

# Legislative Assembly

Friday, 12 November 1982

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie) took the Chair at 10.45 a.m., and read prayers.

## HEALTH: TOBACCO

### *Smoking: Petition*

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth) [10.46 a.m.]: I have a petition to present which is in the following terms—

To—the Honorable, the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned residence in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will support the Tobacco Products Advertisements Bill now before Parliament. Your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

This petition bears 66 signatures; and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 35.)

## HEALTH: TOBACCO

### *Smoking: Petition*

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [10.47 a.m.]: I have three petitions. The first reads as follows—

To—the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We the undersigned Physicians of the Medical Service of the S.C.G.H. deplore the continued advertising of tobacco products in this state, in the face of continuing recruitment, addiction, disease and death due to tobacco usage.

We urge members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council to support the Smoking and Tobacco Products Advertisements Act currently before the Parliament.

Your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 18 signatures of the leading physicians in Western Australia; and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 36.)

## HEALTH: TOBACCO

### *Smoking: Petition*

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [10.48 a.m.]: The second petition reads as follows—

To the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament in Western Australia.

We the undersigned Staff of the Respiratory Medicine Wards of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital recognise and affirm the dangers of smoking to health and the relationship between smoking and premature death.

They continue in the same terms as the other petitions relating to the Smoking and Tobacco Products Advertisements Bill, asking members to support the Bill. The petition contains 31 signatures; and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 37.)

## HEALTH: TOBACCO

### *Smoking: Petition*

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [10.49 a.m.]: The third petition reads as follows—

To the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament in Western Australia.

We the undersigned Staff of the Medical Typing Department at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital recognise and affirm the dangers of smoking to health and the relationship between smoking and premature death.

The petitioners also support the Bill before the House to ban the advertisement of smoking and tobacco products. The petition bears 17 signatures; and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 38.)

## APPROPRIATION (GENERAL LOAN FUND) BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 11 November.

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park) [10.52 a.m.]: It is nice that at least we are rolling again, and there is the hope that before the end of the day more of the business will be deleted from the notice paper, despite the confusion confounded which seems to exist, the change in direction, the change of instructions, and the change in the—

**Mr Nanovich**: That is not very fair.

**Mr DAVIES**: It is eminently fair.

**Mr Nanovich**: It is not.

**Mr DAVIES**: Last night I was told by the Deputy Premier that we would go straight on to the Town Planning and Development Amendment Bill this morning. I have been here since 10.30, waiting for that to happen; and immediately someone came into the House, we were told that the Minister for Town Planning and Development was not here—she has gone home, or something—and that we would not proceed with the Bill. We then went to order of the day No. 7, and then we decided to take order of the day No. 8.

The Deputy Premier is supposed to be in charge of the House; but we have had continued confusion.

**Mr O'Connor**: Why don't you speak to the Bill?

**Mr DAVIES**: I can see some members on the Government side nodding their heads, indicating that we have had confusion in the running of the House.

**Mr Nanovich**: Why don't you deal with the Bill?

**Mr DAVIES**: We should go back to the old days when the Premier was running the House. I must say that in those days we seemed to get together. Of course, we had the former Premier here—

**Mr Sibson**: You always used to criticise him.

**Mr DAVIES**: As far as the running of the House was concerned, we met together and agreed. I must say that in the last fortnight at least we have seen no pattern in regard to the business of the House.

The very best we can say is that the only pattern that has evolved is one of continued confusion. We are ready to proceed with these matters, as long as we know in which order they will be debated. As I said, the Deputy Premier came to me at 1.30 a.m. today and asked whether I would be prepared to proceed with the Town

Planning Bill this morning. I gave him an assurance and sat up part of the night making certain my notes were in order. If the Government Whip wants to take the blame for the confusion on this occasion—

**Mr Nanovich**: Yes, I will.

**Mr DAVIES**: —at least a new confuser is emerging. He has not had a finger in the pie previously and I congratulate him on this elevation in status and indicate that he has probably caused the greatest confusion out of all the confusion which has existed in the past three weeks or so.

However, that was not the matter about which I wished to speak in the Loan Estimates. I referred yesterday to the employment position, because when I rose to speak I had just listened to the 12.30 p.m. news and was shocked to find that employment in Western Australia was in a parlous position and that 8.3 per cent of the work force was seeking full-time employment. It was indicated further that we had exceeded the national unemployment average of 7.7 per cent. I suppose I was shocked, because I might have believed what the Premier had been saying that we had a splendid record of employment in this State. Of course, he told us that approximately 1 220 extra jobs had been created in Western Australia over the past 12 months. I suppose we would expect the Premier to be accurate and truthful and, indeed, he was truthful—1 220 jobs were created, but they were part-time jobs.

When one looks at the number of full-time jobs which have been created, one sees a drop has occurred in the figures from September 1981 to September 1982. I have the latest statistics of all the mainland States and they show that, in Western Australia, available jobs in the metropolitan area dropped by 1 300 in that period. The number of part-time jobs increased by 1 350, therefore, if one subtracts the difference, one produces an approximate figure of 1 220. So the Premier is absolutely right—we have created jobs, but those jobs are part-time jobs. The Premier can surely take no pride in that.

