.

78. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR*Obnoxious Odour*

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that during the last two weeks the Midland Abattoir smell has again been evident in the Gullford, Midland, Swan View areas on at least five occasions?
- (2) Since the appointment of the qualified chemical engineer, have there been any investigations undertaken to ensure that the smells cease?
- (3) Would he investigate the proposition that I have placed before him that the only way that the smells can be overcome is by duplication of the existing offal treatment plant?
- (4) Would he supply the following information—
 - (a) the average daily output of offal that is produced that requires treatment;
 - (b) what is the capacity of the existing digestive cooker;
 - (c) what is the average daily time that the killing processes take at the abattoir;
 - (d) for how many hours is the cooking processes of that offal taking place;
 - (e) if the hours of cooking exceed the hours of killing, how does he sustain the board's point of view that the process is a continuous one?
- (5) Would he advise the present position regarding the equaliser pondage and the progress made for the installation of additional aerators?
- (6) Is there any time that could be established for the commissioning in totality of the existing effluent treatment plant; if not, why not?

Mr OLD replied:

Management of the works has advised as follows:—

- (1) Yes. One complaint was received.
- (2) Yes. In relation to the effluent system.
- (3) The board proposes to make an early submission in relation to the provision of an additional byproducts equipment system, but considers that a mere duplication of the existing offal treatment system will not completely remedy the odour problem.
- (4) (a) 350 000 lbs.
(b) Evaporation of 13 000 lbs of water per hour based on an average 55 per cent

moisture content of material gives a capacity of 23 600 lbs per hour.

- (c) Six hours.
- (d) Eighteen hours.
- (e) The old type batch cookers involve charging the cooker with a complete load; closing cooking and drying for a period of three to four hours; and then discharging the complete load into a hopper.
The continuous Keith plant operates on the basis of an automatic feed in of raw material as cooked and dried material is expelled from the discharge end.
- (5) These aerators will be installed on 27th May. Following successful testing the equalisation basin will be in full operation from 31st May. The plant will then be running in accordance with the original design system.
- (6) It is estimated that within six weeks of recommissioning the equalisation basin the new effluent plant will be operating to design standard. Immediately this is achieved the tertiary water treatment plant will be commissioned.

79.

TOWN PLANNING*Swan Valley: Rezoning*

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Are there any plans in hand or contemplated for rezoning any area within the Swan electorate and/or within the area of the Swan Valley?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the plans and would he make them available?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) (a) Zoning amendments are made in accordance with the provisions of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act and the Town Planning and Development Act and regulations.
- (b) So far as the former is concerned, a number of proposed amendments have been exhibited publicly and submissions by interested parties are currently being considered by The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. It would be impractical to

list them without undue time being spent by departmental officers.

- (c) Planning is a continuing process and it could be assumed that some amendments are always in contemplation as a result of continuing planning studies. It would be impractical for me to try and provide details of matters contemplated by the variety of authorities involved in the planning process.

(d) At the local authority level I do not have details of proposals until submitted to me by councils for preliminary approval, after which they are publicly exhibited. I am unable to provide any information regarding amendments that may be under consideration by the five councils concerned. There are however, a number of formal amendments in various stages of finalisation affecting local authority schemes. As I do not hold copies of all proposals involved I suggest that the member should address his inquiry direct to the particular councils.

- (2) I have no plans to make available other than those which have already been the subject of public exhibition. As indicated in (1) details at local authority level would be more readily available from the council concerned. Maps relating to the Metropolitan Region Scheme amendments referred to in (1) are readily available at the office of The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

80.

TRAFFIC

Driving Instruction School: Midland Area

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Would he undertake as a matter of urgency the establishment of an instructional motor school in the Midland area with a view to training interested persons in the safe handling of motor vehicles and to lessen the probability of people driving vehicles being involved in accidents that are due to their inexperience?
- (2) If the establishment of such a school is considered favourably, could he advise as to when funds may be made available for such a project?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No. Considerable research and evaluation would be necessary before an extension of the driver training scheme could be supported.
- (2) Not at present.

81.

INVENTIONS ACT

Proclamation

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to proclaim the Inventions Act of 1975?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Because it was proclaimed on 19th March, 1976.

82.

HOSPITALS

Resident Medical Officers

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Further to question 24 of Thursday, 20th May, of the doctors employed at each hospital how many are junior resident medical officers and how many are senior resident medical officers respectively?
- (2) What does the Medical Board set as the criteria for an approved hospital?
- (3) Are there any "approved hospitals" outside the metropolitan area?
- (4) (a) Have resident medical officers ever been employed either permanently or temporarily in any hospital outside the metropolitan area;
- (b) If so, where?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Interns (junior resident medical officers)—

Royal Perth Hospital, 31;
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, 28;
Fremantle Hospital, 26;
Princess Margaret Hospital, none—not "approved" hospital;
King Edward Memorial Hospital, none—not "approved" hospital.

Senior resident medical officers—

Royal Perth Hospital, 46;
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, 23;
Fremantle Hospital, 15;
Princess Margaret Hospital, 18;
King Edward Memorial Hospital, 7.

(2) General supervision, facilities and training must be available at a level acceptable to the Medical Board.

(3) The Royal Perth, Sir Charles Gairdner and Fremantle Hospitals are the only hospitals within Western Australia approved by the Medical Board for the purpose of Section 11 (1) (b) (vi) of the Medical Act. Kalgoorlie and Geraldton Regional Hospitals are approved for one term (3 months) attachments only.

(4) (a) Yes.

(b) The Carnarvon, Port Hedland and Derby Hospitals all participate in resident rotation whereby the residents are under complete supervision by senior medical officers employed by the hospital. These rotations are on a 10 to 12 week basis only.

83. FOCAL UNIVERSAL ACTIVITIES *Investigation*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Referring to question 18 of Tuesday, 25th May, 1976, regarding Focal Universal, if, as stated the matter was under investigation by Mental Health Services why, in answer to question 21 of 12th May, 1976 did the Minister advise the matter was not under investigation by Mental Health Services?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The answer to question (18) of 25th May did not state that this was under investigation.

84. CHILD HEALTH SERVICES *Sister Williams: Resignation*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Will the Minister clarify how he proposes to provide Child Health Services to the Mundaring area following the resignation of Sister Williams?

(2) Will the Minister list the times the relieving services will be available at the various centres?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) Sister Williams will be replaced by a child health nurse on a permanent basis, as soon as possible.

(2) In the meantime normal services will be maintained at all centres by relieving staff.

QUESTIONS (10): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. BETTING CONTROL ACT

Off-course Bookmakers' Licences

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Police:

My question without notice is consequential upon the reply he gave to question 53 on today's notice paper. I asked the Minister how many off-course bookmakers' licences have been granted pursuant to section 11 of the Betting Control Act, and the Minister supplied the number. The second part of my question asked how many, if any, such licences are now current, and in what centres are they operative, but the Minister did not supply that information. I now ask the Minister whether he can tell me in how many centres such licences are operative and, if he is unable to do so now, could he make the information available to me in writing?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I do not have the information with me, but I will endeavour to obtain it for the honourable member by tomorrow.

2. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Bunbury Regional Officer: Discussions on Appointment

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Was the recent *South Western Times* newspaper correct when it reported that the Minister held discussions at Bunbury with Mrs J. Craig, MLA; Mr J. Sibson, MLA; Mr B. Blaikie, MLA; the Hon. V. J. Perry, MLC; the Hon. A. A. Lewis, MLC, and the Hon. T. O. Perry, MLC, in connection with the appointment of Mr Michael Drenth as the Bunbury regional officer?

(2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", will the Minister advise why only south-west Liberal and Country Party members were included in the discussions, and why the two south-west Labor members, Mr H. D. Evans, MLA, and Mr T. H. Jones, MLA, were excluded?

Mr Davies: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The honourable member has not given me prior notice of the question. If the question relates to the recent trip I made to the south-west, all members whose electorates I entered were notified.

Mr T. H. Jones: Why was I not notified? I was not invited, nor was the member for Warren.

Sir Charles Court: We spoke about it in the House before we went down.

Mr T. H. Jones: We were excluded from the deputation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MENSAROS: All members were notified of my trip. The particular event about which the member for Collie is talking was a Press conference held at the request of the Press. No members were particularly invited and there was no such deputation as the member mentioned.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

4.

TERTIARY EDUCATION

Fees

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Some notice has been given of this question. Will the Premier make the appropriate representations to urge the Fraser Government—

(a) to reconsider its decision to reintroduce fees at tertiary education institutions for second and subsequent degrees and higher degrees; and

(b) in the event of the Fraser Government's persisting with its decision to reintroduce the fees, in order to preserve a free university in Western Australia will the State Government accept financial responsibility for fees insisted upon by the Federal Government?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I understand the honourable member phoned this question through in mid-afternoon, at about 2.30 p.m., and I have not been in my office for reasons he probably knows. I happened to be with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Jamieson: I was not there.

Mr Harman interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Just to put the mind of the member for Maylands at rest, I want to tell him I happened to be where the Leader of the Opposition was this afternoon. Therefore, I did not receive the honourable member's question until I arrived at the House. I am prepared to give him an answer tomorrow, and if he cannot get it onto the notice paper in time I will be only too pleased to answer it without notice.

5.

PREMIER

Press Photograph

Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

I apologise for inability to give some notice of this question but it was rather difficult to do so in the time at my disposal.

(1) Has the Premier seen what purports to be a picture of himself, dressed in the uniform of an Honorary Colonel of the Special Air Services Regiment on page 1 of this evening's edition of the *Daily News*?

(2) Is it in fact a picture of him?

3.

TRADE UNIONS

Ballots: Numbering of Papers

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) Has the Industrial Commission accepted and approved union rules which specifically provide for union ballot papers to be numbered consecutively?

(2) For what reason does the Industrial Commission accept the need for union ballot papers to be numbered consecutively?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) The answer to this question would require considerable research into every set of rules made since the Industrial Commission was appointed on the 1st February, 1964. Many union rules were registered by the Arbitration Court and some date back as far as 1912. Each relevant old file would have to be obtained from the repository or the archives and carefully examined.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Why didn't you do your homework?

Mr Bryce: We accept your apology.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: The answer continues—

(2) There is no requirement in the general electoral rules for the numbering of ballot papers; however it would seem that some unions have done this. The practice of marking ballot papers is quite unacceptable to the Government as it could completely nullify the provision of the secret ballot section of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

- (3) If it is a picture of him, was his decision to accept the position motivated by admiration of the policies, public relations, and life style of his Ugandan counterpart, Field Marshal Idi Amin?

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member resume his seat? I find the third part of the question in particular to be very offensive. I rule that the question be not completed, or indeed answered.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Are you not too old to play at soldiers?

Sir Charles Court: Aren't you proud of the SAS?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: Say if you are not.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: You are playing at soldiers.

The SPEAKER: Order! This arguing across the Chamber must cease. When I continually call for order I do not expect members, as parliamentarians in this Chamber, to continue to misbehave. If it does occur again I will have to take appropriate action.

6. NUCLEAR PRODUCTS

Waste: Premier's Radio Statement

Mr MOILER, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Premier still believe, as he stated on a radio programme today, that the group of physicists who have indicated concern at his statements in regard to uranium development and nuclear waste disposal "have tried to strike fear into the hearts and minds of people quite unfairly, quite improperly, and distorted the whole situation"?
- (2) Would the Premier more clearly identify those physicists he claims have joined forces with the Opposition to oppose the dumping of nuclear waste in Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The honourable member's question has just been handed to me.

Mr Moiler: You said it today. Can't you answer?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The honourable member's question was handed to me while questions were in progress. If he will tell

me the radio station and the programme to which he was referring—

Mr Moiler: On the ABC programme at approximately 11.30 a.m. today.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If he will tell me which station and which radio programme it was on, and the context, I will be only too pleased to answer his question; but I know of no interview I have given on this subject to a radio station today.

7.

OIL EXPLORATION

Abrolhos Islands

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Did the Minister see a report in yesterday's issue of the *Daily News* headed "Oil Search on Bird Sanctuary"?
- (2) Is it a fact, as reported, that State Cabinet this year endorsed the recommendations of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee including the suggestion that the Abrolhos remain an "A"-class reserve and that no developments be permitted that would conflict with the primary purpose of the islands as a wildlife sanctuary and commercial crayfishing grounds?
- (3) If "No" to (2), will the Minister please advise the correct position?
- (4) If "Yes" to (2), how does the Government reconcile this decision with its recent decision to allow oil exploration at the islands?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. The Abrolhos Islands are part of system 5, which is being considered at the present time by the Environmental Protection Authority.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) Not applicable.

8. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

Atmospheric Emissions

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Was he aware of the excessive atmospheric pollution when this House rose last night, which was most apparent in the precincts of the House and which obviously emanated from the Midland Junction Abattoir?
- (2) Was it caused by a major breakdown in the treatment plant at the Midland Junction Abattoir or was it due to some form of atmospheric inversion which does not usually occur?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) No, I was not aware of it. I was certainly aware there was some smoke around but I was not aware that it emanated from the Midland Junction Abattoir. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition is a far better detective than I.

Mr Jamleson: Everybody recognised it. You could not mistake it.

Mr Clarko: You had your socks off.

Mr OLD: I have lived within a couple of miles of an abattoir and I would have as much chance of identifying it as the Leader of the Opposition has. The answer is: "No".

9. OIL EXPLORATION

Abrolhos Islands

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Further to his answer to question 15 of the 25th May, was consideration given to banning drilling and seismic surveys on Beacon Island?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) will he please explain why it was decided not to include this island among those banned?
- (3) If "No" to (1) will he review the situation and consider protecting this island in view of its historical importance and the location of *Batavia* artifacts and graves on it?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) The honourable member may be assured that the historical importance not only of Beacon Island but also of the surrounding waters is well understood, and he may be assured further that the whole of the area involving the *Batavia* wreck will be safeguarded under paragraph B (ii) of the conditions approved by Cabinet.

In the full answer I gave to the question on notice yesterday, relating to the terms which had been agreed to by the Government in connection with the Abrolhos Islands seismic work and the drilling which might result from it, I clearly indicated that further conditions could apply to certain islands other than those named and also to the adjacent waters.

I indicated further that my attention has been drawn to a statement made in the Press today by the honourable member which, having regard to the answer given yesterday, is not only misleading but also totally without foundation.

10. OPERATIVE PAINTERS AND DECORATORS' UNION

Ballot: Conformity with Rules

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

My question relates to the reply given to another question this afternoon. In view of the further research he has undertaken in order to reply to that question, can he now state that the Operative Painters and Decorators' Union, so far as the numbering of ballot papers in the recent election is concerned, operated within its rules and the rules accepted by the Industrial Commission?

Mr GRAYEN replied:

The union certainly operated within its rules but not within the rules laid down in the Industrial Arbitration Act, which are as follows—

- (3) Rules of a society relating to elections for office—

- (a) shall provide that the election shall be by secret ballot; and

- (b) shall make provision for—

- (i) absent voting;
- (ii) the manner in which persons may become candidates for election;

- (iii) the appointment, conduct and duties of returning officers;

- (iv) the conduct of the ballot;

- (v) the appointment, conduct and duties of scrutineers to represent the candidates at the ballot; and

- (vi) the declaration of the result of the ballot;

and those rules shall be such as will ensure, as far as practicable, that no irregularity can occur in connection with the election.

Numbered ballot papers render a ballot contrary to the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act and therefore contravene the Act.

Mr Skidmore interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Skidmore interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Swan! I am on my feet and I called for order. I do not expect members to talk while I am

on my feet. I think someone else on the other side was talking also. I do not want to hear any more.

AGRICULTURE AND RELATED RESOURCES PROTECTION BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

In accordance with the arrangements made between the Minister for Lands and the member for Victoria Park, I desire briefly to answer some of the questions raised by that member.

Firstly, I want to make the point that, contrary to what the honourable member imagines, the drafting of this legislation was done long before any newspaper articles concerning the recent problems were published.

The member for Victoria Park asked what would be the penalty for a breach of the provisions of this measure. This penalty is provided in section 92 of the principal Act, and is a penalty of \$100 with a further penalty of \$10 a day for each day the offence continues after conviction.

In reference to the appointment of a board of visitors under clause 12, this provision was discussed with Crown Law, and outside the three members to be appointed as designated in the legislation, the other two would be appointed by the Minister and be persons considered appropriate to be on a board of this nature. The Minister would appoint the chairman from any one of the five members of the board.

With regard to the insertion of division 3 into the Act, these provisions are inserted so that it cannot be said that we have provided conditions in regard to private care hostels and have done nothing about voluntary groups.

With regard to clause 20(5), this is a direct extraction from the parent Act, but the Slow Learning Children's Group and the Mentally Incurable Children's Association shall not pay any fees. Clause 21 (2) is also a direct take from the existing legislation.

The member for Victoria Park queried the difference between "approval", "licence", and "declaration of approval". I advise that "approval" is given when the Minister is satisfied that the premises are of an acceptable standard and can

be declared approved premises. A "declaration of approval" is a document which after payment of the fee is issued to the owner to say that he or she has received approval.

I might add that, in regard to penalties for any breach of the Act, the penalties previously advised could include in regard to these provisions the penalty of revocation of approval of licence, or the loss of subsidy. I trust the questions raised by the member for Victoria Park have been satisfactorily answered.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [5.32 p.m.]: I thank the Minister for Works for arranging to ascertain the answers to my questions. I do not think we will ever agree on the matter of the introduction of the measure. The fact remains that this legislation was mentioned in the Governor's Speech in late March. If it was drafted then, it has taken a long time to come to the Parliament. I would have thought that, as it is relatively simple legislation—much of it is taken from the parent Act and is included in a new part IIIA—this would be one of the Bills the Government quickly and readily brought down. The Government says the measure was drafted a long time ago; and I say it is being rushed through at the end of the session.