I suppose the Premier adopts the attitude that some work is better than no work and it is a philosophy which, in the present economic conditions, we might have to accept. Indeed, increasing numbers of people are seeking to work a four-day week instead of a five-day week, but some restrictions apply to that, because it appears that if they are working under awards—it is doubtful how many people will be working under awards of the Industrial Commission before long—they cannot break those awards and work less than a 40-hour week in five days. So confusion and concern exists

even where employees say they might be prepared to work fewer hours. Frequently they find that employers are not prepared to take the risk, because at some future time the person who has been given a shorter week can sue the employer saying, "You broke the conditions of the award" and there is no guarantee people will not do that.

Even if an employee gave a guarantee in writing that he would not do it, there is nothing to stop him doing it at some future date if he wants to.

We must all be alarmed about the situation, particularly when we look at this morning's newspaper and see the rapid increase in unemployment. Approximately 600 people a week are joining the dole queue in Western Australia. Members would be staggered to see the graph on the front page of the paper. That graph is now climbing at more than a 45 degree angle to reach what will be astronomical figures when the school leavers go onto the labour market in December and January, which is the period of real concern.

We had hoped that the Premier might take some positive action to reinforce the suggestions which have been made that another Premiers' Conference be called to discuss this very important and worrying matter, because we have the same percentage of people out of work in Western Australia as in New South Wales. The only State which showed any improvement in the last month was the Labor State of Victoria under John Cain. I am waiting to hear members opposite—

Mr Nanovich: You will!

Mr DAVIES:—say that Labor Governments cannot do anything about unemployment. However, the only State which showed some improvement in its employment position was Victoria.

Mr MacKinnon: What has happened to Victoria's total work force over the last 12 months?

Mr DAVIES: Victoria is in about the same position as is every other State.

Mr MacKinnon: The numbers have declined.

Mr DAVIES: At least the position has started to improve there. Here is a Minister trying to derive an improvement in the employment position here.

Mr MacKinnon: No, I am not. I am just asking you for the facts.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister's Liberal colleagues in Tasmania have reached a level of 11 per cent unemployed which is the highest figure ever in that State. That has occurred under a Liberal Government which was going to cause all

kinds of magical improvements in the labour market.

The only State which is doing anything in this regard is that of the former Premier's old friend, Mr Joh Bjelke-Petersen, but employment is dropping markedly even in Queensland.

It is necessary for all political leaders in Australia, irrespective of party, to get together to try to emphasise to the Commonwealth Government the need for some positive action to be taken to create jobs. One would have thought that, bearing in mind the seriousness of the position, something positive might have emerged since yesterday.

However, on the 10.30 a.m. news today the Federal Treasurer (John Howard) said, "Freeze wages. Let us call for a wage freeze!" He then went on to say, "Not only should we freeze the position in relation to salary and wage earners, but also we should do so in respect of professional people, company directors, and the like". The reporter then asked, "What about a freeze on prices?" The Federal Treasurer said, "Oh no. You can't work it. You can only freeze wages." Can members imagine lawyers, doctors, and the like saying, "Yes I will limit myself to \$50 000 this year". What an absurd situation. Politicians might even have a look at it.

Mr MacKinnon: Our party has done it before.

Mr DAVIES: For about six months, but as soon as the six months were up they were knocking on the door to have the amount restored. However, I congratulate them on that action.

Mr Hassell: It has been done three times.

Mr DAVIES: It did not make much difference and, indeed, most members of Cabinet at least would not notice the amount of money they decided to forego on that occasion. However, it is ridiculous for the Federal Treasurer to say, "Let us have a wage freeze on everybody. Let us limit ourselves."

I suggest politicians might not be the best people to look at the problem of unemployment. We isolate ourselves in an ivory tower and receive a very comfortable wage, to say the least; however, I am becoming more and more concerned at the number of people who are finding it impossible to meet the costs of day-to-day living. They are coming into my office to ascertain in which direction I can point them for some help. Not only does this apply to young people who cannot get jobs and have never had a job, but also it applies to people who, because their companies have been taken over, find that, after giving 20 or 30 years' solid support to a Western Australian company, all the account work or something similar is being

done on computer in an office in the Eastern States and their services are no longer required.

As has been mentioned on many occasions, more and more small businesses are having to give up the ghost, because they are not able to meet rising costs.

A wage freeze certainly is not novel, and if we are to have one, let the Government do something about freezing charges, because in the last Consumer Price Index some of the greatest rises in the indices related to Government charges. Is it not time the Government decided to take a careful look at Government spending as a whole, not only as it affects the employment of staff, but also at how the money is being spent? Was it necessary for the Metropolitan Water Authority to spend that huge amount, an amount highlighted because of questions asked in this House and reported in this morning's paper?

When we ask, "How many full-time jobs were created in the last 12 months?", the answer is "Zero"; not one full-time job was created—1 300 were lost. When we ask, "How many full-time jobs were created in Queensland during the same time?", the answer is "8 600"; it is the only State to record any increase in full-time employment. When we ask, "How many full-time jobs were created in WA for the male work force over the last 12 months?", the answer is "Zero"—1 000 were lost. When we ask, "How many full-time jobs for females were created in the last 12 months in WA?", the answer is "None"—300 were lost. When we ask, "How many jobs of any description, either full-time or part-time, were created for young people in WA over the last 12 months?", the answer is "None"—3 600 were lost. When we ask, "Which mainland State now has the highest proportion of its unemployed work force in part-time employment?", the answer is "WA—19.7 per cent in September 1982 compared with a national figure of 16.8 per cent". We are nearly three per cent higher than the national average for our work force in part-time employment. So on full-time employment and part-time employment for both young and older people, WA is leading the way, and this is a matter for considerable concern.