I do not cavil at it; I am quite happy to accept it and to agree with it for the reasons given last night. However, unfortunately, the Minister has not satisfied me regarding why division 3 needs to be included at all. This division relates to private hostels, day activity centres and sheltered workshops. I asked last night for a demonstration of the need for the control contained in this division. I want to know whether any complaints have been received in relation to this. The fact that these institutions have been running apparently satisfactorily seems to indicate it is unnecessary to include any control over them in this legislation.

I said last night that if there were not a demonstrated need in respect of psychiatric hostels, we would not have this legislation; but a firm and clearly defined need has been established over a period of something like six years—indeed almost as soon as Claremont began to discharge patients to these hostels, the need became apparent and has continued.

The Government has not been able to quote to me one instance of a complaint in respect of sheltered workshops or day activity centres. I repeat what I said last night: These provisions could cause some unnecessary argument amongst the groups which at present liaise so well with the Government, because these groups will find suddenly they are to be under legislative control.

Whether or not they receive a printed declaration to show that they are approved is not of great consequence. The

real meat of this measure concerns that to which I drew attention last night; that is, much can come from the regulations. The regulations can stipulate training and standards for almost every person employed in psychiatric hostels or sheltered workshops, and I feel this will cause the various charitable organisations to react.

I had hoped the Minister would come into the House this afternoon and say, "There is concern regarding this and we do not believe these institutions are being run properly. We have had a lot of complaints and, therefore, whilst we are introducing this type of control in respect of psychiatric hospitals, we will take the opportunity to cover these other institutions."

Unless the institutions in question receive the approval or sanction of the Minister, they will not be liable to receive a subsidy. Therefore, if the Government is running short of money it can say it will not subsidise any more hostels. If the Government does not wish to put more money into this area it can refuse to approve any hostels; it can say, "We will not approve them; whether or not you open them is up to you. You will not be registered, and because you are not registered we will not have to subsidise you." This is a controlling factor which has been written into the legislation either consciously or unconsciously.

I believe this is a great shame. I make no apology for repeating again and again that particularly good liaison has been developed over the years between Mental Health Services and the Slow Learning Children's Group, the WA Mental Health Association, the Mentally Incurable Children's Association, the Good Samaritans, and similar organisations; and this goodwill will be in jeopardy because we will have what some members opposite, especially when they are sitting on this side, like to speak of as the dead hand of bureaucratic control.

I am surprised that the Government is trying to institute this kind of control without demonstrating to its own members in the first place and to Parliament in the second place the need for it.

I do not know what more I can say. I let the Bill go through last night, opposing division 3 only as a matter of form and for the record. However, I oppose it now wholeheartedly. We would have had a longer debate last night had I realised what the result would be. I apologise to those people whose interests I should properly be looking after in my present capacity. I have failed them because I have not done the job I might have done. I can only say that this Government, which is supposed to find any form of Government control abhorrent, and says it should be imposed only as a last resort,

now seeks to include control over these institutions without any request for that to be done.

This control could eventually prove to the Government and to the various organisations to be stringent and embarrassing. I will talk to my colleagues in another place and ask them to oppose these provisions most vigorously unless the Government can say, "This is the reason; we did not just do it because these people are looking after mentally deficient people."

I believe those institutions that have been found to be wanting should be controlled, because they have had long enough to put their house in order. However, those that have not been found to be wanting in any way at all will now find themselves encompassed by these provisions. This is quite wrong, and is not in line with the professed philosophy of the Government. It is certainly not in line with our philosophy. I am surprised indeed that the Government should seek to do this.

Last night I said it is a subterfuge; I did not like using that word. However, I am convinced now that it is a subterfuge. I might even go so far as to say it is a snide way to get control of these organisations because there is such intense public feeling about psychiatric hostels and such a strong crusade to have controls imposed on them, that the Government feels controls over any organisations dealing with those who are mentally ill or deficient are bound to be accepted by the public.

The Government will find these provisions will be rejected wholeheartedly by the public. It will find the public will criticise the Government, and deservedly so, for trying to legislate in this area where there is no need for it. I strongly oppose division 3.

I am divided between two courses of action. I could call on the Opposition to oppose the complete Bill, but I think on balance we must allow the measure to pass in order to have control over psychiatric hostels. However, I am disappointed indeed with the action of the Government in respect of division 3.

The Minister was good enough to ascertain the difference between "declaration of approval" and "approval". I understand "declaration of approval" means—

Mr O'Neil: It is the document.

Mr DAVIES: That is so. I do not know whether that will just be recorded in the office. I should imagine any kind of document issued would be an approval, whether it be a licence which is written out in duplicate from a pad, or whether it be a "declaration of approval". I do not see the need for the differentiation between the two, although I accept it because I do not think it is worth arguing about.

I thank the Minister for his information. I am indeed sorry he was not able to get up and say the Government decided to do this because it had received complaints. I believe we should legislate only when there is a demonstrated need.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

INDUSTRY

Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 19th May, on the following motion by Mr Harman—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately establish a Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit to examine all aspects of workers participation and promote its acceptance by all concerned.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [5.43 p.m.]: This motion has been moved for the purpose of fulfilling some of the objectives any member of Parliament would seek to fulfil in industrial relations in Western Australia. I suppose no issue has raised as much contentious debate as that of worker participation, and in my research of the matter—not only because of this motion but because of my extreme interest in it over some 15 to 20 years since it was first envisaged in West Germany—I find books, books, and more books have been written on the matter.

One might ask, "Just what do we really mean by worker participation?" As late as this afternoon I had a telephone call from a person who is doing research on the matter at the WA Institute of Technology. I had to answer a telephone questionnaire, and I was asked whether I could define "worker participation". I said I would have extreme difficulty because there are so many ifs and buts, but that I would try.

I gave him my idea of worker participation which is that the workers would participate in all levels of their industry, from management down to problems associated with their jobs on the floor of the factory. I added the rider that I felt the question of managerial participation by workers perhaps caused a great deal of distress to the employer who felt that some of his managerial rights would be whittled away if the workers were able to attain a level of managerial control. I suggested that here lay some of the problems associated with worker participation.

A lot has been written on this subject. In an effort to condense my thoughts on the matter to three-quarters of an hour I have taken out only a few extracts from books which covered some 2 500 pages of words on this question. I should like to refer to those places in Europe which have

a type of worker participation, albeit in some countries—Sweden and West Germany—the systems are not at all akin to each other and have a certain difference of application. Of course, in England there is also a variation in the concept of worker participation.

I should like to deal in a little detail with the present position in Sweden. I refer to a book on the question of workers' control. It is readily available and is also quite readable. The chapter to which I wish to refer deals with Swedish workers and is written by Wilfred List. Wilfred List is a well-known Swedish industrial research worker who has a great deal of expertise in this field. He says that Sweden has experienced only three strikes in the last 23 years and is used as a model for other Western countries on how to achieve industrial peace. How does Sweden find a secret recipe which allows it to have such a good record of industrial relations, at least in comparison with other countries?

The peaceful course of Sweden's industrial relations is remarkable when one considers that there is a work force of 3.5 million people and the total population is 7.9 million. Virtually half of the country's population are in industry and 90 per cent of industrial workers and 70 per cent of white-collar workers are union members. One could look at the matter and say that Sweden's worker participation programme is working quite well on the surface because of the large number of people in unions, the percentage of union membership being much higher than we would ever achieve in Australia.

For many years industrialists, employers, people interested in a better understanding of workers' problems, and also workers who want a better understanding of the employers' problems, have visited Sweden and examined that country's worker participation programme. I wish to quote very briefly from this article because I think it adds significantly to our thoughts on the difficulty that faces us in trying to decide whether we should have the proposed research unit to investigate whether worker participation should be established in this State. Part of the article reads as follows—

But neither royal commissions nor government taskforces have been able to bring away with them a magic formula for easing conflict in their own countries. Is it all a mirage, or does Sweden have a secret prescription for avoiding industrial warfare?

When one looks at the matter, it is most significant that a country that has achieved so much with regard to worker participation is unable to direct other nations with the same wish for achievement. Sweden cannot say to them in specific terms, "Do this, do that, and you will be successful." It seems to me

that very small quotation indicates the need for us in this country not to bury our heads in the sand but to endeavour to look at this matter in a responsive and responsible way with a view to endorsing the motion which is before the House. I am extremely regretful that the Minister for Labour and Industry is not in the House.

Mr Thompson: He is, and he has been ever since you started.

Mr SKIDMORE: My apologies to the Minister; I did not see him. I was not going to castigate him in any way.

Mr Grayden: No, no!

Mr SKIDMORE: I was going to say to the Minister that I feel his approach to this question when he spoke on the motion was not in the best interests of the people concerned. This was demonstrated by the manner in which he put forward his views. He suggested that the member for Maylands was indulging in politicking.

Several members interjected.

Mr SKIDMORE: If, as they are always telling us, Government members wish to treat this subject seriously and wish to show that they are interested also in the work force and industrial relations, they should at least be prepared to say that what I am saying is fair comment. In his speech the Minister indicated that in his opinion this motion was a piece of politicking. It is not my desire to politick because of my extreme interest in this matter for many years. I feel that anybody who looks at this matter in such a light is like the ostrich with his head in the sand and does not want to understand that there are more ways of killing a cat than pushing a pound of butter down its throat. The same comments apply to the question of realisation of industrial achievements in this country.

In Sweden the right to strike is still available to workers, albeit in 23 years there have been only three major strikes in that country. I might add that one of them was a real beauty, but it was resolved. The most remarkable thing about the matter is that although strikes have not disappeared from the Sweden scene, there are massive deterrents against strikes being held which arise out of the very strength of worker participation by union organisations. Those organisations are able to lean on each other for their strength and are able to say to the worker, "This is not on; we will sort this out at top level and there is no need for a strike." But this system is not infallible and at times it falls by the wayside.

The three most recent strikes in Sweden were a strike in the metal industry in 1945, a nationwide strike in the spring of 1953 which ran for three weeks, and, strangely enough, a teachers' strike in 1966. But there are no outward signs of the strikes which took place; in other

words, a lot of stress is not caused to the workers who were on strike. Law and order are maintained and, strangely enough, under the worker participation programme strike-breaking is shunned and employers simply close down.

I would say that the number of man-hours lost through strikes in Sweden in a period of 20 years is fewer than the number lost in this country in the first three months of 1976. If we look at the success of the system we would surely realise the great value that can be gained from a system of worker participation.

In the time available to me it is not possible to tell the House what the Swedish system is other than to make the general comment that it works very well and allows the workers in Sweden to enjoy a form of worker fulfilment that is not available in this country.

Later I shall quote from a newspaper article of a speech made by a very prominent member of the Federal Parliament in which he suggested that certain workers were reaching such a state in their jobs that they were not paying the attention they should be paying and something should be done about it.

Another really classic example of worker participation is the programmes in West Germany. In that country the idea of worker participation is not new because it dates from pre-World War I times. That was when the thought of worker participation first raised its banner in Germany. It was suggested that this could be the means whereby workers could participate in the productivity of an industry, in the well-being of their social life and in the managerial structure. Of course, West Germany is well known to be one of the leading nations in the field of worker participation.

The West German system has its faults, just like the Swedish system. It does not satisfy every worker or employer, but it certainly goes a long way to making a compromise between the two different opinions. Its usefulness in the process of industrial relations relies on the ability of strong managements and strong trade unions.

When I hear the Minister for Labour and Industry and many other people in this country, including politicians of all political colours, berating the trade union movement for its irresponsibility in indulging in strikes and tactics which are considered to be strong-arm tactics, I should like to suggest to them in fairness they ought to look closely at worker participation. The problems are there, but we will not get rid of them without doing something about them.

In Germany the first issue that arose after World War II was the passing of a co-determination Act covering the iron, steel and mining industries. When we think of the Ruhr Valley and of the mining

industries and the production of iron and steel in West Germany, we can realise the magnitude of the unions' efforts in worker participation in that country.

The position in that country was related to me by the director of one of the metal trade unions in the iron industry who visited this country as a guest of the Australian Council of Trade Unions some four or five years ago. He came to Perth under the auspices of the trade union movement here to explain to us the areas of worker participation which would probably be foreign to the concept of worker participation that we may have. I refer to worker insurance, managerial training of workers from the floor, workers having their own bank, workers having their own co-operative and building societies for loans, and the question of workers controlling, with management, credit unions. All those issues are outside the normal facets of worker participation that we look at in this country in our own narrow way.

It was very illuminating to hear this chap. He spoke impeccable English. In fact he could give many of us in this place a lesson, although I do not wish to be sidetracked on that question. The important thing is that he told us so sincerely that in West Germany workers can come off the floor and be trained for directorship positions in industry. They can be sent to universities and receive university degrees in industrial relations. They can be taught to take their places on an equal footing with management. Management in no way sees this as an infringement of its rights or a lessening of its ability to control the industry of which it is a part. In fact they work hand-in-glove with each other and the industries prosper by virtue of the detailed involvement of the workers.

Some people in this country express the view that workers are not responsible for the productivity of any industry. The lie is given to that view time and time again by the fact that workers are responsible if they are given the opportunity to accept responsibility. This is what worker participation is all about. We cannot expect a person to accept responsibility if a decision is made for two of his mates to leave the assembly line without any reason being given when he knows that the company has just received quite a substantial order for, shall we say, the manufacture of motorcar engines. He just does not understand the decision but the company could have a valid reason because it may intend within a week or so to introduce a machine into the process which will do away with the necessity for the two workers.

Management fails to understand that the worker is entitled to know these things. The system seems to break down. If the worker were in a managerial position

and were able to pass the knowledge through to the workers long before the time came for them to be sacked, no doubt, as in other countries, a niche could be found for them in another part of the factory with no loss of prestige to management and a certain repayment to workers, who have given loyal service over many years.

In West Germany companies, at their own cost, retrain their workers. It is a total involvement and works very well. However, there are some problems associated with it and in this regard I would like to quote from an article. Some militant workers feel that it is window-dressing for unions to be involved. Dr Gunther Friedrichs, an expert on automation of the metal trades union states—

The managements of the enterprises often refer to two arguments when they deny the workers prior information and participation on manpower planning. First, they want to avoid unrest within the plant or postpone it as long as possible. Second, they fear that the competition could become alerted and take advantage of this information. Neither argument is valid. Competition generally is better informed about technical planning of the enterprise than the workers employed in it. Besides, not all workers are supposed to participate in manpower planning, but only a few elected representatives, who are pledged to silence.

Here is one of the basic distrusts, not only by the trade union movement, but also by managers. Neither will trust the other in worker participation. Only a small number of workers are trusted with information. Any secret given to them could obviously be used by their opponents. Therefore any secret divulged to the workers cannot be passed on, and they do not pass it on to the other workers. They merely go onto the shop floor and tell the workers that it is necessary to complete a certain function or job in a certain way and they must accept that it is in the best interests of all concerned.

This occurs time and time again. Even in West Germany, where the system has many faults and there is window dressing by militants, the unions act responsibly.

Unrest within the factory is not avoided, but rather encouraged by secrecy. In other words, if management wants trouble it should not tell the workers anything, but allow them to go along hopefully in the belief that they will enjoy a lifetime job. Such an attitude in itself encourages indecision and unrest.

Many people participate in the process of planning and there will always be a risk of leaks of manufacturing processes. This is well known to all of us. If we consider the international situation during war time and the leakage of secrets then,

we realise that this will always happen. But surely we should not, in turn, destroy the concept of worker participation mainly because of those few isolated instances of leakage of information. Intelligent works councils will support rumours and even exaggerate them at certain times if they see in this a possibility to gain access to information and enforce early negotiations.

It would appear to me that in West Germany—that is, the Federal Republic of Germany—a very conscious effort has been made over a long period of time. It commenced after World War I. Obviously today that country is facing some difficulties in the implementation of some of the things it desires to achieve. Insurance companies, credit unions, and so on are operating to a certain extent, but there are many problems associated with them. I do not want to be specific or to be held to ransom, but I understand that most of the undertakings are working reasonably well and both worker and management are accepting the role of these councils running the individual efforts because they give the worker a degree of security. In West Germany a worker knows that he can move from one industry to another and his interests will be looked after because of worker participation.

In England the scene is not the success it is in West Germany. In 1969 a charter was introduced after a three-month strike of predominantly immigrant workers in the Halesowen Foundry of GKN-Shotton. The charter comprises a council consisting of eight management representatives and eight worker representatives and meets three times a year under supervision by a representative of management whose place is taken by a worker representative if he is not available.

This council is what one would term the board of management. This information is found in a book titled *Participation in Industry* by Campbell Balfour. He does not profess to have a great deal of knowledge; he merely has the ability to carry out research. I do not set him up as an expert, but merely say that he has recorded the systems in England and he has done it very well. He tries to be objective and I find his books on these matters to be intelligent and well worth reading. He endeavours to look at both angles.

The council also reviews the work of four consultant subcommittees which are concerned with agreements and factory manning; safety, health, and welfare; employment benefits and leisure activities; and discipline. Each of these subjects is dealt with by the special committee concerned. Each committee is composed of representatives of both employees and employers. In some cases there is a mixture of representatives of the employers and employees and other members who are

ordinary members from the floor. They are not like our shop stewards, but are ordinary workers.

They meet and determine all the issues in this particular factory from managerial control right down through the ranks to disciplinary action against workers. They do not go to an industrial court. If a worker repeatedly fails to report for work he does not have to answer to an Industrial Commission or magistrate, but to his own fellow workers. They have the power to suspend workers for reporting for work late and they also deal with others who fall out with one another. However so far no-one has been dismissed.

So many times in the industrial scene in Western Australia the unions must take action against an employer because the employer has sacked an employee for what is termed misconduct. The worker must go before the industrial court in order that it might be determined whether he was justifiably dismissed. Many hours are lost by the commission, union representatives, and advocates appearing on behalf of employers and employees. What a terrible waste! Yet, under worker participation these issues are solved in a sensible and logical way and the same objective is achieved so easily and quickly within the industry concerned.

There is so much merit to be found in research that we should not just idly bypass it. We should be advised by people who have studied industrial relations and worker participation. I do not profess to have studied all cases, but I have covered a cross-section of systems of worker participation and I have felt that in all cases they have worked well, particularly in the factory to which I have referred.

The following is a quotation from *Participation in Industry* to which I have referred—

But the works convenor has been reported as saying, 'You never hear the word "strike" in this company. We've given the information to know how the company is doing, and we're pretty certain that our wages will go up with the prosperity of the company.' The Personnel Manager has commented that 'the charter is a lot of words that are meaningless without good will and good communications and the Company considers that it now has both.'

Here again there is a difference of opinion and it seems that all is not honey and roses. Problems are experienced and of course we can readily understand that in those countries there would be problems. We will spend many years in a wilderness of industrial chaos unless we are prepared to accept the responsibility as legislators to determine the right of workers to participate in management. We must achieve good industrial relations.

If it has taken West Germany some 60 years to achieve that objective perhaps it is too late for us to do so, but at least let us make a start on our efforts to achieve worker participation.

Coming closer to home, I have studied some of our so-called worker participation programmes in Australia. They are not complete and total worker participation programmes, but are really schemes of profit sharing, which I suppose is the genesis of worker participation in the true sense. At least such a scheme provides a reward to the worker for his efforts over and above the norm expected.

I want to refer to one particular factory. I do not profess to know a great deal about it but, in general terms, it is a subsidiary of Lincoln Electric Co. of America. It is known as Lincoln Electric of Australia and, as I understand it, it issues shares to its employees. In this way the workers feel they are really a part of the company. Believe it or not it is not possible to join that company in Australia unless one is the daughter or son of a present employee. It is more or less a closed shop because it is almost impossible for an outsider to become an employee.

What a tremendous challenge that must be to other industries, which should also accept a responsibility in worker participation by issuing shares to their employees. I understand that in this particular company the shares are issued over a period without any interest rates being charged. The employees regard themselves as part of the company.

I wish briefly to touch on another company which could be a national company; I do not know. I understand this particular company has a factory at Osborne Park. The employees are a part of the company. They are shareholders and participate in the decisions of the company. The system works very well.

In three-quarters of an hour I do not have sufficient time to submit all the information I would like, but I do wish to emphasise that worker participation does work. The examples I have given do not represent complete worker participation, but the employees are shareholders and those companies are doing very well.

Sitting suspended from 6.14 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr SKIDMORE: I dealt with the question of what is really meant by worker participation, and I do not think if we wanted to we could separate that issue from the question of what is meant by confrontation with unions. The two go hand in hand with industrial dispute or industrial peace. Some of the most contentious issues as they relate to the unions are those which we have seen develop, even in this Parliament in recent weeks, in connection with union ballots.

I think some responsibility should rest with the people who do not wish to accept the fact that we should not come out and

endeavour to destroy a concept, because we do not believe in the things that the unions do, merely on the argument that the ballots could or could not be rigged. In my view to do so would show a complete lack of responsibility.

The confrontations which took place between the unions could have been avoided by the Minister concerned getting together with the trade union movement in an endeavour to see whether what he suspected was in fact taking place. When we come to the question of worker participation it is a question of participation in the attitude of Governments. It is a good question and we should not lose sight of the fact that this is one of the reasons we have confrontation with the unions.

Let us, for example, consider the question of strikes. In a certain situation it is possible for strike action to be taken, and it is taken with disastrous results to all concerned. This, however, could be avoided and the problem could be solved.

Let us consider the question of strikes in the construction industry, which is a classic example of an industry in which workers find themselves at variance with employers in relation to regulations appertaining to industrial safety or other aspects. Strike action is generally not taken without very good reason and more often than not we find the problem is associated with the inactivities of Governments, whether they be Liberal Governments or Labor Governments which, in the past, have created situations which unions consider adverse to their interests. In such circumstances the only answer is for a union to withdraw its labour until such time as the matters are attended to.

When one considers the issue of participation of unions it surprises me to find in the Federal Republic of Germany there is an equality on the supervisory boards in connection with management and labour. There is an article which clearly indicates that there is numerical equality between the workers and shareholders, and there is also numerical equality in regard to the strike areas. When we have a strike in this country we find ourselves at sixes and sevens; we are so far apart—and I now refer to management and labour—that it is almost impossible for the trade unions or the employers to get together and talk about it. In no small part this is due to the sheer stupidity of the restrictive provisions in our industrial laws. These laws are not conciliatory, they are arbitrary and force unions away from the conciliation table. This is why we should look at worker participation in full. This is precisely what is meant and these issues are referred to in the countries I have mentioned. When these questions arise the legislation of the country concerned is considered in full and an approach is then

made to the Government to change its thinking and attitude as they relate to industrial matters. This works very satisfactorily in relation to the trade union movement, and in other ways.

I would like to revert for a moment to the position in our own country. I find that in Sam Corporation in South Australia there is a worker participation programme which is only in its infancy, but which works very well indeed. For example the workers on the floor select the leading hands and foremen. This is done on the assumption and the feeling that who better knows the person who will be acceptable to the worker than the worker himself. This system works very well indeed. The employer adopts a responsible attitude, one which is acceptable to the workers and as a result there develops a situation of great trust and, as a consequence, the attitude to work is far more responsible and satisfactory.

I would like to make some reference to the issues that have caused provocation and problems in the system which exists today.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to mention some of these problems and in doing so I wish to refer to a matter where confrontation is inevitable because there is no worker participation in the industry concerned. The letter which I wish to quote was written by L. Drage of 28 Albany Highway, Mt. Barker and reads as follows—

Enclosed is a detailed account of my experiences on the Trawler *SAXON PROGRESS* as described by me in our recent conversation. Having just completed my first and hopefully last engagement as a crew member on the Trawlers of Southern Ocean Fish Processors Company operating out of Albany, I would like to add my experiences to the other complaints that are circulating around the town, complaints which if not experienced would be hard to believe.

As a preliminary to starting work for this company I was required to sign an agreement which laid down the remuneration I might expect, together with a compensation form which required if I wished to be covered against any accident, the sum of \$1.00 per day would have to be paid.

This is staggering. To continue—

I started work provisioning the vessel with ice and equipment on the 20th April and worked in this capacity for the best part of two days. We left for sea p.m. on the 21st April and arrived at the fishing grounds at p.m. on the 23rd. It was then, my troubles commenced.

The hours we were expected to work were from sixteen to twenty two hours a day depending on the success of the trawl.

The meals provided tho well cooked, were as a result mainly cold and unpalatable.

Being completely ignorant of the work involved and suffering from irregular meals and virtually no sleep, I was ill prepared for the continued harrasment and abuse from the persons in command. After six days of this treatment I complained to the Captain, that I could not handle the conditions he was imposing and was thereupon threatened with violence and refused food and was indeed placed on a diet of BREAD AND WATER for a day and a half, until the crew intervened and saw to it that I got some food.

This was in 1976. The incident happened at sea and there was no possible way of getting off the trawler. The letter continues—

On the completion of this voyage I was informed by the management that owing to my inability to stand up to the work and the conditions demanded of me, I was denied payment of any sort even for that period of time in which I worked prior to going to sea, as well as the time I spent in actual work at sea.

To my mind this smacks of sheer exploitation. It is not inconceivable to imagine that a person working for this Company could be deprived of any payment on almost any excuse.

Mr Davies: How many lashes did he get?

Mr SKIDMORE: This is a public document and anyone who cares to see it may do so. The incident outlined in the letter smacks of an inability to accept worker participation on the trawler in question. I hope the owners of the trawler *Saxon Progress* will give some explanation because this would enlighten the workers in the industry in Albany. There should be worker participation in this industry to see what the conditions are on this trawler and to ascertain whether the workers or the management were wrong.

There are other matters which I wish to debate but in the short time available to me I am afraid I will not be able to cover them.

Mr Watt: Can I get a copy of this letter?

Mr SKIDMORE: Certainly, and if any other member would like to see it he is welcome to do so. Here we have a classic example where worker participation even on a small level would have avoided what took place on that trawler. It is certainly no joke—in the year 1976—for a

worker to be kept on bread and water for a day and a half. I thought that went out years ago on the industrial scene.

There are other matters I wish to raise, but I merely say that if the Minister and the Government are dinkum and sincere in their desire to consider the question of industrial peace and the way of life of everybody in Western Australia they should accept the challenge set out in the motion moved by the member for Maylands. The Government must do this if we are to achieve the Utopia which, I believe, is possible in connection with worker participation in industry.

MR SODEMAN (Pilbara) [7.42 p.m.]: Owing to the nature of my electorate and the nature of the participation between employees and employers in our State, as this relates to worker participation, I feel it is necessary that I contribute to the debate on the motion before the House which reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately establish a Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit to examine all aspects of workers participation and promote its acceptance by all concerned.

I must say at the outset that I cannot support the motion as it has been moved.

Mr Hartrey: Why?

Mr SODEMAN: If the member for Boulder-Dundas will listen I will inform him of my reasons, of which there are several. In the first place the nature of the motion itself is presupposing. I cannot agree with something that says let us establish a workers' participation research and advisory unit in which people should participate by way of research and, after the research has been carried out we should advise others of the results of that research while at the same time commencing a promotional campaign which should be accepted by all concerned. I cannot see how the honourable member would expect me to agree with that.

Mr Davies: You read too fast; read it again because I certainly cannot see what you mean.

Mr SODEMAN: If the member for Victoria Park would read the motion I would be happy to discuss it with him. I will not repeat myself; the honourable member should have been paying attention.

After having listened to the member for Swan I am more convinced than ever that the attitude I am adopting is the correct one. The honourable member said that we needed some sort of association to foster worker participation; that as a concept it should be encouraged and not destroyed.

I did not think this would ever happen, but I must say that on this occasion I am in complete agreement with the remark

made by the member for Swan in its particular context. When it is isolated from some of his other remarks I think it is extremely responsible.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr SODEMAN: I certainly agree that the principle of worker participation should be fostered by the Government, by unions and by companies who employ individuals to work for them.

Before I proceed I wish to recapitulate and refer to one or two of the matters mentioned by the Minister for Labour and Industry; I would like to amplify his comments and add to them with particular reference to my electorate.

In replying to the motion the Minister said that there were many forms of worker participation already in operation; he said this was practised in varying forms in virtually all aspects of private enterprise in Western Australia. This, of course, is true. The Minister also said that worker participation is operating in the public sector of Western Australia and that it is a well established principle in the composition of boards and committees. It is also evident and established in the Apprentices' Advisory Council in Western Australia and many aspects are being implemented by the Government.

The Minister stated also that worker participation existed in the Consumer Affairs Council, the Health Safety Advisory Board, the Machinery Safety Advisory Board, and the Hairdressers' Registration Board. These are just a few areas where worker participation exists in Western Australia at the moment. The main point, of course, is that it exists in certain Government committees and statutory bodies.

An important factor is that the Minister made the following remarks after his comments about the policy-making organisations, on which there is worker participation at Government level. He said—

We have it in the Government, in the manner I have described; and we have in the Department of Labour and Industry officers who are watching worker participation throughout the world and would be keen to set up committees or anything like that at the drop of a hat if they considered it to be advantageous.

I feel personally that this is an extremely responsible departmental attitude, and it conveys ideas of flexibility and openmindedness, and there are already a facility and an avenue through which something can be accomplished. The Minister continued—

Two years ago at my request those officers looked into the question of setting up some sort of committee to monitor worker participation. They rejected the proposal, because they considered they had the expertise and were more competent to do this work.

One should applaud the responsibility of those officers who do not wish to duplicate a situation or create an organisation for which there may not be a spelt out need. I refer again to the comments of the member for Swan when he said that we need some sort of system whereby workers can participate in industry. He admitted himself that he is not quite sure what sort of system we should follow.

In debating the motion, the honourable member listed a number of systems and highlighted some of their shortcomings. I intend to do the same but in a slightly different manner. Firstly, it is not quite as easy as some members here seem to think to establish such a system and there is no standard blueprint from which companies can implement worker participation in their activities. The Minister went on to say—

I cannot therefore accept the proposition for the formation of the committee proposed in the motion for a number of reasons. Firstly, many unions do not want worker participation and would be loath to form such a committee, and a number of employer organisations do not want to be involved in a committee on worker participation.

And neither they should. There is a very good reason for this, and I will mention it a little later on in my speech. To continue—

So we have a refusal from both sides. Unions should not be forced to have worker participation. However, a number of unions desire worker control, but not worker participation.

Worker participation should be allowed to evolve through management-worker negotiations. The evolutionary process will be more acceptable to the parties, without forcing them to accept it. This should be a self-generating process.

That confirms my own feelings about the motion moved by the member for Maylands.

The comments of the Minister indicate at least two things at this stage: (a) that we have worker participation and, (b) that some of the parties involved have indicated that they do not want to be part of this form of inquiry or committee to set up worker participation.

I mentioned earlier that many aspects of worker participation are already in operation in my electorate, and of course, this is one of the reasons I gave previously for my participation in the debate. I wish to acknowledge that this worker participation exists, and that to some degree it works successfully. The participation may be in the form of safety committees or industrial relations committees where there is an exchange of agenda items from both sides, and either party is free to

raise any pertinent matter. In some of our company towns we have mess committees comprising representatives from the company, the caterers, and each of the single men's quarters. So as members can see, there is no imbalance or bias towards company representation. In actual fact, the bias is towards employee or worker representation. The members of this committee discuss such things as quantity and quality of food, general accommodation facilities and amenities, and so on.

The combined unions committee concept is another form of worker participation. Management is not represented on that committee, but members discuss their problems, and suggestions, and recommendations are then put forward to management. The committee is made up of delegates from each of the on-site unions and I might add, from my observations, this committee has a tremendous influence on management decisions. So I wonder to what extent the member for Maylands, and the member for Swan who supported him, would suggest that these particular levels of worker participation should be broadened or changed.

I am quite sure the people involved on these committees do not want to see any change in their structure, unless of course it is for the better.

Mr Harman: Have you asked those men?

Mr SODEMAN: Yes, I have, and I will come to that in a minute. As members will appreciate, there are many of these committees in the Pilbara, and I have not spoken to all their members.

Another form of committee is the training committee where company and employee representatives meet together to discuss and to make decisions about potential trainees, who perhaps may be taught the operations of certain types of equipment. These committees collectively draw up training programmes—another part of their responsibility.

During his presentation this evening, the member for Swan made another good point about the retraining and mobility of workers, both inside and outside industry. I support his comments in their entirety. However, I do not think we need worker participation in management to develop a scheme for this purpose. Companies and unions alike should pay attention to the ever-changing technology which creates an expanding problem to workers in industry. I am all for shifting a worker to another position rather than sacking him when his job disappears through changing techniques. One should resort to retrenchments only when there is no other alternative. Sometimes an industry will close down altogether or a major change will take place, making some workers redundant.

The member for Maylands asked me whether I had spoken to union members and employees in my area. I have spoken

to large numbers of them and I might add that the people themselves are not sure. We have a split viewpoint and in many instances, the workers cannot give an intelligible reason as to why they are for or against worker participation.

Mr Bertram: How well informed are they?

Mr SODEMAN: The honourable member asks me how well informed these people are. The union organisation itself is fairly outspoken and the hierarchy of the unions is forever talking about what it thinks Governments should and should not do. If the rank and file union members are not informed about something, it seems that the executives of the unions are remiss. The unions seem able to advise their members fairly rapidly about other matters, so I think the honourable member should pass his suggestion on to them.

The member for Maylands was not able to come up with one solid idea, and the member for Swan said that it was an area of vague conceptions and misunderstandings.

Mr Harman: That is why we want a research unit.

Mr SODEMAN: A research unit would not be able to pluck out of the air some academic professor who can put his finger on the correct answer straightaway. In a moment I will read out some suggestions that have been put forward in other countries. The member for Maylands did this the other evening, and I was quite prepared to sit and listen to him. The problem has been looked at by people in other countries, and we see that they have come up with grey areas or black spots in most instances. I have a booklet here and I believe that it puts forward a reasonably good recommendation.

Rather than talk about the Pilbara continually, I will refer to another form of worker participation which exists in the metropolitan area. Engineering and construction companies operate by calling meetings of shop stewards and management at periodic intervals, sometimes monthly. The problems which have evolved since the previous meeting are discussed fully and an endeavour is made to solve each problem as it is brought forward. I do not say for one moment that such a system exists in every organisation and in every industry.

I said earlier in my speech that some companies involve themselves in worker participation to differing degrees and using different forms. I am told that a system used by one or two organisations in the metropolitan area operates satisfactorily for all concerned. If we look at the records of these companies in relation to strikes, lost time, and the periods of service of some of their employees, they

speak for themselves. Within the systems there is a great degree of harmony between employers and employees.

To return to the situation in the Pilbara, I am advised that where possible companies inform the combined unions committee of any major changes in procedure or developments which are to take place and which could affect the work force. For instance, changes of shift are notified to the combined unions committee beforehand and the system encourages a feedback from the workers represented by the committee.

From what I have said to this point, it is evident that the Government, companies in the Pilbara and the State, generally recognise the need for realistic levels of worker participation. However, I feel that we need to understand the word "realistic". If we were to ask a dozen union or company representatives—even the very well informed representatives—what form of worker participation they feel is desirable or under which system they should operate, it would not be too surprising to find that we have a dozen different answers.