These figures have been supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and I can table them if members require. They indicate that something positive must be done, even if it involves a bipartisan approach to the Federal Government. The Opposition would be happy to go along with the Government to see what could be achieved.

Mr O'Connor: Did you agree that WA, apart from one State, has the highest employment per head of population in Australia?

Mr DAVIES: Those two States have not lost jobs as fast as the other States have.

Mr O'Connor: The position is not good anywhere.

Mr DAVIES: We are all saying we will do something, but no-one is doing anything. The Federal Treasurer is calling for a wages freeze, but not a prices freeze; he wants everyone to limit their wages.

We are blaming the Eastern States for the drought there and its effects on people here; the Eastern States are blaming Japan for the steel position; Japan is blaming America for not buying enough goods; America is blaming Europe for the common market; and Mrs Thatcher is saying her Government is doing everything possible and it is a worldwide situation which is beyond her control. Everyone is blaming everyone else; no-one is doing anything.

Everyone blames the interest rates. Surely someone somewhere has the ability to control interest rates. If every country in the world is supposed to be in the same position, is it not time every country started to look at what might be done instead of blaming someone else and saying the problem is just too hard?

Politicians got the world into this sort of situation in 1929, and they are doing it again. We have to accept the blame. We are the people who should be doing something about this problem. However, we are a bit isolated; we are cocooned in our ivory towers. We get a comfortable wage and we think everyone is living like we do.

The Premier said he would do something. I think it was the week before last that we saw a splash in *The Sunday Times* about the number of jobs the Premier would create. If every job that had been announced by *The Sunday Times* would be created in WA over the last few years had come to fruition, we would all have six jobs each. Weekend after weekend that paper tells us of giant programmes which are about to happen, but which never do happen.

The Premier said he would bring forward the spending of loan money for 30 projects, but the amount of money involved was less than one per cent of the total works programme. In the metropolitan area this meant a spending of about \$6.4 million. Of the jobs to be advanced in the 30 programmes he announced about half would be advanced by no more than a month. That is the only thing the Government is doing. We are grateful for it, but we would like to see the Government do

this 10 times over. Although this proposal will mean jobs will be provided, when we consider it amounts to just one per cent of the total works programme, we know it is not something about which we can be ecstatically happy.

If we consider the estimates of expenditure of loan funds we find the usual number of pages and the usual lists of work to be done and we might even clap our hands with joy when we think that a few jobs might be created. However, when we examine the work proposed to be done, we see that in many instances it involves only token measures.

The Millen Special School, in Carson Street, East Victoria Park, has a very good parent group working for it. It seems to be a feature of the special schools that the parents, knowing they have handicapped children, put in a great amount of time and raise a tremendous amount of money for the schools. I will not denigrate the effort put in on behalf of the Government, and I indicate to the Minister for Health that we are grateful for the allocation to provide two speech therapists. I am sorry, I did not want to wake him up, but I wanted to pass this message on to him.

Mr Young: I don't mind being woken up to hear someone thank me.

Mr DAVIES: We have been talking about the provision of speech therapists since the last Parliament; the Minister promised he would look into it for the next Budget, and he has done this. Two therapists will be provided in each area. Of course, we always could say this is not enough as I understand they work only on a primary level, but this allocation has restored the position of one therapist and extended the services of another.

These parent groups do a lot of work and expect co-operation from the Government. I was delighted to see on page 20 of the estimates that the Millen Special School for handicapped children was to have \$20 000 spent on it. The parents involved knew some work was to be done because they had spoken with officers of the department and had received a promise that certain work would be done. They asked me if I could find out just what would be involved in the work.

In question 1864 of 28 October I asked the Minister for Education the following question—

What work will be done in regard to new buildings and improvement of grounds at the Millen special school, Carson Street, East Victoria Park, this financial year?

The Minister replied—

A start will be made on classroom additions, manual arts extensions, provision of

more administration and storage areas, together with carparking, covered area, a hit-up wall, and some modification to the existing outdoor area.

That is a typical answer. I knew all that already; I wanted some detail of what would be spent, and when it would be spent. Perhaps I wrongly phrased my question; however, we have some smart Ministers who like to give as little information as possible. They do not realise that this involves them in answering further questions. On the occasion to which I refer, that is what happened. On 3 November I asked question on notice 1902 which states—

(1) Referring to question 1864 of 1982 respecting the Millen special school, can he detail—

- (a) the extent of classroom additions;
- (b) the extent of the manual arts extensions;
- (c) the extent of the additional administration and storage areas?

(2) Will the work cost in excess of the \$20 000 shown in the General Loan Fund Estimates?

(3) If so, what is the estimated cost?