My second reason for not supporting the motion moved by the member for Maylands is that I feel his arguments were heavily biased, and I will refer to a comment he made during his introductory remarks to illustrate my point. He said—

I would not be a party to any kind of worker participation where workers were being manipulated by management in order to suit the needs of management.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr SODEMAN: The honourable member made no mention, however, of what his attitude would be if the converse situation existed. Therefore, one would assume he would be a party to worker participation in management in a form where workers manipulate management.

I mentioned previously that considerable confusion exists in union circles as to the advisability of worker participation in management. In his reply to the motion, the Minister highlighted comments made by Mr Joe Owens, a former Secretary of the Australian Builders' Labourers Federation, and Mr John Halfpenny—

Mr Harman: Who was he?

Mr SODEMAN: —the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union

Mr Bryce: Who is the funny man on your left?

Mr SODEMAN: The other evening someone asked who the three people I referred to were and they turned out to be his own

colleagues of some time past, so I do not think the honourable member should risk that again.

Mr Harman: The last person mentioned is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr SODEMAN: The other person referred to was Mr Peter Cook. If he is, it is not self-expressed.

Mr Bryce: What a lousy smear—and a half-baked one at that!

Mr Bertram: He is a socialist then?

Mr SODEMAN: Is the member for Mt. Hawthorn not a socialist?

Mr Bertram: You are too, you know—you and your Government practise it and have a record level of it.

Mr Barnett: How close do you think Liberals are to fascists?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SODEMAN: It is noticeably clear that the member for Ascot has resumed his seat. The first person to whom I referred, Mr Joe Owens, the former Secretary of the Australian Builders' Labourers Federation had this to say—

Worker participation quite frankly is a sop. It is clearly proved in West Germany that worker participation is designed to contain the Unions, to make them effective within the capitalist system existing there and that move is beginning to emerge in Australia where many Union leaders do not want to see Unions "run wild", as some of them refer to it, and certainly the employers are very much together on this question of participation.

The second person, Mr John Halfpenny, had this to say—

I want to indicate quite clearly that the aim of the Trade Union Movement to acquire political and economic power remains, now as it did at the beginning, the principal objective of trade unionism.

I totally reject the concept of worker participation because it is little short of management inspired for the achievement of management objectives. In my view, greater worker involvement should be achieved by worker interference and intervention through independent trade union organisations rather than by participation.

Let me come a little closer to home for the benefit of members opposite.

Mr Carr: Is this your speech, or the Minister's?

Mr SODEMAN: I prefaced my remarks by saying that these were the Minister's comments, and that I proposed to amplify

them. Mr Peter Cook, the State Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, was reported as saying—

We would have strong reservations about any employer-sponsored system of worker participation, because employers have yet to show any real desire to introduce industrial democracy in the work force.

Mr Cook went on to say—

The ultimate question is whether workers are asked to assist the productivity objectives of management or whether they really do have a say in the way in which their work place is organised and the profits of their labour are dispersed.

It is the last few remarks in Mr Cook's comments that bring me to a most important point. By what level of worker participation in management does or should an individual worker really have a say?

I was looking through various articles and studies, in order to find something that was reasonably short and to the point, and that gave a general overview of the situation. Surprising as it may seem, rather than look for comments by somebody who was either socialist or Labor or union-orientated, I wanted to find an article or study by—

Mr Harman: Or communist!

Mr SODEMAN: —someone who was industry or private enterprise orientated. I came across a booklet headed, "Towards a Better Understanding Between the Work Force and Management" put out by the Central Industrial Secretariat comprising the Australian Council of Employers' Federations and the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia. The booklet contains various remarks relating to worker participation in management and it might surprise the member for Maylands to learn that it was put out by an industry organisation. The booklet states as follows—

The Central Council of the Secretariat, having considered these developments, has reaffirmed its view that the most effective means of achieving worker participation in management is by the use of the techniques set out in the pamphlet "Communication, Consultation and Negotiation".

Before members opposite ask, "What are the details?", I inform them that these are described in the booklet. It goes on to state—

This pamphlet has accordingly been produced with the aims of:

(a) clarifying the misconceptions surrounding the various forms of worker participation in management—

Opposition speakers have mentioned that misconceptions exist. To continue—

- (b) encouraging management to implement techniques of communication and consultation within the enterprise.

The booklet then lists the various forms of worker participation which have been examined throughout the world and put into operation in various parts of the world, some with a small degree of success and others with a great degree of success.

The first form I wish to mention is that of employee representation at board level, in respect of which the booklet states—

A number of schemes have been implemented whereby employees have representation at board level in the enterprise. In most countries where this type of worker participation in management has been implemented, the worker representatives are in the minority on the boards and thus the owners of the enterprise have retained control.

In some cases these representatives are elected by the employees in the enterprise, while in other instances they are nominated by the trade union which represents the employees in the particular enterprise, or in many cases by the central trade union organisation. In cases involving enterprises in the public sector the representatives are generally nominated by the Government as has been the case in Australia where trade unionists have been appointed to the boards of State public utility authorities and such institutions or enterprises as the Reserve Bank and Qantas.

However, participation in company affairs at the board level and the demands that this role makes upon the participant often results in the identification of the participant with management and his consequent disassociation from employees at the shop-floor level.

This form of participation, although it is participation at the highest level, does not in reality give the individual worker a sense of participation in the management of the enterprise in which he is employed. The "worker directors" have in some overseas countries been seen as being no different from the "owner directors".

If one reads some of the writings of sociologists, and listens to comments of members opposite, one comes to the conclusion that worker participation is a worker being directly involved in his work place situation. If the end result is that we have people sitting on boards representing workers, we will have advanced no further than the situation we have at the moment.

If a worker in his own right and through his natural ability evolves into a position of sitting on a board, that is precisely how it should be. There are a number of general managers in this State and a number of high level executives in my electorate who in actual fact are tradesmen. They have gone through the various stages of foremen and supervisors and have worked their way up. These people have a tremendous accord with the people with whom they work and whom they direct.

Mr Bryce: You are only about a quarter of a century behind the times.

Mr SODEMAN: One of the other forms of worker participation mentioned in the booklet is headed "Co-Partnership/Employee Capital Formation" in respect of which the booklet states—

A number of schemes have been devised whereby employees are given a voice in the control of the enterprise through the issuing of shares. In West Germany, for example, it is proposed that employees should receive shares in a centrally managed fund to which a portion of the profits of the enterprise would be paid. In Denmark, on the other hand, legislation has been proposed to enforce this system irrespective of the profitability of the enterprise.

The advocates of this type of co-partnership claim that it provides each individual employee with the opportunity of sharing in the decision making and policy making function within the enterprise.

Although in theory such schemes offer the opportunity for participation in management through partial ownership, in reality management prerogatives remain in the hands of those appointed to the management positions and thus any suggestion that the individual has any feeling of personal participation becomes rather tenuous.

The member for Swan raised this only a few moments ago; he mentioned exactly the same thing. This type of worker participation is supposed to be the one which makes the individual worker feel part of the operation; he is not involved in the day-to-day mechanism of the company; this system is in existence today. However, it does not achieve the benefits which the member for Maylands is trying to achieve through his motion.

Another form of worker participation is collective bargaining in respect of which the booklet states—

Collective bargaining is a form of worker participation in management which seeks to restrict the rights of management to make decisions affecting the interests of employees. In

some countries the trade union movement takes the view that this is the only way in which worker participation in management can be implemented. They argue that workers through collective bargaining can influence and review decisions of management.

This form of worker participation has been referred to as "participation by pressure group". Through this system workers participate in management from the outside by exerting pressure on management through their elected officials and by way of their own industrial strength.

However their direct participation is somewhat limited since it is generally the elected officials and not the individual workers who negotiate with management at the bargaining table.

So, the unions themselves also let the side down. When the executive of the unions works directly through the executive of the companies, they become the decision makers without proper reference to the rank and file which they are supposed to represent.

Another system is the group bonus and profit-sharing scheme. The booklet states as follows—

Productivity-related bonus or profit sharing schemes depend for their success on favourable labour-management relations.

In addition, such schemes must provide extensive organisation and training so that each employee can perform adequately his accepted part of the activity and can play a role in determining quality and quantity output targets for his group.

The interest and participation of employees in such schemes depends largely on the ability of company management to present financial information to non-supervisory employees in a way that is meaningful and convincing.

Group bonus schemes, however, have the problem that in mass production units there is such a close-meshed interdependence of work groups that freedom of choice for the individual in method and output is hardly practicable.

That also is very true. They have looked at and tried to put into practice many of the systems which seem to find favour with members opposite. I might add that members opposite have referred to these proposals in their speeches.

What type of operation can succeed? The next heading is, "Worker Organisation" which relates to communication and

consultation, which is what I mentioned at the outset that this booklet advocated. The publication states as follows—

This process is one of the few types of worker participation which actually give the employee direct participation in decision making processes. Through "work organisation" the worker is placed in a work situation where he has the opportunity and the responsibility to solve the work problems that directly affect him. The worker is given the opportunity to make decisions within the overall pre-determined production plan, which sets out the quality and quantity of work to be done, and is given the responsibility to decide how this work is to be done.

This system entails extensive delegation of authority by management so that eventually management and supervisory staff become only marginally involved in direct supervision and instead principally perform the functions of co-ordinating and reviewing the work of employees.

Point of Order

Mr BERTRAM: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order. The member has been quoting at great length from a publication and I ask that he table it either now or at the end of his speech.

Mr H. D. Evans: It would be easier to table his speech!

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with previous decisions given by me and former Speakers, I direct that the document in question be tabled with the proviso that it need not be tabled if it contains information of a personal nature. However, the member does not have to table it at this juncture; he may do so at the end of his speech.

Debate Resumed

Mr SODEMAN: I would be delighted to table this booklet for the benefit of members opposite; I could even obtain a number of copies for each member tomorrow, if members cared to see me after my speech.

Mr Barnett: From what are you quoting?

Mr SODEMAN: I mentioned this at the outset, but for those who were not listening—

Mr Bryce: On the contrary, you were mumbling and we did not hear.

Mr SODEMAN: After an interjection like that, I feel it is important to continue. The booklet goes on to state—

This system entails extensive delegation of authority by management so that eventually management and supervisory staff become only marginally involved in direct supervision and

instead principally perform the functions of co-ordinating and reviewing the work of employees.

I repeated that small section because the context of my speech was interrupted by the member for Ascot. The quote continues—

Some degree of communication and consultation between management and employee takes place in every enterprise as a continuous process. For example, many work problems which arise from day to day necessitate face to face discussion between various levels of management and employees or their representatives.

It concludes by stating—

Successful joint consultation demands the exercise of good will, integrity, and communication at all levels of the enterprise, together with an understanding by all involved that the views of employees will be given proper weight . . .

If worker participation in management is to be effective it must involve the individual employee. It must provide the employee with the opportunity to express his views and the right to be consulted on issues which will affect his work and his position within the enterprise. It must also give him the right to make decisions in the performance of his work so that he experiences a sense of participation and self-esteem.

Any form of worker participation which does not satisfy these criteria is only token participation and will not contribute either to the attainment of the aspirations of the employee or to the efficiency and viability of the enterprise.

This sort of thing was not mentioned by the member for Maylands in his dissertation; nor did the member for Swan mention it. What is required is something that does not exist at the moment.

Harmony between the various unions should be fostered and promoted by the companies; and personal relationships at all levels need to be improved.

I put the following to members opposite, who talk about individuals without previous experience becoming members of boards: Would tradesmen accept directions from a labourer or trades assistant? Would the leading hand be expected to take complete direction from the tradesman? Would the supervisor take complete advice from the foreman, and allow him to dictate his activities, and so on?

The point I make is that there should be realistic worker participation on all these levels. It should be carried out effectively and efficiently by people working in their proper slots where they are involved on an individual basis.

I would point out to the member for Ascot who does not seem to have been listening that if a person wants to evolve through these stages he should be allowed to do so. The member for Ascot himself, if rumour has it right, was a teacher, but that does not make him better than a person who has not undergone similar studies or achieved similar qualifications to his. The honourable member expects to be accepted by those he represents. I suggest that other people who evolve through the proper stages in the structure of the company to attain managerial positions in industry or in the Government be paid the same regard as the honourable member is paid.

Mr Bryce: I suggest you visit West Germany to see how worker participation operates. If you do you will find that what happens there is contrary to what you have said.

Mr SODEMAN: I suggest that if the honourable member wants to make a speech he should stand up to do so.

Mr Bryce: This is the first time you have been on your feet this year.

Mr SODEMAN: That is incorrect: West Germany pays regard to the attitude that exists between the rank and file unionists and the hierarchy, as do most individuals in Western Australia.

Because of the disquiet exhibited by the unions themselves, and because the member for Maylands has presented the the House with a presupposing and biased motion, paying little or no regard to past achievements and positive efforts being made by employees and employers to implement a realistic form of worker participation in management, it is my intention to move an amendment to the motion.

Mr Harman: What is your solution?

Amendment to Motion

Mr SODEMAN: I move an amendment—

That all words after the word "should" in line 2 down to and including the word "concerned" in line 6 be deleted and the following words substituted—

continue to actively monitor the various forms of worker participation including those which are the subject of current experimentation in Australia and in other parts of the world.

Mr THOMPSON: I second the motion.

The booklet was laid on the Table of the House.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Because it is a good one?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara to delete all words after the word "should" in line 2.

Mr Bryce: Have we a copy of the amendment?

Apology to Chair

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Ascot to express his apology to the Chair.

Mr BRYCE: I am not certain of the exact type of apology I should proffer. I simply asked whether we had a copy of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should apologise to the Chair for speaking when I was on my feet.

Mr BRYCE: If I have disturbed you, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not qualify the apology. He should just apologise.

Mr BRYCE: I apologise.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The SPEAKER: To continue with the amendment, the member for Pilbara seeks to substitute the following words for the words deleted—

continue to actively monitor the various forms of worker participation including those which are the subject of current experimentation in Australia and in other parts of the world.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [8.20 p.m.]: Worker participation in management has always been a controversial subject, and its desirability and effects have been confused by the fact that parties often have different concepts of the meaning of worker participation in management, as well as different ideas on fears concerning this concept.

This lack of understanding is clearly illustrated in a report that was brought down by a committee in South Australia in 1972. In transmitting that report to the Government the committee had this to say—

While we sense an increasing interest in the subject, much of the current discussion is uninformed and knowledge of the scope and potential of any form of worker participation in management on the part of most boards, managers, trade unions and workers is limited.

I think one of the great weaknesses in any debate on worker participation is the clouding or the lack of understanding of the definition which each person might put to the concept.

At the outset I want to make it perfectly clear that in supporting worker participation I do not support the idea of worker directors on boards, or even worker control. In this respect I am being consistent with what I said in a speech I made in 1971, recorded at page 570 of *Hansard* of that year, under date, the 30th November.

On that occasion I quoted from a series of papers that were prepared in 1971 for a symposium entitled "Participation in

Management" held in February of that year. Among other things, I said—

Early experience in the U.S.A. shows that union management co-operation turned out to be a process by which the leaders gained such a thorough appreciation of the problems of the company that proposals which seemed unreasonable to the rank and file seemed reasonable to the leaders.

So, we have a situation where the worker director on a board might understand a situation and accept it. However, he might not be able to convince the workers that the point he is representing is a valid one. It therefore leads to a conflict between the workers and the worker-director.

Reference has been made by previous speakers to the situation in West Germany concerning co-determination in the steel industry. In the speech which I made in the debate in 1971, I said—

In terms of broader objectivity, participation even at best, has had limited success. It has involved top leaderships far more than rank and file and it has almost ignored lower and middle level of management. It has not brought power and influence to the ordinary worker, nor has it unleashed workers' creativity or even actively involved the leaderships in making production decisions. The division of labour between decision makers and those who carry out decisions has not been abolished. There is little evidence that participation has resulted in workers working harder or even smarter.

I could go on quoting in this light, and say that worker participation in the high levels of management has been a failure.

I also feel that worker participation on what can be termed the shop floor level is a fairly sound proposition; and, of course, many farmers in the course of their activities engage in this type of discussion. They have employees who work with them, rather than for them; and in arriving at decisions they discuss the matters with the workers. Small businessmen are in the same situation. So, quite frequently we have employees talking about "our firm", because they have a feeling of belonging to it as they have been involved in the decision-making process.

I have an example of the success of worker involvement at the lower echelon. This can be illustrated clearly in the situation that existed at Midland Junction Abattoir some eight to 10 years ago when there was much industrial unrest which caused a great deal of anxiety to the farming community.

When Mr Wilson took over as general manager he arranged a form of worker committee, and the management of that establishment met with that committee regularly. I think I am right in saying

that there has been virtually no industrial unrest since that time. This is an example of the success of the lower level of worker involvement.

That contention has been borne out by the experience in South Australia. I quote from a report by Mr L. B. Bowes on worker participation in management in South Australia—

Consistently, companies from the private sector that have decided to endeavour to involve their workers have looked for shop floor developments; it is in this area that they have perceived maximum advantages to both individuals and the organization. Invariably organizations that have decided to initiate these changes are those in which industrial relations and safety performance are both already above average, and the involvement of workers at shop floor level is a continuing reflection of their interest in the well-being of their staff.

That gives further support to the success of worker involvement at the shop floor level.

I know the member for Pilbara quoted extensively from a publication issued by the Central Industrial Secretariat of the Australian Council of Employers' Federations.

Mr Harman: That made up three-quarters of his speech!

Mr STEPHENS: I am not concerned about how much of his speech was taken up by those quotes. It is interesting to note that this organisation, which can be described fairly as representing the employers, has put out the publication. One of the points made in the publication is—

Encouraging management to implement techniques of communication and consultation within the enterprise.