The answer states—

(1) (a) One classroom will be added;

We knew that. To continue—

- (b) the existing manual arts shed to be demolished and replaced. An additional shed to be supplied for storage of equipment currently stored in the manual arts shed;

Further detail of the work to be carried out was provided, and then it was stated how much it would all cost. As members who have been listening closely will recall, I said that an amount of \$20 000 is listed in the Estimates for the work required. Members must listen to this part of the answer—

(2) and (3) The total allocation for the job is \$260 000. The \$20 000 mentioned in General Loan Fund Estimates represents the expenditure to be incurred in 1982-83, the balance of funding to come from 1983-84.

Therefore less than 10 per cent of the money that needs to be spent on this school will be spent this financial year, with the balance to be spent in the next financial year. I have looked down the estimates and found that many schools will be in a similar position—these schools have been allocated a token \$20 000. Indeed, the member for Gosnells has been asking questions about this.

It seems a lot of pork barrelling is occurring; it seems that a lot of promises are being made and that, with an eye to the approaching election, the Government is saying, "We will spend the required money on that school, hospital, or building." However, in relation to the school to which I have referred, only \$20 000 out of a necessary \$260 000 will be spent this financial year. The Government is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the parents of the children attending that school; those parents have been led to believe that the required work will be accomplished this financial year, but they will be lucky to see it accomplished within five years unless there is a change of Government next year.

Members would understand that if no change of Government occurs, the parents of these schools will be told that the money promised will have to be diverted to other work, to meet other promises made. The work will be done only bit by bit.

This kind of listing in these General Loan Fund Estimates distresses me. It is all very well for the Treasurer to say that a remarkable amount of money will be spent, although not as much as he would like to spend. However, I appreciate it is not as much as he would have been able to spend under the system abandoned by the present Federal Government, and I can appreciate the problems this Treasurer has.

I drew attention on another occasion to the great increase in State charges and taxes paid per head of population by Western Australia over the past several years, and I indicated that this amount of money is likely to increase as the years go by unless there is a change in the policy of the Federal Government. However, I am distressed about the way the Estimates are listed, and about the way in which the Government attacks its responsibility to meet its electoral promises. I am distressed that the Government is prepared to have tax-paying parents believe wrongly that the Treasurer's promises will be met this financial year. I am unhappy about the way Government Ministers answer questions asked in this House. I only wish they would realise it is far better to answer questions fully than to have those questions followed by further questions.

I noted the report brought down yesterday by Mr Oliver Dixon on his further inquiries into the Police Force. As yet I have not had time to read it, but from a speed reading of an article about it in this morning's paper I feel the report suggests that everything in the garden is lovely. As I said in the House the other night, I do not have any reason to doubt the ability of Mr Dixon, but I do have some concern about the types of witnesses to

whom he has spoken. I would have thought this type of inquiry would necessitate his going a bit further to settle once and for all the comments we continue to hear around the city about the Police Force, and which do not do the force any good.

I only wish the Government had grasped the nettle in 1975 when Inspector Daniels was prepared to make public statements about gambling and prostitution in and around Perth. If, at that time, the Government had widened the terms of reference of the Norris Royal Commission, some of the matters being known now would have come out on that occasion. In particular, I refer to the escort agency run by Mr Bercove and his wife. Not the slightest doubt exists that those assisting with the inquiry in 1975 knew that that agency was operating, yet seven years later it took a man in Melbourne investigating the painters and dockers' union to discover what has been happening here under the nose of the Government for some time, and has been known to be happening by at least some people in authority at the time of the Norris inquiry. While it must be heartening now to Inspector Daniels—he is long since retired and lives in Albany—to know that his claims in 1975 were justified, it still must be galling to him and others who were willing to speak out at the time, that the Royal Commission in 1975 was prepared to slander them.

The matter cost Inspector Daniels a considerable amount not only in legal fees, but also in retirement benefits. He was the only police officer who did not have his legal fees paid by the Government, but he was the man prepared to speak out to uncover what he considered were less than desirable events occurring in the community. His legal fees ran into thousands of dollars. He was fairly philosophical about that expense, although the money he used was part of his nest egg for retirement. He said, "Well, if it has done some good, it has been worthwhile."

The powers that be were not content with refusing to pay Inspector Daniels' legal fees; the commissioner of the day changed the system in regard to the retirement of officers, and as a result Inspector Daniels lost something like an additional \$2 000. Up to that time officers retiring were able to work until their 60th birthday before clearing leave. Just before Inspector Daniels retired, one retiring officer was told he had to clear his leave before he turned 60, and that same condition was applied to Inspector Daniels. It then applied to Inspector Sweeney and, perhaps, one or two others who retired at about the same time.

As soon as the matter died down, the Police Department went back to the old system for retirement, but the initial change of policy was de-

signed to spite Inspector Daniels so that he would suffer a \$2 000 decrease in earnings at retirement, which he was entitled to expect.

In 1975, Mr Archie Marshall was associated with a civil liberties group, and he also felt it necessary to speak out. I have listened to some tape recordings of interviews he conducted, and I believe they will be made available in due course to Commissioner Costigan. I am sure they will be of some interest to him. As well, I have listened to recordings of phone conversations that occurred between ex-madams and Inspector Daniels. They made their remarks in private and would not repeat them in court. I am convinced that what Inspector Daniels said was correct. We did have later a further inquiry, but it related only to two people; it did not relate to that continuing concern which was expressed as long ago as 1975, and which remains with us today.