In support of the contention that the most successful form of worker participation is at the shop floor level, the publication had this to say—

If worker participation in management is to be effective it must involve the individual employee. It must provide the employee with the opportunity to express his views and the right to be consulted on issues which will affect his work and his position within the enterprise. It must also give him the right to make decisions in the performance of his work so that he experiences a sense of participation and self-esteem.

This is one of the prime reasons for advocating worker participation in management. At that level I think I have demonstrated it has the support of the employers' organisations.

In his speech the other night the Minister for Labour and Industry indicated that his department was following the

concept of worker participation in management and everyone in his department was involved in it.

I am also aware that at the ANZUS conference in Tasmania the Federal Minister for Labor indicated that while he opposed the statutory implementation of worker participation in management he would do everything possible to encourage its voluntary introduction. I would support that contention. It is not an area in which we should legislate in order to direct people or companies to become involved in worker participation in management. However, I do agree we could have the situation where encouragement should be given for such a process to be effective, and to be effective I think motivation should come from within the firms affected and from the employees affected.

I do not altogether agree with the amendment proposed by the member for Pilbara. I do not think it will do anything to improve the original motion. It is more or less repeating what the Minister said recently: The facilities are already available.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr STEPHENS: Because of that I feel we should have a situation whereby within the department there are some specialised officers who can handle adequately inquiries which may come in, and give advice as required.

I make the analogy that not all the scientific officers employed by the Department of Agriculture could handle every inquiry made to that department. I think the same situation pertains in the Department of Labour and Industry.

From the debate which has taken place it is quite evident that worker participation in management covers a very big field and it is one which should involve a specialist approach. For that reason, I do not agree with the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara and I propose to move to further amend his amendment.

Amendment on the Amendment

Mr STEPHENS: I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting the word "should" with a view to substituting the word "establish".

I presume I will be permitted to explain what I have in mind. If my amendment on the amendment is successful it will have the effect of deleting all words after the word "Government". It is my intention then to move for the insertion of the following words—

within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide, upon request by both parties, information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That is very weak.

Mr STEPHENS: Well, it may be very weak as far as the member opposite is concerned but I feel that the situation will be improved as a result of my amendment.

I think the original motion goes a little too far and may easily be misconstrued. Some people may support the idea of worker-controlled industry and director-controlled industry but I am opposed to that. I do support the idea of worker participation at shop floor level and I think that could be brought about adequately as a result of my amendment.

Mr COWAN: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: Has the member copies of the amendment?

[A copy of the amendment was handed to the Speaker.]

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling has moved an amendment on the amendment which has been seconded. His amendment is to delete all words after the word "establish".

Mr STEPHENS: If I may explain, Mr Speaker, the amendment which I have handed to you was prepared before the member for Pilbara moved his amendment. At this stage my amendment is to delete the word "should" with a view to inserting the word "establish".

The SPEAKER: Then I ask the member to take this amendment back, correct it, and sign it please.

[The amendment was corrected.]

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling has moved to further amend the amendment of the member for Pilbara by deleting the word "should" with a view to inserting other words. The question is that the amendment on the amendment be agreed to.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [8.37 p.m.]: I would dearly appreciate a copy of the precise wording of the amendment, and the most recent amendment to that wording.

Sir Charles Court: So would I.

The SPEAKER: I must say I found it somewhat difficult to get a copy myself.

Mr BRYCE: Finding myself in the same position I can thoroughly appreciate your difficulty, Mr Speaker.

The viewpoint I would like to express, having heard the remarks of the member for Pilbara, is that it seemed to me very much that he devoted his time to speaking to his amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk is trying to get a copy of the amendment for the member. Will the member resume his seat? I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 8.38 to 8.46 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I trust that members who wish to have the amendment now have it before them. For greater clarity I indicate that the amendment is to delete the word "should" with a view to inserting another word.

In order that the debate may have meaning, members would have to pay some regard to the value of the word to be struck out and the word proposed to be inserted by the member for Stirling. I do not want the debate to be wide-ranging on the first topic. The member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: The amendment which is now very clearly before the House is spelt out in these very precise words—

That in the opinion of this House the Government immediately establish within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide upon request by both parties information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

That means we have three clear alternatives. The motion moved by the member for Maylands suggested that in the opinion of this House a workers participation research and advisory unit be established to examine all aspects of this question. The member for Pilbara then moved an amendment which is quite meaningless as far as this question is concerned. It is a completely negative amendment which proposes the deletion of all meaning from the substance of the question which was before the House. In fact, the member for Pilbara spent considerable time condemning all the forms of worker participation which have been experimented with in most parts of the Western world.

Mr Sodeman: That is not true.

Mr BRYCE: I am very sorry that at this stage of the debate I am unable to obtain a copy of the document which was tabled by the member for Pilbara, which is in the possession of the *Hansard* reporters. I do not complain about that but I believe for the sake of debate by members on this side of the House it would have facilitated debate had we been able to see the document.

Tabling of Paper

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Ascot please resume his seat? I would like the member for Pilbara to advise me about the document he said he wanted to table at the conclusion of his speech.

Mr SODEMAN: The paper under discussion was so tabled and I think the *Hansard* reporters have taken it to have it copied.

The SPEAKER: I neglected to say the paper has been tabled. I do so now.

Debate (on amendment on the amendment) Resumed

Mr BRYCE: There are three proposals before the House: a proposition for the establishment of a workers participation

research and advisory unit, a proposal moved by the member for Pilbara that such a unit be not established and that the Government simply monitor what happens, and the proposal moved by the member for Stirling that there be established within the Department of Labour and Industry a specialist section to provide upon request by both parties information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

The point I would like to emphasise is that the member for Pilbara rose in his place during this debate and in effect ridiculed and condemned worker participation.

Mr Sodeman: No. That is totally untrue.

Mr BRYCE: He read at great length, with much tolerance from this side of the House, a description of a whole series of different forms of worker participation. He pointed out to us that the concept was impractical and it did not work to have worker representatives in a decision-making capacity on the boards of industry.

Mr Sodeman: And I mentioned why.

Mr BRYCE: He put forward an argument to suggest why it did not work.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member resume his seat? I advise again that while reference can be made to the first amendment and the original motion, they cannot be debated *per se*. They can be referred to for purposes of comparison but the question before us is the amendment moved by the member for Stirling. So I ask the member for Ascot and subsequent speakers to have regard for this. I do not want the debate to generate into a wide-ranging discussion of the three issues.

Mr BRYCE: The point I was making is—

The SPEAKER: I know the point you were making.

Mr BRYCE: —in a comparative context the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara was certainly a pious attempt on the part of the Government to suggest there should be no serious consideration of this question.

Mr Sodeman: Untrue again.

Mr BRYCE: In my view, the amendment moved by the member for Stirling put a very serious suggestion to this House that, far from simply monitoring developments in this country and other countries in respect of worker participation, as suggested by the member for Pilbara, in fact something substantial, meaningful, worth while, sincere, and serious should be done. There is a degree of difference because, after all, we are being asked to consider these two amendments before we vote on a very important question.

The amendment moved by the member for Stirling has made a very sensible point; namely, that a specialist section should be established in the Department of Labour and Industry so that upon request by both parties—and I assume he means employers and employees—information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation can be provided. I am happy to support that proposition because I find only a qualitative difference between that and the establishment of a research or advisory unit.

Two and a half years ago I had the privilege of visiting West Germany and a number of other European countries where a great deal of effort has been applied to the question of worker participation. Those countries have economies which are world renowned for industrial peace and productivity, certainly in the context of a comparison with all European economic systems. I had the privilege of attending some of the worker universities in Dusseldorf and Frankfurt where, contrary to the thinking of the member for Pilbara, it is possible to prepare members of the work force from the shop floor for the job of participating in decision-making around the board table without their being ostracised by their fellow workers in the manner he suggested was inevitable.

Mr Sodeman: I did not suggest that. I quoted unionists and people in the Labor Party as having said that.

Mr BRYCE: The impression I gained was that the authority he quoted certainly derided worker participation on those grounds. The point I make is that it is important that this State be not found wanting or lagging behind the rest of Australia, and certainly not behind the rest of the western world.

If we were to accept the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara, nothing would happen; and that is a typical conservative stunt or move on this kind of question—an attempt to do nothing but simply to monitor. Who will do the monitoring? Who will see the monitoring is done? What form of assessment will be made of the monitoring afterwards? Nobody will ever know. It is a perfect excuse for doing nothing.

However, the propositions moved by the member for Maylands and the member for Stirling recognise that something meaningful and significant should be done, and as far as I am concerned the two constructive suggestions are preferable to the inaction proposed by the member for Pilbara. I therefore advise members of the House that the amendment moved by the member for Stirling and the motion moved by the member for Maylands are equally acceptable to me.

In order that there may be no doubt in our minds, I reiterate that the two clear options, if we want to do something constructive, are to weigh up the alternatives

of establishing a specialist section within the Department of Labour and Industry to provide upon request by both parties information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation, and the establishment of a workers participation research and advisory unit. Both of these propositions recognise that it is necessary to do something constructive and positive, and I urge members of this House to do something constructive in regard to this question and support either of those two measures.

Adjournment of Debate

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [9.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment of debate) put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Nanovich	Mr Young
Mr Old	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Cowan	Mr McPharlin
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Stephens
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr O'Connor	Mr B. T. Burke
Dr Dadour	Mr T. J. Burke
Mr Sibson	Mr May
Mr Coyne	Mr J. T. Tonkin

Motion thus negatived.

Debate (on amendment on the amendment) Resumed

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [9.03 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now divide.

Point of Order

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, could I obtain clarification of this motion? What is the question you are about to put?

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the Chair is the amendment moved by the member for Stirling, and the member for Boulder-Dundas has moved the gag motion.

Debate (on amendment on the amendment) Resumed

Motion (that the House do now divide) put.

The **SPEAKER**: I may have inadvertently given wrong information to the Premier arising out of a question he asked.

The question before the House is the gag motion "That the House do now divide". If the motion is carried, the question before the House will be the amendment moved by the member for Stirling.

Division resulted as follows—

Ayes—21

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Cowan	Mr McPharlin
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Stephens
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Nanovich	Mr Young
Mr Old	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr T. J. Burke	Dr Dadour
Mr May	Mr Coyne
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Sibson

Motion (that the House do now divide) thus passed.

Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—21

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Cowan	Mr McPharlin
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Stephens
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Neill
Sir Charles Court	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Nanovich	Mr Young
Mr Old	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr T. J. Burke	Dr Dadour
Mr May	Mr Coyne
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Sibson

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [9.14 p.m.]: I move—

Insert in lieu of the word deleted the word "establish".

Mr COWAN: I second the motion.

Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—21

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Cowan	Mr McPharlin
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Stephens
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Neill
Mr Charles Court	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Nanovich	Mr Young
Mr Old	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr T. J. Burke	Dr Dadour
Mr May	Mr Coyne
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Sibson

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [9.18 p.m.]: I move—

Insert after the word "establish" the following words—

within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide, upon request by both parties, information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

I do not think I need elaborate on the reason for this.

Mr COWAN: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: The amendment that should be moved by the member for Stirling is to delete all words after the word "establish". He has succeeded so far but he must now delete the words that were in the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara.

Mr STEPHENS: I move—

Delete all words after the word "establish".

Mr COWAN: I second the motion.

Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—21

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Cowan	Mr McPharlin
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Mr Davies	Mr Stephens
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr Fletcher	

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie	Mr Old
Mr Charles Court	Mr O'Neill
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Dr Dadour	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Mensaros	Mr Young
Mr Nanovich	Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Watt
Mr May	Mr Coyne
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Sibson

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [9.25 p.m.]: I move—

Insert in lieu of the words deleted the following words—

within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide, upon request by both parties, information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

Mr COWAN: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [9.26 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

Point of Order

Mr JAMIESON: I raise a point of order. My point of order is that a division on the motion "that the House do now divide" having been taken, Standing Order 159 very clearly indicates—

If the motion "that the House do now divide" be carried, the House shall now vote on the question before it without further debate or amendment;

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is perfectly correct, but he will remember that the question before the House at that time was taken without debate.

Mr Jamieson: Without further debate or amendment.

The SPEAKER: Not the question before us at present. The motion before the Chair at that time was taken.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I rise on a point of clarification. Mr Speaker, you indicated to the House that the question before the House was the amendment on the amendment moved by the member for Stirling. As I understand it, this is still part of that question on which debate cannot continue.

The SPEAKER: As I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition, the motion before the Chair at that time was taken to

a division without debate. It was part of the whole machinery for arriving at the question before the House at present.

Mr Hartrey: Can I move now that the question be put?

The SPEAKER: The Minister has been given the call.

Debate (on amendment on the amendment) Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: I suggest that at this rather late stage this whole debate has been in the nature of a fizzog.

Mr Bertram: The Government has been fizzed out!

Mr GRAYDEN: It is quite obvious that the Opposition does not understand.

Mr Moller: You sound as silly as your leader when you say that.

Sir Charles Court: He will take you for a first-class ride.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is exactly the situation: The members of the Opposition do not realise how they have been taken for a ride and how they have wasted the time of this Parliament when we could have been making some progress with legislation of consequence to the people of this State.

This debate commenced last week. We spent several hours on it on the last private members' day and we have been debating it since approximately five o'clock today.

Mr Skidmore: You sit down now and we will get on with the business.

Mr GRAYDEN: We debated it last Wednesday, we have debated it today and what have we come up with?

Mr T. H. Jones: Something the Government does not like.

Mr GRAYDEN: I suggest to the member for Collie that he obviously has not been following the debate. He does not know what has taken place or what is going to take place; otherwise he certainly would not make an interjection of that kind. I shall tell the member for Collie what is going to be inserted in the Act.

Opposition members: What Act?

Mr GRAYDEN: I should have said "the motion".

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Skidmore: Let us listen to the pearls of wisdom.

Mr GRAYDEN: The words it is proposed to insert are—

within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide, upon request by both parties, information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

That is precisely the situation which obtains in the Department of Labour and Industry at this moment.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: After several hours of debate—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister please resume his seat?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call members to order. I do not want shouting across the Chamber. The Minister.

Mr GRAYDEN: After several hours of debate last week—

Mr T. H. Jones: You took up a fair bit of time.

Mr GRAYDEN: —and several hours tonight, we are back to the situation which obtains in the department at the present time.

Mr T. H. Jones: Rubbish!

Mr Bertram: Will you name the members?

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Mt. Hawthorn asks me to name the members.

Mr Hartrey: Why did you vote against it?

Mr GRAYDEN: Because it will be recalled that last week I endeavoured to outline the situation in the department. I mentioned at that time that two years ago I asked the department whether it felt it was desirable to establish some sort of committee within the department actively to monitor worker participation schemes throughout Australia and the rest of the world and if anything of consequence was gleaned to encourage and promote that type of worker participation. No arguments of consequence were submitted so we did not pursue it. That was two years ago. We did not pursue the matter because there were certain officers within the department at that time—two years ago—charged with the very task of monitoring worker participation schemes and also charged—

Mr Bertram: That was an unfortunate slip.

Mr GRAYDEN: —with the task of making that information and advice available on a voluntary basis to anyone who sought it. That is the extraordinary thing. Two years ago this took place in the Department of Labour and Industry.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn refers to an unfortunate slip. I do not know what he means.

Mr Bertram: You know what I mean.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Mt. Hawthorn asked me who the officers were and I am about to tell him, so I trust he will listen attentively.

Mr Bertram: They are monitoring, are they not?

Mr GRAYDEN: The people charged with the task about which we are speaking are the under-secretary (Mr H. A. Jones)—

Mr Davies: He would be on it anyway.

Mr GRAYDEN: —the Assistant Under-Secretary of the Department of Labour and Industry (Mr B. R. Colcutt), the administrative officer (Mr J. A. Campbell), and in the research division there are five officers.

Mr Bertram: Five monitors.

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes. They were the ones doing the monitoring.

Mr Bertram: That was a bad slip.

Mr GRAYDEN: So we have eight officers in the department charged with the task to which we are referring, and yet now what is proposed is the insertion in the motion of the words—

within the Department of Labour a specialist section to provide, upon request by both parties, information and advice on the voluntary introduction of worker participation.

Would there be in the department more qualified individuals than those to whom I have referred; that is, the under-secretary, the assistant under-secretary, the administrative officer, and five research officers? Can anyone in the Opposition suggest someone in the department who should be on the list and is not?

Mr Davies: Yes. How many do you say were on the research?

Mr GRAYDEN: There are eight including five research officers.

Mr Davies: Your classification list shows there are only three classifications in the research section—a research officer, a librarian assistant, and another librarian assistant. Now you say there are five. You do not know who is in your department.

Mr GRAYDEN: The honourable member is behind the times. I will go a step further and give the member for Victoria Park the telephone number of the under-secretary. It is 87 1298. He can ring him to confirm the situation.

Mr Davies: You can tell him he doesn't know.

Mr GRAYDEN: If we went through the personnel of the department with a fine-tooth comb for one week or three weeks, we would not come up with any other names of individuals who should be in the group charged already with this task.

Mr Skidmore: It is the fourth time you have said that.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is extraordinary that with the session ending tomorrow, on the two last private members' days we have devoted virtually all the time to a discussion of worker participation.

Mr T. H. Jones: That is not the Government's worry.

Mr GRAYDEN: We have spent all day today on it to the exclusion of discussion on many other problems of consequence in Western Australia.

Mr T. H. Jones: That is the Opposition's worry.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Opposition has made no attempt to discuss other subjects. It has dwelt on this particular one and reached the stage where we are simply verifying what the Government has already done—not only what it has done, but what it did two years ago. In those circumstances I say the whole exercise has been an extraordinary fizzog.

Mr Bertram: I'll say.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is unbelievable to me that in the closing days of a part of a session, when there are so many items of consequence to debate—

Mr Harman: Why not sit down and shut up then?