Mr Archie Marshall is a constituent of the Deputy Premier. He feels that, in view of his speaking up at the time of the Norris inquiry, and his being slated by Commissioner Norris for what he said, now that the matter of Bercove has come to light this might be the time for the Government to do the decent thing by apologising to him.

I was pleased to hear one of our members say yesterday that he was happy to see our leader apologise when he was wrong, but it seems to be the exception in this House, rather than the rule. Mr Archie Marshall wrote to the Deputy Premier as his member of Parliament and asked for some consideration of an apology in view of what has transpired in the last several days. He wrote to him on 29 August and received this letter on 3 November—

I have now had the opportunity to study your letter dated August 29th and to take advice on this matter.

I am advised that you did provide the counsel assisting the Commissioner, Mr D. O'Dea, with information to the effect that Mr Bercove of the Deputy Commonwealth Crown Solicitor's Office in Perth was associated with the conduct of an escort agency. However, all that was put forward in support of your suggestion that the escort agency was involved in prostitution was the statement of a well known criminal.

I will interpolate there and point out that Mr Marshall wants to know who the well-known criminal who made that statement was because he is not aware of such a person. The letter continues—

There was no suggestion that the matter had any immediate relevance to the Royal

Commission's terms of reference and Mr O'Dea did not adduce any evidence before the Commissioner. It follows that there can be no suggestion that any of the criticism which Mr Norris later directed at you had anything to do with your allegations against Mr Bercove. It also follows that the said criticism is in no way invalidated by anything which Mr Costigan has since said about Mr Bercove.

Your letter also made reference to the police witnesses, who gave evidence before the Commissioner. As you have indicated in your letter, one was subsequently charged with a criminal offence and dismissed and another resigned. I am advised that whilst it is true that the Commissioner said that Tangney was a 'capable and responsible' policeman, as he may well have been at that stage, the fact is that the Commissioner's conclusion directed towards you did not depend on the evidence of either of these officers.

On the basis of the advice given to me and having regard to all the circumstances involved, I do not believe that the Government is obliged to comply with your requests for an apology and compensation.

So despite the fact that the evidence shows that Mr Marshall and Mr Daniels were right, the Government has no intention either to apologise or to climb down. On the one hand, it is saying, "You told us something a criminal told you", but it did not check the facts out. It was not a criminal who told them the facts, as I understand it. Mr Marshall is not aware of any criminal.

Here is the statement which was handed to Mr O'Dea on 15 December 1975 which draws attention to the escort agency being run by Bercove; after all, prostitution was under consideration at that time. It is a matter for regret that although, as Mr Marshall points out, some of the evidence given by police officers has since appeared to be under something of a cloud, the Government is not prepared to do anything in regard to apologising for its continued action.

I hope at some stage at least Mr Daniels will be compensated for the considerable sum of money—\$2 000 in wages, plus approximately \$4 000 or \$5 000 in legal fees—which he had to pay out as a result of being prepared to stand up and be counted. We can see what happened to him. I have the greatest admiration for that man, and, if he overreacted, it was because of his deep feelings for the situation. He stood up to be counted and he certainly suffered for it.

I am sorry the Minister for Education is not here because yesterday he made one of the most despicable interjections which I have ever heard.

Mr Laurance: He is just outside the door. I was going to call him, but when I heard the tone of your comments I thought I had better not.

Mr DAVIES: He made one of the most despicable comments I have ever heard. When we were talking about a tavern being near a school he said the Opposition would like massage parlours in schools because of its attitude towards prostitution and homosexuality, and he is a Minister!

Mr Nanovich: And a good one, too.

Mr DAVIES: I wonder about the Minister; one would think he was lecturing or coaching a reform school football team. He must surely have some responsibility as a Minister to see that he upholds his department, and even though he might like to make what he considers to be funny and catching remarks, when he makes those untrue and stupid comments he does himself little good and it is time he got himself out of the gutter and recognised that as a Minister he has to bite his tongue on some occasions. Policies on homosexuality and prostitution have been with the Labor Party for years and are likely to remain.

Dr Dadour: Vested interest!

Mr DAVIES: As the member for Subiaco reminds me, there is a lot of vested interest in the field of prostitution.

Dr Dadour: No, I meant the Labor Party.

Mr DAVIES: We have not got any; in the field of prostitution there is, but he does not say anything about Government policies in regard to prostitution, containment, and toleration, nor does he say anything about the Government's policies in regard to gambling. He did himself little credit by that comment.

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [11.31 a.m.]: I missed the opportunity to speak on the Budget so I take this opportunity to say a few words.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Dr DADOUR: I have been interested in the health area for some time and in the estimates and annual reports I could not find any reference to the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. I found no explanation for its deletion from the estimates. I could not even find out the cost per kilo of laundry!

In 1971, when I first came to Parliament, the then Minister for Health, the member for Victoria Park, brought in a Bill to institute the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. This had been left on the table by the previous Minister for Health (Mr MacKinnon) of the former Govern-

ment. Later people latched onto this and began to bring about the birth of the service. We were in Opposition then and we argued and argued that it would be wrong to introduce this type of centralised labour service, one of the reasons being that, if such a service went on strike, it would cripple the hospital system overnight, more or equally as readily as if nurses and doctors went on strike. That was a most valid argument.

The Hospital Laundry and Linen Service was set up with money raised by teaching hospitals and the Home of Peace, and that is how it came into being. As members know, on at least two occasions the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service by strike action was able to cripple hospitals; surgeries were cancelled and no hospital admissions were accepted unless in extreme emergencies. It had an effect as devastating as if the doctors and nurses had gone on strike. In my opinion, the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service could be done away with. It is a constant threat they may go on strike and the hospitals would be reduced to chaos. I thought that we would have closed that service by now and let it out to private enterprise, because it would then be done much more cheaply.

I do not have the figures for the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service charges, but I do know that private enterprise could carry out the service just as efficiently. During the strike the hospitals had their laundry done by smaller laundries in order that the hospitals could remain open, and they found that the cost was much less.

If the teaching hospitals contracted their linen and laundry to sheltered workshop laundries, we would then not have to grapple with strikes. We could be very cunning and make sure that we obtain all the linen and laundry we need.

Mr Davies: No-one will be able to strike at all from now on.

Dr DADOUR: The sheltered workshops would not go on strike and we would never have any problems. As for saying there will be no more strikes in the future, it is like saying there will be no more jobs in the future. It is just not on.

Mr Davies: We're working towards that now.

Dr DADOUR: Every member of Parliament must feel that what happened early this year with the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr Hodge: Whom do you blame for the situation?

Dr DADOUR: I must blame the union for it.

Mr Hodge: You do not think the employer is to blame?



Dr DADOUR: The employer is the State Government, and that could not have been to blame.

Mr Young: The Industrial Commission did not seem to think it was the State Government which was to blame and ordered the workers back to work. They refused because they did not like the decision of the umpire.

Dr DADOUR: It seems we abide by the umpire when it suits us. However, we still have this malignant growth at Murdoch and it is ready to spread its tentacles at any moment. If another strike occurs, it will bring the whole hospital service to its knees.

Mr Davies: You remember this service was started by the Minister who preceded me as Minister for Health.

Dr DADOUR: The plans were left on the table and, when the member for Victoria Park took up his position, he instigated the plan because it was a real socialist measure and he and his party thought it was good.

We tried to defeat the move in the lower House and it went to the upper House where we have a majority, but it received the okay of the upper House.

Mr Davies: My biggest political surprise.

Mr Bertram: You can get some surprising results from the upper House.

Mr Blaikie: Would that not show that the upper House acted as a House of Review, as it is?

Dr DADOUR: Can it be recorded in *Hansard* that I am laughing? House of Review? Mischievous, that is what it was. However, I am not allowed to make such comments about the other place.

When the Liberal Party was in Government previously, and Mr Baxter was Minister for Health, the situation continued as it did under the next Liberal Minister for Health. I hope something will be done about the matter now. I know how to overcome the problem—close the place down.

Mr Hodge: What about improving the industrial relations out there?

Dr DADOUR: That will not work.

Mr Hodge: Industrial relations out there are not so bad.

Mr Young: We saw some of the industrial relations during the strike; they stood over some of the women.

Dr DADOUR: The accounting of the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service is hidden in the Budget. I looked for it for some time and found it

hidden under "Subsidies to Public Hospitals and Related Services, \$323 million".

Another matter which distresses me is the hospital computing service. We note that expenditure in hospitals is being cut down, particularly in teaching hospitals. I always have argued for this, but I have argued that it should be done with as little interference as possible to patient care.

Reference was made to the health computing services in the annual report of the Department of Health and Hospital and Allied Services of 30 June 1982. The report includes a list of the new systems installed or implemented as well as a list of the existing production systems and new locations. However, it tells us nothing about how much it costs.

Supposedly, 111 people are employed by the health and computer service and the staff has been increased by approximately 30 this year. In private enterprise that work load could be carried by 40 people. That is an estimate off the top of my head because I have no way of checking it out. However, we have an increase of 29 to 30 staff in the health area this financial year when hospital services are short of money. The Budget Estimates do not show that a bedside or patient care service is included in this amount to be spent. I find it rather difficult to understand that a provision has not been made for that service.

Once again, this service is hidden in the \$323 million. I wonder what else is hidden and what other departments have sprung up over the years. How much of it is jobs for the boys? How much is really needed for patient care? I would be far more selective in cutting back expenses in our hospitals.

Another point that worries me and the administrators of hospitals is that this year the cutback in finance was \$34 million. This will be repeated next year, and the year after. I am led to believe that this is the case and the Grants Commission intends cutting back Western Australia's grants to what it believes the Government should be spending on health. We are being compared with our sister States. Last year the Grants Commission said WA spent on health funding \$96 million in total more than it should have compared with the other States. This year the total overspending was \$130 million, and that is the way in which the Grants Commission is trying to peg back health costs.

There are three different categories of hospital beds in teaching hospitals. We have one class of beds for super specialities which are very expensive and cost in the vicinity of \$1 000 per day.

Mr Davies: What makes them so expensive?