Mr GRAYDEN: —the Opposition is wasting the time of the Government in this way.

Mr Bertram: Wasting time?

Mr GRAYDEN: The Labor Party entered the debate, quite oblivious of what the Government was doing. The Labor Party has hibernated on the subject of worker participation for two years and is completely unaware of what the Government has done.

Mr Davies: You forgot to mention it last week.

Mr GRAYDEN: Now it is grasping at an amendment of this kind and is supporting it gleefully thinking it is achieving something. Goodness gracious me.

Mr Bertram: What a performance this is.

Mr GRAYDEN: The situation is so farcical and a fizzog of such dimensions that it is simply not worth wasting the time of the House by talking any further on the subject. I simply say that—

Mr Bertram: You will support it?

Mr GRAYDEN: —I deplore what the Opposition has done in wasting time in this way. It is lamentable that the Opposition can find nothing more important to do than unnecessarily waste time by inserting into a motion words of this kind when, in fact, the Government has been doing what it is being requested to do—and much more of course—for over two years.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas)
[9.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now divide.

Motion (that the House do now divide) put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—22

Mr Barnett
Mr Bateman
Mr Bertram
Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Davies
Mr H. D. Evans
Mr T. D. Evans
Mr Fletcher

Mr Harman
Mr Hartrey
Mr Jamieson
Mr T. H. Jones
Mr McIver
Mr McPharlin
Mr Skidmore
Mr Stephens
Mr Taylor
Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Moller

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie
Sir Charles Court
Mrs Craig
Dr Dadour
Mr Grayden
Mr Grewar
Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Laurance
Mr Mensaros
Mr Nanovich

Mr Old
Mr O'Neill
Mr Ridge
Mr Rushton
Mr Shalders
Mr Sodeman
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Young
Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr B. T. Burke
Mr T. J. Burke
Mr May
Mr J. T. Tonkin

Noes

Mr O'Connor
Mr Watt
Mr Coyne
Mr Sibson

Motion (that the House do now divide) thus passed.

The SPEAKER: Without debate I will now put the question that the words to be inserted be inserted.

Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—22

Mr Barnett
Mr Bateman
Mr Bertram
Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Davies
Mr H. D. Evans
Mr T. D. Evans
Mr Fletcher

Mr Harman
Mr Hartrey
Mr Jamieson
Mr T. H. Jones
Mr McIver
Mr McPharlin
Mr Skidmore
Mr Stephens
Mr Taylor
Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Moller

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr Blaikie
Sir Charles Court
Mrs Craig
Dr Dadour
Mr Grayden
Mr Grewar
Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Laurance
Mr Mensaros
Mr Nanovich

Mr Old
Mr O'Neill
Mr Ridge
Mr Rushton
Mr Shalders
Mr Sodeman
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Young
Mr Clarko

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr B. T. Burke
Mr T. J. Burke
Mr May
Mr J. T. Tonkin

Noes

Mr O'Connor
Mr Watt
Mr Coyne
Mr Sibson

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

Debate (on motion as amended) Resumed
Motion, as amended, put and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th May.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [9.46 p.m.]: I commence—

Mr Skidmore: The accents of a stirring speech!

Mr RUSHTON: —by agreeing with these words which are contained in the second reading speech—

Local government is a vital part of our community organisation.

Those are about the only words I will agree with. Like the episode we have just witnessed, this Bill is just another gimmick and we must suffer it. The Bill has been designed to further the objective of the Labor Party to take over local government.

Mr Bertram: And of the people.

Mr RUSHTON: It includes some very undemocratic proposals.

Mr Taylor: Like giving everybody a vote?

Mr RUSHTON: It takes the vote away from them, actually. It includes a number of contradictory and anomalous statements, and it is a package which is unacceptable to local government and to the Government.

Mr Bertram: What about the people?

Mr Taylor: We represent people, not the Government.

Mr RUSHTON: The Government represents the people.

Mr Taylor: Does it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want a running fire of interjections from various parts of the House.

Mr RUSHTON: I will mention only a few of the inaccuracies and anomalies in the Bill, which are reason enough for its rejection. There are many of them but I will list just a few which contradict the intentions of the member who introduced the Bill.

Mr Bertram: Will you move amendments?

Mr RUSHTON: The member who introduced the Bill said it was designed to bring the electoral system of all tiers of government into line. However, in proposing to grant the franchise to all residents of the district, there is no qualifying period of residence specified, so that apparently it would be possible for a person to be enrolled in a district at any time, except within 29 days of an election,

if he were to take up residence in a district. This, I believe, differs from the requirement for enrolment under other legislation.

Section 101 which requires the form of the ballot paper to be printed in the form of the tenth schedule to the Act has not been amended. Without such an amendment, the ballot paper prescribed will require the voter to mark his preferences by numerals and provides, in large type, that the voter is not to place a cross in a square.

Mr Taylor: So you reject the principle, not the detail?

Mr RUSHTON: I am dealing with the anomalies.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You have the numbers to carry amendments.

Mr Bertram: You are not dinkum.

Mr RUSHTON: The Bill is not worth considering. We should just put the question and have it thrown out.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: The principle is the important thing.

Mr RUSHTON: I will come to the principle, if there is any in this Bill. It is just subterfuge and camouflage.

This Government considers that a cross is a most unsatisfactory form of recording a preference. A cross has a negative connotation and many people would regard such a symbol as recording opposition to the candidate against whose name it is placed.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Are your amendments on the notice paper?

Mr RUSHTON: The proposed amendment to section 46 relates to the preparation of electoral rolls. Whilst requiring the deletion of the particulars of the situation, description, and valuation of the ratable property occupied or owned by the elector, it nevertheless has the effect of retaining the prescribed form of the roll as set out in the fifth schedule. The fifth schedule provides for the description of the land and the number of votes to which each elector is entitled to be recorded.

The honourable member did not have the legislation prepared very carefully. He only wanted a vehicle in which to propound some of the philosophies of the Labor Party.

Mr Taylor: He wanted to put forward a principle.

Mr Bertram: You are attacking the Parliamentary Draftsman.

Mr RUSHTON: The colleague of the member for Mt. Hawthorn said the Opposition just wanted to put forward a principle.

Mr Taylor: We wanted a decision on the principle, not on the detail.

Mr RUSHTON: We will have a decision on the principle in due course. In the proposal to repeal section 120 of the Act, which at present prescribes the system to be used as preferential, and substitute a description of the first-past-the-post system, it appears that some conflict has been created with the proposed new section 127. In the new section 120, the description of the first-past-the-post system requires a candidate to whom "the majority of votes have been given" to be declared elected. This does not appear to be consistent with the proposed section 127, which requires the returning officer to declare the person elected as the candidate in whose favour the greater number of votes is counted.

Mr Taylor: Could you advise me whether the detail you are reading is the opinion of your department or the Crown Law Department?

Mr RUSHTON: It is the opinion of my department and myself. Clearly a majority of votes is unlikely to be gained by a candidate in all circumstances, particularly where there is a large number of candidates for a vacancy.

There are many more anomalies. In fact, the provision relating to loan polls would create a ridiculous situation.

Mr Taylor: Would you explain why?

Mr RUSHTON: There are so many contradictions. One cancels out the other and the Bill would result in total confusion.

Mr Taylor: There is a contradiction now with respect to loan polls in that only certain ratepayers can vote.

Mr RUSHTON: The contradictions are in the Bill we have before us. It is so loosely prepared that it will not do what the honourable member said it would do. One proposition cancels out the other.

Mr Taylor: If we amend the detail will you agree to the Bill?

Mr RUSHTON: No. I will continue with the facts.

Mr Taylor: We will test you by making the relevant amendments.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition tried this previously and is now making another attempt. Mention was made of what the Whitlam Government did for local government. What that Government did for local government in Western Australia was to bring it very nearly to its knees and destroy it. It had local authorities so apprehensive that they were struggling for life. Since the 13th December the scene has completely changed and local authorities can now have some confidence. They can hold their heads high and look forward to federalism.

For the benefit of the member who introduced the Bill, I advise that a review is taking place of part IV of the Act,

which contains the electoral provisions. A serious review of this part of the Act is being undertaken by departmental officers and local government representatives, and their report will come forward in due course. One of the most serious matters is that of absentee voting. This is one of the items which will come forward, and it is as well for members to remember that. I trust they will also note that the review is being undertaken in consultation and in conjunction with representatives of local government, whereas this Bill seeks to impose something on local authorities without consulting them.

Mr Taylor: Local government is the child of the States, is it not?

Mr RUSHTON: One moment members of the Opposition are talking about the glory of local government, and the next moment they are trying to destroy it. It is suggested adult franchise should be introduced.

Mr Taylor: How will that destroy local government?

Mr Moiler: Explain why it should not be introduced.

Mr RUSHTON: I will if members opposite will be patient. We listened to them quietly. Adult franchise, of course, has no relationship to the responsibility of ratepayers.

Mr Moiler: Rubbish!

Mr RUSHTON: Just think of what happens in a loan poll.

Mr Moiler: In which only ratepayers can vote. What are you talking about? You do not know the Local Government Act if you are talking about polls.

Mr RUSHTON: We are talking about adult franchise, where people will be having a vote in everything that goes on.

Mr Jamieson: Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr RUSHTON: There is when one does not have any responsibility for paying for what one does.

Mr Jamieson: Each child who buys a lolly from a shop has a responsibility.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition is propounding a philosophy which is not acceptable to the people who have the responsibility. Only a proportion of the funds are obtained by way of taxes other than from ratepayers. When it reaches the stage that quite a substantial sum is coming from all taxpayers, that is the time this proposal should be considered; not before.

Mr Taylor: What percentage is it now?

Mr RUSHTON: Another matter mentioned in the honourable member's second reading speech is multiple voting, which is described as an evil and one of the most serious matters which have to be considered. The matter is being considered in the total review, but at this point of time, the disparity is practically

nonexistent because with inflation and changing values everybody has basically the same voting strength.

Mr Taylor: How many will vote eight times?

Mr RUSHTON: We are talking about ordinary voting in an ordinary poll. Preferential voting is perhaps the most serious matter, and the Labor Party is attempting to substitute the first-past-the-post system and deprive groups of less influential people of a fair go. It is seeking the election of minority governments which give no security. This is what is provided for in the Bill. It is suggested that a person who receives, say, 35 per cent of the vote in a four-man or four-woman election—a little over one-third of the votes—should be elected when his opponents have received 25 per cent, 21 per cent, and 19 per cent of the votes respectively. Therefore, 65 per cent of the votes are thrown out in favour of a person who receives 35 per cent of the votes. For that reason first-past-the-post voting is not acceptable.

Mr Taylor: It works in reverse, too.

Mr RUSHTON: The person who has the majority should win the election.

Mr Taylor: The firsts, seconds, thirds, fourths, and upwards.

Mr RUSHTON: It is just political trickery in an attempt to give power to a minority. This has happened before and has brought instability in other countries. It is one of the strengths of our nation that it has security through majority government. This is just another of the tricks embodied in the Bill.

Mr Young: It is getting a lot of support from the Opposition!

Mr RUSHTON: The Bill would destroy local government, and in fact, the Labor Party is attempting to impose its political dictates on local government without consultation. It is in absolute contrast to the feelings of members on this side of the House because the philosophy of the coalition Government is for consultation with local government as against the Opposition which wants to impose its will without consultation.

Mr Taylor: Your philosophy is the status quo!

Mr RUSHTON: This illustrates very clearly the difference in our philosophies. I am proud to say that we do consult, and we have regard for the views of local government. I know local government appreciates this, and that certainly it does not appreciate the attempt firstly by the Whitlam Government and then by all its appendages to impose upon local government an ideology which is not acceptable to it. I can say that local government thanks its lucky stars

that the Whitlam Government was defeated and that it now has a Federal Government which consults with it.

Mr Moiler: Gives it no money!

Mr RUSHTON: The present Federal Government is introducing a financial structure that local government has asked for—it has asked for this system of tax sharing.

Mr Davies: They are not getting the money.

Mr RUSHTON: Do not say too much, because in a little while members opposite will see that the Federal Government has been very active in working towards this commitment. I am proud to say that local government in this State has consulted frequently with myself and other officers of the department. In the not-too-distant future we will be bringing forward a tax-sharing system which I know local authorities will be very pleased about. So, it is timely that I should tell the House—

Mr Moiler drew attention to the state of the House.

Sir Charles Court: It is your Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Moiler: It is your Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I find a quorum present. The Minister for Local Government.

Sir Charles Court: Private members' day!

Mr Davies: You tried to adjourn the House before—it was our day; do not forget that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: You tried to adjourn the debate.

Mr Davies: It is no good—you are not in the Army here!

Mr RUSHTON: I said this was a Bill we should not be debating and apparently members opposite are so serious about it that they have all gone off to another place. That shows their respect for local government.

Sir Charles Court: They have built up to six now.

Mr Davies: The chambermaid is on her feet!

Mr RUSHTON: This shows the regard of the Opposition for local government. It has not consulted with local government, but it wishes to impose its ideology upon it and to regionalise it and centralise it in Canberra. The Opposition could not care less.

Mr T. H. Jones: What happens after the next Budget? We will then see what local government thinks of the Federal Government.

Mr RUSHTON: The honourable member will eat his words in due course.

Mr T. H. Jones: Wait until the Premiers' Conference.

Sir Charles Court: Did you not see the allocation to local government?

Mr RUSHTON: We should reject this legislation because it is designed to impose Labor Party philosophy upon local government, without consultation, and obviously against the will of the majority of local government councillors. The measure is designed also to take away the democratic preferential voting system and replace it with a first-past-the-post system, a system designed to remove the voice of minorities or less influential people.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Do you have to read it all?

Mr RUSHTON: I think it is reasonable that I should put forward points of impact. I am not reading at length, and I have not done so.

I ask the House to reject the Bill also because it is full of imperfections which would not be in the interests of local government.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: You amend it—you have the numbers.

Mr RUSHTON: I have no intention of amending this Bill. It is purely a Labor Party camouflage.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Giving a vote to every person?

Mr RUSHTON: It does not give a vote to every person. It takes away the autonomy of local government, which we respect.

Mr Hartrey: What autonomy?

Mr A. R. Tonkin: What are you talking about?

Mr RUSHTON: If legislation of this type were passed, it would enable the Labor movement to perpetuate its intentions upon local government. It would seek to remove local government and replace it with regions.

Mr Taylor: What rubbish!

Mr RUSHTON: Once the regions are established, the Labor Party would draw finance from them and take the powers back to Canberra.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Is that in the Bill?

Mr RUSHTON: This measure is a camouflage to take over local government. It is a vehicle to provide for the dominance of minorities and less influential people.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Oh, read the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want repetitive interjections.

Mr RUSHTON: The fact that local government has not been consulted by the member demonstrates the true colour and intention of the Labor Party. This is the really dramatic fact. The Labor Party is

prepared to bring forward legislation like this, which is somewhat insulting to local government.

Mr Bertram: Tell us how?

Mr RUSHTON: Local government is grass roots government. On the one hand, Opposition members are talking about the measure enhancing local government, but they are not even prepared to talk to local government about it.

Mr Taylor: I agree I did not circulate the Bill, but have you circulated it to get a reaction?

Mr RUSHTON: I have had a reaction from local government.

Mr Taylor: I asked you whether you circulated the Bill.

Mr RUSHTON: I would not circulate this.

Mr Taylor: You are as much to blame as I am.

Mr RUSHTON: I have circulated this to people close to me and they have given an opinion. However, I would not send this rubbish to 138 local authorities to get their opinions. They would think I had become half-witted to send this out.

Mr Bertram: How could they think that?

Mr RUSHTON: The legislation shows no concern for the ratepayers. Obviously, there is no concern for the people. In fact, the legislation is an insult to local government.

Mr Bertram: Are you talking to Parliament or to the Press?

Mr Taylor: It gives a vote to everyone.

Mr RUSHTON: It relies on camouflage to take away their powers.

Mr Moiler: Take away whose powers?

Mr Taylor: How can it?

Mr RUSHTON: Let me describe it to members opposite. If this measure were passed, the Labor Party would have its members placed in local government as minority groups. We would not have those elected representing a majority, but rather a minority. That is the way the Labor Party works best.

Mr Taylor: With universal suffrage?

Mr RUSHTON: The Labor Party can work the minority system very well—it is expert at it.

Mr Taylor: I know who controls it now.

Mr RUSHTON: Thank Heavens in Australia we have a preferential voting system that allows majorities to be elected. The Whitlam Government acted to remove local government and centralise everything in Canberra. The autonomy of local government is in fact one of its greatest values. It enables

decentralisation of power. This is something we on this side of the House treasure because it allows people to have a voice in local communities.

Mr Taylor: Which people?

Mr RUSHTON: The people of those communities.

Mr Taylor: That is what we want—all the people to have a voice.

Mr RUSHTON: No, the Opposition does not want that. First-past-the-post voting would allow the election of minority groups, and by its connection through the party machine, the Labor Party would dominate local government. That is its whole objective.

Mr Taylor: What about the present system with absentee landlords and businesses?

Mr RUSHTON: The idea is to cut down the number of local authorities, and after a while finance would be withdrawn from the local authorities or regions and the job would be completed.

Mr Moiler: What percentage of the population voted in last Saturday's local government elections?

Mr RUSHTON: Quite a good percentage.

Mr Moiler: What percentage of the population voted? You would not know—it was less than 30 per cent.

Mr Taylor: Less than 20 per cent.

Mr Moiler: Is this a minority group?

Mr RUSHTON: Last Saturday's voting was conducted on a free and voluntary basis. Free people went to the polls to elect people to administer their area. I am very proud of this, because it is important to us. As long as we have free elections and local government, the Federal centralist policies of Labor will not take over this country.