Dr DADOUR: It is because of the intensive treatment of those patients. Naturally the cost of open heart surgery is much more than the cost of an appendectomy. In the case of open heart surgery a team of 40 doctors, paramedics, and nurses is required to ensure that everything is co-ordinated. This cost is terrific.

Much of the cardiac and open heart surgery has been necessary because of cigarette smoking and when we take into consideration the surgery and associated costs, overall, the increase is great. Fifty per cent of the open heart surgery performed in this State—at a phenomenal cost—is necessary because of the effects of cigarette smoking and this fact substantiates my argument further.

Mr Davies: Are there a couple of heart operations a day?

Dr DADOUR: About 800 such operations are performed each year and this is the reason that the speciality beds are required.

I was referring to the three categories of hospital beds. There are the super speciality beds, the teaching hospital beds, and ordinary beds, and many of the patients occupying ordinary beds could be cared for in peripheral hospitals. However, the patients are required to be treated in teaching hospitals because the medical students must have experience with not only the uncommon illnesses but also with all the common ailments. The patients using the speciality beds do not provide much experience for the medical students because often the condition of the patient is so serious that his treatment must be in the hands of the experts.

Mr Davies: What is the average bed cost per day in teaching hospitals?

Dr DADOUR: The average cost is \$300 per day. However I am not exactly sure of this figure because so many charges are loaded into the health computer service and this in turn is included in the charges for teaching hospital beds. This must occur because I cannot find any allocation in the documents I have before me. I think what happens is that the Health Department receives \$X and this goes into the hospital fund with each of the teaching hospitals receiving so many millions of dollars. A certain percentage of this money must go towards the health computer service. If this is not the case, from where does the health computer service receive its funds? I am unable to find any allocation for this; it must be buried in some other charge.

Mr Gordon Hill: Is it a Government cover up?

Dr DADOUR: It is not a Government cover up, but we, as members of Parliament, should be

able to determine the details of money expended in these categories; they should be before our eyes.

In the present allocation for health there should be a category for linen and laundry services, but this is not mentioned.

Mr Young: You realise it is self-supporting. Therefore, all the hospitals pay for the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service.

Dr DADOUR: If that is the case it is more reason for us to know the details.

Mr Young: There is not a drain on the revenue.

Dr DADOUR: That may be the Minister's opinion, but I think it is a drain on revenue.

Mr Young: My understanding is there is no cost to the State for hospital laundry and linen services.

Dr DADOUR: I would like to know what it costs each hospital per item of laundry.

Mr Young: You can get that figure from me if you want it.

Dr DADOUR: Why is it not shown?

Mr Young: You will not get the cost per kilo of laundry in the CRF. If you want that figure I will get it for you.

Dr DADOUR: Investigations should be undertaken to ascertain if private enterprise could undertake this service, because if this were the case there would be no dark cloud overhead in regard to strikes.

Mr Gordon Hill: Your Minister said that the service is not a drain on revenue. If this is the case the sale of the service to private enterprise would not save the State any money.

Dr DADOUR: It is a drain on the revenue and the member for Swan cannot tell me that the linen and laundry service would not function as efficiently if it were undertaken by private enterprise.

Mr Gordon Hill: Do you disagree with your Minister?

Dr DADOUR: What the Minister is saying is compatible with what I am saying. He is not arguing about the costs.

Mr Gordon Hill: Were you suggesting earlier that there would be no strikes in the service if it was operated by private enterprise and it would, therefore, be more efficient?

Dr DADOUR: We have all our eggs in one basket and that one basket can easily cripple the whole industry. If we were to have the service that existed before the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service came into existence, with the laundry

being washed on site or by private enterprise, we would not have a strike situation.

Mr Gordon Hill: I ask again, are you saying that there would be no strikes within a privately operated linen service?

The SPEAKER: The member for Swan and the member for Subiaco are having an exchange which is essentially a private one between themselves and neither the *Hansard* reporter nor I can hear. Would the member for Subiaco address his comments to the Chair and if the member for Swan wants to interject perhaps he could do so in a manner that ensures that we can hear.

Dr DADOUR: I am sorry Mr Speaker. I am trying to break the egg into as many small parts as possible so that if a strike occurred it will not affect all the hospitals.

We were in Opposition in 1971 when the Bill to establish the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service was introduced. I thought then that it was a socialist idea. It was originally suggested by a Liberal Minister, but after the change of Government, the incoming Labor Government latched onto it and produced legislation which became the current Act. This should never have been born. It should have been destroyed before it was even an embryo. However, that was not to be.

I would like to see the dark cloud removed, even by our closing the place down. That is the only way it could be done. We could then use the building for something else; it does not matter. From what I can see, an amount of loan funds is being spent on buying the houses in Servetus Street; and the department is crying out for more funds. Perhaps we should allow the department to start raising funds at 14½ per cent. Plenty of money seems to be available in the loan funds so that the hospitals will be able to expand one day. Whatever we lose by closing the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service, we will pick up in the long run because we will then be in a position that we have removed one more thing that has caused trouble in the past.

The service will continue to cause trouble as long as it remains. The fact that I am speaking about it will probably give the employees good cause to go on strike because I am trying to bring about their demise. Anything could happen from that point of view.