Mr Davies: Why doesn't your Premier sit you down?

Mr RUSHTON: It is amazing how the rumblings come from the member for Victoria Park. I imagine that he would support this Bill, and that this would be his ideology.

Mr Davies: We believe in a fair go, which is more than I can say for you.

Mr RUSHTON: The honourable member's idea of a fair go is to elect minorities and not to give a person with too much influence a fair go. I ask the House to reject this legislation enthusiastically because it aims to destroy local government, to take away the rights of the small person to maintain his vote and to dominate the individual and take away from him a principle which is very dear to the Government—that of local autonomous administrations.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [10.11 p.m.]: I wish to address myself for a few moments to certain aspects of the Bill before the House. I am sure members will be delighted to hear that I do not intend to speak for a great length of time.

Mr Thompson: Hear, hear!

Mr HARTREY: Thank you. I refer firstly to clause 2 of the Bill, which proposes to repeal and re-enact section 45 of the principal Act, and provides that the qualifications of a voter in a local government election shall be the following—

- (a) he has attained the age of eighteen years;

I have no objection, so far. Clause 2 continues—

- (b) he is a natural born or naturalised British subject;

I should think that is a very reasonable qualification—

- (c) he resides in the district of the municipality and is on the electoral roll compiled under the provisions of the Electoral Act, 1907.

In other words, he must be entitled to have a vote for the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of this State.

Some 150 years ago, there was a very sacred idea that only people with a stake in the country should have a word to say about the running of that country; only people of wealth and means should have a say.

In the third or fourth year of her reign, Queen Victoria wrote to Lord Melbourne and said that great care must be exercised that voting was not conferred upon mere numbers, and that pecuniary interests must be represented. In other words, big money interests were the controlling factors and only they were to say who should represent them in the House of Commons—and, of course, automatically in the House of Lords. They were given a say not because of their intellectual capacity or moral worth or because they may have had any special experience in the process of government; their wealth was the deciding factor.

I have a great affection for the Minister for Local Government; I believe he has quite efficiently administered his department. He was kind enough to take me through part of my electorate a while ago, and was well received wherever we went. I am not saying a word against him personally.

However, the Minister for Local Government was talking tonight exactly as a member of the House of Commons would have spoken in about the first year of Queen Victoria's reign. She came to the throne in 1837, which is now 140 years ago.

We do not have to go back 140 years to note the fall in this State of a bastion of good government—that wonderful property qualification for people voting in Legislative Council elections. The Liberals believed that as long as not everybody had a vote for the Legislative Council, the country would be safe, and if the day ever came when everyone could vote for the Legislative Council, the State would be ruined.

Mr Shalders: Who abolished it?

Mr HARTREY: The Liberal Party! It pulled out the very foundations of its own security; the whole thing fell in ruins around it, and nobody even noticed! Nobody gave a damn! Abolishing the property qualification for Legislative Council elections did no harm to the State of Western Australia. Such a qualification is anachronistic; it is at least 100 years out of date and is totally unjustified.

I should like to put to the House the view of a person of foreign origin. He has been a resident of Western Australia for the last 48 years, and an Australian citizen for the last 30 years. His philosophy is quite brilliant and I intend to relate his attitude as a very good argument for abolishing this stupid qualification for local government elections.

The man is of Macedonian origin, although he speaks Greek. He was a hard-working miner for over 40 years and lived a decent and respectable life. He saved his money, and did not booze it away, or lose it at the two-up school. For 30 years he did not have a vote for the town council of Kalgoorlie.

Then, with his savings, he purchased two houses and he found he had two votes! A candidate for the town council came to him and said, "Chris, I want you to vote for me." He replied, "I do not want to; 30 years I am in this country. I spend my money in town; I work in town; I do hard work. But I get no vote. Now I get two votes because I have two houses. I did not earn the votes; the houses did. Let the houses have the vote."

That is a classic illustration of the stupidity of the property qualification. The man was a good member of the community, but he was no better after he purchased the houses than he was when he owned no property at all. He was just as fit to cast a vote in Federal and State Government elections and to participate in the governing of Australia before he owned the two houses. However, it was only when he purchased two houses that he had a right to cast a vote for the smallest governing institution in Australia.

Mr Sibson: But if he had been renting those houses—

Mr HARTREY: Never mind about that; I am talking to Mr Speaker, and I would prefer to speak of the philosophy of my friend from Macedonia than listen to the

noisy member for Bunbury. Local government is the smallest and least important unit of government.

Mr Sibson: Who said that?

Mr HARTREY: I said it, and I repeat it: Local government is the smallest and least important unit of government in Australia. Does the member for Bunbury mean to say that the business we have been transacting in this House, and the laws we have to make here are of less importance to the people of Western Australia than what the shire council of Mukinbudin may decide to do tomorrow? Is the honourable member right in the head?

Mr Sibson: You were talking about local government—

Mr HARTREY: I am talking about what I am talking about, and if the member for Bunbury does not understand he should dry up and listen. The people who vote for the Federal Government are voting for a Government which is dealing with much more serious matters like defence, foreign policy, and peace and war—matters of the greatest possible importance to the entire nation, as a nation.

But there is no suggestion that people cannot vote unless they own a house. Nobody would have put forward such a proposition in the past, because he would have been ridiculed. Even before the days of Federation, when the Constitution was being drafted, those responsible did not provide for property qualifications for the House of Representatives or the Senate. In fact, there would have been no Federation had such a qualification been stipulated, because the States would never have agreed to come in on that basis.

Therefore, this is a most important feature of this Act. We on this side actually have the arrogance, stupidity and nerve to propose that the dignity of man should be recognised, as it has been in the Federal Parliament since there was a Federation of Australian States, and as it has been in this State for some time.

How many people seriously believe that the Shire of Mukinbudin, East Widgeemooltha or anywhere else are so important that they should be preserved from destruction by imposing a property qualification on voters?

The property qualification for Legislative Council elections was abolished only about 13 years ago and nobody noticed the difference when it was abolished. Similarly, no-one will notice the difference when the property qualification for local government elections is abolished.

Mr Rushton: I beg to differ.

Mr HARTREY: A person without property can live in a town and the fact that he lives in that town increases its ratable value. He carries on his business in that town and uses electric light, provided in

most instances by the town. He goes to the municipal pools provided by the town and borrows books from the municipal library provided by the town. Therefore, he has the right to participate in the decisions taken in such a town.

Mr Sibson: He has now.

Mr HARTREY: It is the man who is entitled to vote. The damn house cannot vote and the man is not a better man for having three houses than he is for having one. He is not a better man for having 10 than for having five. I say no more of that because adult franchise is entirely commensurate with the dignity of the human being.

It is repulsive to suggest, as I pointed out through quoting my Macedonian friend, that a man is not worth a crab from the point of view of local government until he has a house and that then he becomes a bulwark of local government. My friend said, "Let the damn house vote." I say, "Let the man vote, or the woman, or the children." I say that because when I was a boy of 18 I was still a child.

I want to say a word or two about clause 16 whereby section 127 of the principal Act is to be amended. I want to refer particularly to subclause (3)(a) because it affects me and certain other people in this House especially. It reads—

(3) (a) Where the election is to fill more vacancies than one, and there are more candidates than vacancies, the returning officer shall count each unrejected ballot paper on which a cross appears against a candidate's name as a vote in that candidate's favour, irrespective of the number of candidates against whose names a cross appears.

In the towns of Kalgoorlie and Boulder four people must be elected every time there is a council election. Originally we had the most rotten system. We had a block vote by which one group elected all four candidates and the other group got none in at all. That system was abolished by this Parliament because of the good work of the member for Kalgoorlie in cahoots with the then Minister for Local Government who was also the member for Katanning. That rotten system was abolished and a very simple system was substituted for it. If there were seven candidates one voted one to seven. The lowest number was rubbed out and if No. six was then put ahead of No. five, then five went out. This went on until four names were left. It was the simplest and fairest way to count. It gave representation to everybody who could muster enough votes to get into fourth place.

That was fair enough, but that system was abolished for the shocking system we have now—the stupidist damn system in the world. A candidate does not have people voting for him, he has people voting against him. The man who has the

most votes against him is defeated, but the man who gets the most votes for him does not get elected. In other words, the whole thing is based upon a hate campaign to begin with.

It has the most ridiculous mathematical results. Last Saturday night 55 000 votes were counted in Kalgoorlie. There have never been 55 000 people in Kalgoorlie at any time. The winning councillor got 6 200 votes; the next got 6 700; the next got about 8 000, and the next about 10 000. There were never that many people voting in Kalgoorlie at any time. Kalgoorlie as a Federal electorate would have more people, but not Kalgoorlie as a municipality. That has about 14 000 inhabitants altogether. So if every man, woman, and child voted the number would not come to 55 000.

That idiot system exists today. I appeal to the House to wipe out that idiot system. The Liberals do not like it, the Country Party does not like it, and the Labor Party does not like it. In Kalgoorlie at the counting of votes, I mix mostly with members of the Liberal Party because they have greater representation on the council than the Labor Party. They all say that it is a rotten system of voting. The votes are put into tray after tray on the table, and at about one o'clock in the morning we have a idea of how the thing has worked out. It is a shocking system to count.

Mr Jamieson: The CPA use it; it must be good. I always finish up last so it must be pretty good.

Mr HARTREY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his interference. I think I have sufficiently dealt with this particular aspect of the story not to need assistance from anybody. I have said all I want to say and I say it with fervour. Let us apply to the smallest and least significant of all the elements of government the same principle as is applied without any hesitation at all to the Parliament which has the most grave responsibility—the Federal Parliament—and to the Parliament which has the second most grave responsibility—our own Parliament. I suggest that the system we have now with regard to the election of four candidates is ridiculous, stupid, mathematically and intellectually absurd and universally unsatisfactory and unpopular.

I urge the House to reject it and to adopt what is proposed in this Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moiler.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 19th May.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [10.28 p.m.]: It took a fair amount of study of the Bill introduced

by the member for Mt. Hawthorn to find out really what the total proposition was about. During the course of his rather long remarks and very few specific points concerning the Bill, it evolved that the system proposed to be introduced for elections for the Legislative Council in Western Australia was to be somewhat the same as the system now in vogue in South Australia.

Let me say at the outset that we oppose the Bill. My personal viewpoint is that I have always regarded the many systems of proportional representation used in Australian parliamentary elections as being not the Hare-Clark system but the hairy-goat system. I have never believed that that system provides the best way of producing representatives for the Parliaments of Australia. I accept that the system is one in which minorities have an opportunity to be represented in the Parliament.

The system of proportional representation is designed to produce that result. Secondly, in my view it is designed to ensure there is a close balance between the representation of the two major interests in the political scene.

The system in Tasmania which is, in fact, used for the lower House is a modified Hare-Clark system, and it has some peculiarities. In Tasmania there are seven electorates, and these are the same as the Federal electorates. I think the seven electorates elect five members each. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier of Tasmania could represent the same electorate.

Mr Jamieson: Very often they do.

Mr O'NEIL: Under that system every individual has the right to indicate his preference not only for the party of his choice, but also for the person of his choice within the particular grouping. The same may be said of the system that applies in the Senate, but in the Senate there are six State groups elected—and perhaps more after the recent arrangement—but the Commonwealth is divided into a number of separate electorates for the Senate, one representing each State. Under a recent amendment the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory do have some representation.

The proposal contained in the Bill is that the whole of Western Australia be one electorate. The people are not to be given the opportunity to vote for the person of their choice. Under this scheme people are encouraged to form themselves into groups, and those groups appear on the ballot paper from left to right. The elector only has the opportunity to vote for the group.

A group might consist of one person. Only in that case does the elector have the right to select the representative of his

choice. So, clearly there is a great disadvantage in the system proposed in the Bill. We find it would tend to become a matter of the political parties appointing a number of representatives to the Legislative Council of this State. Under the Hare-Clark system it would be a matter of one party gaining one more member than the other party to have a majority, depending on the climate of the day. To me that is not what I understand parliamentary representation to be.

It has often been said that no party introduces an electoral Bill unless such a Bill tended to favour its side of politics. In my view probably the same can be said of the measure before us.

Mr Jamieson: I do not think we deny that.

Mr O'NEIL: The Leader of the Opposition is not denying that?

Mr Jamieson: The position is not equitable now, so it must become more equitable under this Bill, and thus it will be of assistance to us.

Mr O'NEIL: The Labor Party admits that the purpose of this Bill will tend to make the representation in the Legislative Council more inclined to its way.

Mr Jamieson: More equality.

Mr O'NEIL: In advocating that, it must be assumed that the present system does not enable the Labor Party to win seats on the same boundaries and under the same system. That viewpoint has been squashed completely. In a recent Legislative Council election for one province in the north of the State, when there happened to be one vacancy for three years and another vacancy for six years, on full adult franchise introduced by the Liberal Party in 1965 and supported by the Labor Party at that time, the Liberal Party won one seat and the Labor Party the other; that was an election held on the same boundaries, on the same day, and in the same polling places.

Mr Jamieson: The donkey vote won seats for both candidates.

Mr O'NEIL: The Leader of the Opposition cannot say that the system proposed in the Bill will not lend itself to the same donkey vote as any other system. If that can obtain in respect of the election for one province, there is no reason that the same cannot obtain in the elections for other provinces. That happened also in provinces where one seat was held by a member of the National Country Party and the other seat by a member of the Liberal Party. There is a metropolitan province, with one representative being a Labor Party member, and the other being a Liberal Party member.

So, it cannot be said that through direct representation by individuals and political

parties the Labor Party is placed at a disadvantage. I cannot understand the reason for that viewpoint.

Mr Bertram: If you look at the figures you will find it is so.

Mr O'NEIL: The honourable member has introduced this Bill, and in reply to the second reading debate he can refute anything I am saying.

Mr Bertram: I allowed you to interject when I was speaking.

Mr O'NEIL: My interjections related to what is contained in the Bill.

Mr Bertram: My interjection is meant to cause you to put up a good case.

Mr O'NEIL: I am not having a shot at the honourable member. I interjected when the honourable member was delivering his speech because he did not say very much about the Bill. I had to make a study of the Bill to find what it provided. In that regard I follow the lead of my colleague, the Minister for Local Government, in pointing out the deficiencies in this legislation. I am not blaming the honourable member for that. Having said that we are totally opposed to the principle contained in the Bill and to the Bill itself, I shall indicate some deficiencies in the drafting of this legislation without waiting for a request from the Opposition to place amendments on the notice paper to which the Opposition will agree.

Mr Bertram: I think your approach to the Bill is much fairer than that of the Minister to the previous Bill.

Mr O'NEIL: There is a considerable number of anomalies in the Bill as it is drafted. One anomaly I can think of is the sample ballot paper and the requirement as to how the names of the candidates appear on it. That sample is in conflict with the three pieces of legislation we are looking at, and appropriate amendments will have to be made to the others. Secondly, special provision needs to be made to polling places if this system is adopted, and appropriate amendments to intertwining Acts will also have to be made.

It is quite easy to see that this Bill is a copy of the South Australian legislation, because there is no requirement in respect of expenses of candidates. I understand that in the South Australian legislation the system is a little different. I also understand that in South Australia there is no limit on election expenses by candidates. However, in Western Australia there is a limit as far as both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly are concerned.

The provision in the Bill before us does not imply there is no limit on expenses for candidates. We could have a situation, for example, if we stuck to the limit of \$1 000 to be spent by a candidate on

election expenses, that a group of 10 candidates appearing in one column could each spend \$1 000, in addition to whatever money might be spent by the political party or the people supporting them; whereas the individual who is in a group of his own in one column is limited to \$1 000 in election expenses.

Because people are not entitled to vote for individuals, but only for groups, we could have a group containing 10 persons who under this electoral law would be permitted to spend \$10 000 on their campaign, whereas the individual comprising a group is entitled to spend only \$1 000. So, in that respect the Bill creates a degree of unfairness.

Another matter which indicates a fault in the drafting of the Bill is that the sample ballot paper contains a square on the wrong side of the paper as far as the requirements of the Assembly are concerned. So, there is a colossal amount of tidying up to be done, even if we were to agree to support the Bill.

As I say, I am not blaming the honourable member. From my own experience I know the difficulty in having proper work done on the drafting of legislation and particularly this type of legislation involving new principles.

I also believe that one of the great problems in respect of proportional representation, in counting the votes, is the great delay in arriving at a conclusion. For example, the system under which the quota is set—this applies to the Senate as well as this proposition—is that the returning officer must be absolutely certain of the accuracy of all the formal votes. This means that they must all be checked and counter checked until such time as he declares all the formal votes are there because no further action can be taken in respect of establishing the quotas until that is done.

Mr Jamieson: This is not important where you have members taking office on a fixed day, except at a double dissolution.

Mr O'NEIL: That is right; but it has the disadvantage, as under the Federal Senate system, that it would be three weeks before the result was known. I understand, too, that one of the criticisms of this sort of system in respect of voting is the very high degree of informality—something around 10 to 12 per cent in some particular cases on a Senate ballot paper.

Mr Davies: Were they ever that high?

Mr O'NEIL: I think so. I think that South Australia, still under this very simple system of voting, managed to have 5 per cent informal. I understand, too, that the ballot paper used on that occasion was over 20 inches long and in the

Press reports I read one person complained that the piece of string on the pencil was not long enough to reach the end of the ballot paper!

These are some of the difficulties, and especially in determining a result fairly quickly. Under this system there would be much closer ballots between the representation of the two groups or parties concerned. I think we would find it is fairly important, and the public would certainly desire, to have the results much more quickly. So many times have Governments and parties tried to find quick ways to produce a result in a ballot, but I believe that our officers do as well as they can and I also believe that any short cuts to determine representation in Parliament could quite easily lead to some negligence on the part of the officers doing the job in ensuring the will of the people is in fact fully reflected.

The system of filling casual vacancies under this proposal is by both Houses meeting together and appointing a person to replace the person who has either retired or passed on. The Leader of the Opposition interjected and said that in his view it would probably be the next fellow down the list in the group from which the deceased or retired councillor came. That is all right, but what if, by accident—and it would be only by accident—some poor fellow who decided to be in a group of his own was elected and then retired or died? What then would be the situation? The situation would be similar to that which would exist when an Independent senator died or retired. Then these so-called conventions which have obtained mostly are very difficult to follow.

Mr H. D. Evans: It would not prove an obstacle in New South Wales or Queensland.

Mr O'NEIL: It would here. The point of course is that having a system where we vote for a group of people, determined by the number of quotas that group gets, so we elect people from the top of the list down. As I understand the situation—and I think I am right—if one particular group gets 4 5/7ths quotas it gets four councillors and if the 5/7ths happens to be a fraction greater than anyone else along the line it gets an extra one by virtue of the extra fraction. There is no distribution of preferences within the groups because there are none. We vote for the group as a whole.

I suppose that in Senate elections the major political parties would be fairly certain that the first two people in their grouping would be elected and whether the third one was elected would be a matter of some luck.

Mr Jamieson: Where?

Mr O'NEIL: In the Senate.

Mr Jamieson: You want to ask Mr Samson about that theory.

Mr O'NEIL: That is bad luck in those circumstances. I think there could be occasions when an Independent might win under certain circumstances, but basically I think most people who aim to be in the Senate would be lucky to be No. 1 on the team because it appears there is, because of that system alone, a tendency for political parties to make appointments rather than for people to be elected.

There is still the option within the group of people to indicate their preference within that group and certainly there are arrangements within the counting system within the Senate to enable people who vote No. 1 for the least favourite candidate to have an opportunity to have some say in the balance. Under this system of course that opportunity is missing. We simply vote for the group.

I have always been intrigued with the Tasmanian modified Hare-Clark system in the way that State fills casual vacancies. In Tasmania the ballot papers, in respect of the lower House election, are all retained and if in that lower House a vacancy occurs by death or retirement there is a recount and the next fellow with the required votes is appointed.

I am given to understand that on one occasion—perhaps on more than one—a candidate in an election who had lost his deposit and had, in fact, been out of the country for two years—remembering that Tasmania has a five-year Parliament—found himself a member of the Tasmanian lower House.

Mr Jamieson: I think the present Speaker lost his deposit at the last election.

Mr O'NEIL: That could well be. So one can see some of the peculiarities of the Hare-Clark system in its various forms.

Mr Jamieson: It still works though.

Mr O'NEIL: Any system of voting works. Many years ago I had occasion to do some studies on what would be the result of a particular election under the various systems involving four or five candidates. I have to say that there is only one system of voting in which every vote has a value, and that is the one known as the Borden system or the ACTU system under which every vote is counted and the person with the lowest score wins. That indicates he has a greater number of votes.

Mr Davies: Did you try it out somewhere?

Mr O'NEIL: Yes.

Mr Davies: I tried it with 50-odd candidates at one time and 120 voters and I got just about the same result.

Mr O'NEIL: What I am saying is that under that system every vote of an elector has a value, but the complication is the way of recording the votes because it is a colossal exercise. It is necessary

to put down the names of all the candidates and the votes against them and make a total. This is a long drawn-out exercise. Compared with that, the system of proportional representation we have here—I am just guessing at the moment—will, in 99.8 times out of 100, produce precisely the same result as the Borden system.

So far as the margin of error is very small and because of the relative simplicity of counting the ballot after the vote has been given, people tend to favour that system.

Mr Davies: I think the only difference is that in the election of, say, 20 people you can get down to 19 or 20 votes.

Mr O'NEIL: That is correct. On the basis of reflecting the interest of the electorate, based on the quickest and simplest way, I think the proportional representation system is favoured. I know the Labor Party favours first-past-the-post.

Mr Jamieson: No, you are wrong. Optional preference.

Mr O'NEIL: There has been a change there, and I think the Labor Party is moving towards our view because I think within its own party organisation that system is used.

Mr Jamieson: The optional preference system is used within the party too.

Mr O'NEIL: These are the various voting systems used, but I, personally, do not favour the Hare-Clark system of voting at all because of the many anomalies it can create.

I want to say also that the Senate system now comes from eight places in the Commonwealth; the six States, the Australian Capital Territory, and the Northern Territory. However, this Bill proposes to make Western Australia one province. At the moment we have 15 provinces. It used to be 10 provinces each with three members but now it is 15 provinces each with two members. So, quite clearly, the representation in the Legislative Council appointed under the present system certainly means that members are closer to the people who elect them.

I fear that if a system such as that now proposed is adopted we would find that the Legislative councillors would in fact come from the areas of greatest population within the State—from the metropolises.

Mr Jamieson: That has never been the case because people are brought in to vote.

Mr O'NEIL: I do not know about that. I suppose it is pretty safe to say that a representative elected in an extremely remote area would find it easier to represent his constituents from the metropolitan area, but he would return very frequently to his province or electorate to keep contact with the people. Under

the proposed system I cannot see that happening. I think it would take away from the people in remote areas that personal representation which is now provided. Certainly, decisions in elections are more speedily arrived at than they would be under the system which is proposed.

I cannot see any merit in the proposal whatsoever. I do not believe the people of Western Australia generally would accept such a system. I have not asked them; I have not had an opportunity. However, I did notice a singular lack of interest by the media in the proposition which has been put forward. I also noticed in the Press reports concerning the election in South Australia that whilst the public of Australia generally was interested in the results of the Assembly election the rather historical occasion which occurred with regard to the election by the use of the system proposed in this Bill of members to the upper House apparently went by almost unnoticed. It was not regarded as a major issue.

Mr Davies: The Government really comes from the lower House, always. There was quite a bit of interest in the upper House, eventually, because its membership increased.

Mr O'NEIL: Perhaps I can now see the motivation for the introduction of this Bill.

Mr Jamieson: There is no argument about that. Even *The West Australian* indicated there was inequity under the present system.

Mr Davies: The ALP did not get a majority in that instance.

Mr O'NEIL: I am not so concerned with the state of the parties in the other States; I am more concerned that we stay here on this side of the House at the moment.

I do not propose to go much further into this matter. I have indicated the attitude of the Government to the principle which this Bill endeavours to introduce into our parliamentary elections. I appreciate, of course, the main points of the Bill now before us, and that the other two Bills moved by the honourable member are related to it. So, I am sure the honourable member will not mind if I simply indicate at this stage that I am also opposed to those two other measures which are on the notice paper.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

BILLS (5): RETURNED

1. Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act Amendment Bill.
2. Bulk Handling Act Amendment Bill.
3. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 4).
4. Industrial Lands (CSBP & Farmers Ltd.) Agreement Bill.

5. Mental Health Act Amendment Bill. Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th May.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [10.56 p.m.]: I desire to indicate that we oppose this Bill. The only provision it contains is for the interim period during the changeover from the system which now prevails to the system proposed in a previous Bill. It simply indicates the position in which members presently elected to the Legislative Council would find themselves, and how they would be able to adjust to suit a single province in Western Australia. We oppose the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th May.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [10.58 p.m.]: I suppose I should indicate to the House, at an early stage, the intention of the Government with regard to this measure but I would reflect on a point raised by the Minister when he introduced the Bill.

Mr Taylor: Thank you.

Mr RUSHTON: I should have said on a point raised by the member when he introduced the Bill. He indicated he would be prepared to see his own Bill go out if the Government gave some undertakings. I certainly do not intend to give any guarantee on the basis requested, but I will indicate to him what is being done. Perhaps that will satisfy him and he may not then feel so badly when I say that the Government has no intention of approving of the Bill now before us.

Even if it were the desire of the Government to proceed with this legislation immediately, it has to be taken into account that different councils have different periods in order to qualify for long service leave.

I think the member referred to this fact during his address and he said he was really bringing forward a principle rather than a proposal, and he was willing to see his Bill go out if the Government was prepared to bring forward another Bill which would include long service leave entitlements.

I think it is worthwhile reporting to the House what has transpired. The member mentioned that the previous Minister supported the portability of long service leave, and quoted extracts from a letter in his second reading speech. I could not find

that letter with the quotation. In 1971 the Minister indicated he favoured the principle of the portability of long service leave.

The previous Minister did not make any recommendations to Cabinet regarding any system worked out with local government. When I took over the portfolio, I had to take it from there.

Mr Taylor: Did you find the letter to which I referred, where he said he would introduce it in the next session?

Mr RUSHTON: It was in a form like that.

Mr Taylor: That was March, 1974.

Mr RUSHTON: No; it was in 1973. In December, 1971, my predecessor gave formal approval to the preparation of an amendment. Nothing seems to have happened then until September, 1973, when my predecessor wrote to the MOA advising that a copy of a submission had been sent to the country shires and the Local Government Association to finalise a proposal for amendments to be presented in the next session of Parliament. Both the MOA and the Institution of Engineers were pushing this.

Mr Taylor: That is right.

Mr RUSHTON: That is where it stopped. When I took over in April, 1974, I could not find the quoted letter of March, but the intention was mentioned in the letter of September, 1973, so I am not denying it was stated. However, no submission was made and no Cabinet approval was given. There was no agreement with local government and no form was worked out as to what the amendment should be. So not much progress had been made in this matter between 1971 and 1974.

Just a few days after I took office I received letters from the MOA and the Association of Professional Engineers asking whether I would take action in this regard and proceed with the request which the previous Minister had approved in principle. I created a working party to advance the proposals. I did this in May, after having become acquainted with the background.

Mr Moiler: Did you agree to it?

Mr RUSHTON: I am indicating what has taken place. The member will realise I have been trying to help the cause. In the first year I was in office I sampled the opinions of all the local authorities in the State and brought the subject up whenever practical to do so. There were conflicting views. Officers in some councils wanted it, and officers in other councils did not want it.

Mr Moiler: Does the Minister think it is good or bad?

Mr RUSHTON: The honourable member will have to wait a little while to understand what has taken place. In May, 1974, I created a working party to see if agreement could be reached.

Mr Skidmore: When was that?

Mr RUSHTON: One month after I took office—on the 7th May, 1974. In September a scheme was prepared and circulated to the Country Shire Councils' Association and the Local Government Association for comment. It went to both associations and was considered and rejected. I then took the issue to the liaison committee we have created with local government to have full consultation with local authorities, and after negotiation with the liaison committee it was agreed the department would prepare a modified scheme and put it up for consideration. That was done and it went before the associations. When the decision was about to be made, the MOA threatened strike action if the scheme was not implemented forthwith. The modified scheme was also rejected, but I do not say that was the reason it was rejected. I understand the MOA was making the claim that the majority of councils supported it, so I asked the local government associations to circularise the 138 local authorities and get a consensus of opinion. This was readily agreed to. It is underway at the moment.

The undertaking I give the member who introduced the Bill is that I will consider the results of that referendum of opinions when they come forward and make a recommendation to Cabinet in due course. The matter has been given constant attention during my term of office. We had before the executive of the Local Government Association a modified scheme which provided a period of five years' service, and the MOA and a number of local authorities indicated their acceptance of it. At this moment we are sampling the opinions of local authorities on this very question, and that is why I suggest to the honourable member that we do not proceed with his Bill.

The Executive Officer of the Local Government Association has indicated in the media the reaction of the associations; that is, that long service leave is granted for recuperation purposes and as an incentive for an employee to remain with a particular employer.

Mr Skidmore: That is more important than recuperation.

Mr RUSHTON: I am stating the opinion expressed in the Press recently by the Executive Officer of the Local Government Association.

The member who introduced the Bill made a great deal of the necessity for constant transfers between local authorities and he gave some statistics. In fact, there is minimal interchange of staff between local authorities. Coming from the

branch system, where there was a fair amount of interchange of staff, I can see a lot of advantages in it, and local authorities could receive benefit from it. Each local authority is an autonomous body which employs staff individually, and this is one of the reasons that portability of long service leave has not been readily agreed to by them. I think the smaller councils see themselves ending up with the thin end of the wedge because they are constantly losing employees and the big authorities are acquiring the trained men. I think we could agree that the young fellows starting out might be encouraged to move from one authority to another.

Mr Skidmore: Could they not be encouraged to take their long service leave with them?

Mr RUSHTON: I am just saying that there seems to be fair support for the proposition that an officer would need to serve a certain period first; he would not be able to jump around every year. I suggest it would not be of any great advantage to local authorities for officers to be moving from one to the other every year. Officers would need to serve a certain period of time, and this is the basis on which the modified scheme has been put to them. I can say this, in discussions with officers, senior and junior, in local government—and as I say, I have been to all the authorities—I have discovered a mixed opinion on the issue and this was quite surprising.

Mr Taylor: Can you give us an approximation of the percentage, because it is very surprising that some local government officers do not believe in the principle of portability. I would like you to spell that out, if you do not mind.

Mr RUSHTON: I did not write down the comments of every officer to whom I spoke.

Mr Taylor: Even a rough estimate would do.

Mr RUSHTON: It will be very interesting to see the result of this consensus of opinion which is being sought from local government.

Mr Taylor: I think you said you spoke to local government officers.

Mr RUSHTON: I have spoken to employers and employees.

Mr Taylor: How many local government officers have you spoken to?

Mr RUSHTON: Quite a number.

Mr Taylor: Quite a number?

Mr RUSHTON: A number of officers are totally against the idea, and a number support a modified form incorporating a qualifying period.

Mr Taylor: Rather than the proposition now before them?

Mr RUSHTON: The proposition before them is a modified form of the proposal.

Mr Taylor: They would prefer that to having the complete form?

Mr RUSHTON: The main view seemed to be that some period of service should be laid down—perhaps three or five years. The present proposition before local government officers is that they would serve five years before long service leave would be portable to their next position. The suggestion was that a period of five years was fair.

Mr Taylor: You have satisfied me by indicating that in your view a substantial number of local government officers are not happy with the proposition of complete portability.

Mr RUSHTON: Yes, a percentage feels this way.

Mr Taylor: A fair percentage. I am satisfied with that statement.

Mr RUSHTON: A large number would support a modified system.

Mr Taylor: I understand the councillors, but I was interested in your remarks about the officers.

Mr RUSHTON: The councillors have full responsibility also. I have indicated to members that at the present time we are seeking the opinion of councillors about adopting the modified scheme. I indicate that the Bill before us is not totally adequate. The member who introduced the Bill was prepared for the Government to introduce an alternative measure, but he sought a guarantee which I would not give. I am not sure whether he heard me before when I indicated to him my intention to obtain a consensus of opinion and review the result with the executive of local government. I will then take a recommendation to Cabinet, and that is the normally accepted procedure.

Therefore, there is no need to speak at any great length because I have covered what is being done at the moment. I have not gone into the details of portability of long service leave, because it is a very involved and extensive subject. The Government is attending currently to the question raised in the House and I assure members that this approach will be continued. I ask the House to oppose the Bill for the reasons I have given.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moller.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th May.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [11.15 p.m.]: Very briefly I wish to indicate the opposition of the Government to this Bill.

Mr Jamieson: I thought surely you would support one of them!

Mr O'NEIL: The sole purpose of the Bill is to create the electoral districts, as described under the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Act, 1976, as an electoral province. In other words, it provides to make Western Australia one province for the purpose of Legislative Council elections. We oppose the Bill.

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

House adjourned at 11.16 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 27th May, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE

Presence in Chamber

THE PRESIDENT: Honourable members, I would like this afternoon to recognise the presence in the Chamber of the Hon. F. J. S. Wise, a former member of this Chamber, a former Premier of this State, and a former political antagonist of mine; but, at the same time, a very good friend. I feel those members who know him will be very pleased to see him here in good health.

[Applause].

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE

David Ross: Indictment

The Hon. D. J. COOLEY, to the Minister for Justice:

Has Cabinet made any decision on the request by the Police Department with respect to the indictment of William Wilson for the alleged shooting of David Ross?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

I acknowledge that the Hon. D. W. Cooley conveyed this question to me prior to the sitting, and the reply is, "No".

QUESTIONS (12): ON NOTICE

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION FUND

Payments

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) In this State, in each of the last ten years—

(a) how many cattle have been slaughtered under—

(i) the T.B. eradication campaign; and

(ii) the brucellosis eradication campaign;

(b) on what number has compensation been paid;

(c) what percentage do these numbers represent out of the total tested as being infected;

(d) what has been the average compensation payment per head;

(e) how much has this compensation cost—

(i) the Federal Government; and

(ii) the State Government?

(2) (a) What is the present agreement between the States and the Federal Government in regard to payments made for compensation;

(b) is this agreement expected to change with the introduction of a one dollar per head slaughter fee;

(c) has the Victorian Government decided to go ahead and pay full compensation for cattle slaughtered for either—

(i) T.B.; or

(ii) C.A.;

(d) are all cattle which are being tested in this State being tested for both diseases at the one time; and

(e) if not, why not?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(1) (a) and (d)—

	Tuberculosis			Brucellosis		
	Total Slaughtered	Total Compensation	Average Compensation payment per head	Total Slaughtered	Total Compensation	Average Compensation payment per head
		\$	\$		\$	\$
1975/76 to date	217	15 861	72	1 543	122 322	79
1974/75	380	78 383	206	2 500	389 376	156
1973/74	344	84 030	244	2 069	336 111	162
1972/73	346	86 993	251	804	163 047	203
1971/72	535	106 604	199	3 617	732 353	202
1970/71	797	123 070	154	185	38 760	210
1969/70	746	173 050	232			
1968/69	753	105 174	140			
1967/68	174	39 518	227			
1966/67	205	30 277	148			