I return to the teaching hospitals. I find that new categories have been taken on in the teaching hospital area over the years. I would have thought that we as a Government would be looking at more of these areas where expansion has occurred, and the new categories of hospital workers that have been born. We should give consider-

ation to what would happen if we were to remove them from their positions, or make the positions defunct. That is the way I see it.

One category to which I refer is the so-called ward pharmacist. I have spoken about this situation before. Pharmacists always have been in the hospital pharmacies, dispensing drugs for outpatients and inpatients. However, somewhere along the line somebody had a good idea that we should put pharmacists in the wards; so instead of our having pharmacists in the pharmacies only, we now have pharmacists in the wards. They top up all the bottles of drugs in the wards and ensure that enough drugs are available. They walk around and tell the patients what the drugs are supposed to do. In my time, that was all done by the doctors, the nurses, or the sisters in charge.

A big thing has been made of having ward pharmacists. They talk about the interaction occurring with certain drugs on occasions; and possibly they have saved a few lives. How far do we go with having more and more people in more and more categories in the hospitals?

Mr Davies: Are you saying there is a full-time pharmacist in every ward?

Dr DADOUR: No, not in every ward. I think they have one to two wards, or something like that. They have more or less doubled the number of pharmacists in the teaching hospitals because of the ward pharmacist situation. I am talking about only the pharmacists, because they were the last category to be acknowledged by the Public Service Board.

I would have thought that this was one area which we could cut back in toto rather than cut back on a category involved in bedside care. That is the only argument I can put forward. As I say, the problem of cutting back on the staff in our hospitals is vast. The build-up has been slow over a number of years; and if we were to leave it to the administrations of the hospitals to cut back, we would be skating on thin ice because if an administration wanted to be nasty, it would cut back on an area which would affect the patients the most.

We should have a great deal of consultation and a great deal of care shown to ensure that a case cannot be made out for the hospital service to be less effective in bedside care. I am talking about certain categories of non-bedside care, such as the health and computing service, which should come under great scrutiny. The staffs have increased, but we are floundering because we are not in a winning position. We have had nothing but trouble, trouble, trouble; and, ever since, we

have been getting further and further into the quagmire.

I know that the university is making an input in certain areas; but we must have 61 maintenance men in that area to keep it going. We have problems in areas, but we do not have balance sheets or any other way of checking on the exorbitant amount of money being spent to very little effect.

I am not satisfied about the situation. The Government has no books and accounts or tables for me to find out exactly what is happening. Something is wrong with the whole system; and we should be able to see exactly what is wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! I apologise to the member for Subiaco for interrupting him again. There is too much background noise for members in the Chamber to hear the debate.

Mr Gordon Hill: I beg your pardon?

Mr Nanovich: Smart aleck!

The SPEAKER: I take the point of the member for Swan. There is too much background noise, and I ask members to have regard for the fact that some people are trying to listen to the debate.

Dr DADOUR: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for looking after my interests.

Mr Pearce: You have some friends!

Dr DADOUR: We should be able to see at a glance where every penny of hospital expenditure goes. As members of Parliament, we should be made aware of what is going on, and where the money is coming from. We should do our bit toward ensuring that the Government acts far more economically than it has been doing.

The thought of the Public Accounts Committee makes me laugh. How many reports have come out? I think it is about 25. Does anyone know?

Mr Davies: Up to no good; I can tell you that.

Dr DADOUR: Has anyone ever read the 20-odd reports of the Public Accounts Committee? I do not think anyone has ever taken any notice of them.

Mr Nanovich: Eighteen.

Mr Sibson: I have read the current one.

Dr DADOUR: No-one has ever taken notice of the reports, because nobody has acted on them.

Mr Bertram: Yes, we have.

Dr DADOUR: That applies even to the report on the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee at the time was the present Minister for Education. That report has never been acted on; nothing has been done about it. So we go on, and on, and on.

We should have proper Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the autonomous bodies which run at no loss, because the loss is covered by the fact that the bodies are probably charging much more than would be required if private enterprise entered the field.

I rose to speak for a few minutes only. I think I have over-extended my welcome. Thank you.

MR McIVER (Avon) [12.05 p.m.]: In making a contribution to this debate, I shall comment briefly on the statement this morning by the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard) who appealed to wage earners who had made submissions for wage increases to look at the economy, because such increases would only cause more jobs to be lost. In some ways, that statement could be rather accurate.

However, how can the Federal Treasurer expect the average wage earner, housewife, or family to cop it, bearing in mind the Federal Government's expenditure not only in relation to the Parliament, but also in the provision of Government cars so that the Prime Minister could take his son, Mark, to his wedding? Federal Ministers have huge expense accounts, some claiming they have been out of the country for over 300 days of the year at a cost of \$120 a day. That is ridiculous!

If the Federal Government expects the public to co-operate with its Budget, it should put its own house in order before appealing to the workers and families of this State to tighten their belts. Government cars were made available to Malcolm Fraser to cart his son's party to the wedding!

Mr Sibson: If you were a Minister and you were going to your son's wedding, and if you had the use of a Government car, wouldn't you use it for that purpose?

Mr McIVER: What? I would rather go by horse and cart!

Several members interjected.

Mr McIVER: What Gough Whitlam did was nothing compared with what Malcolm Fraser is doing.

It is ridiculous for the Federal Treasurer to tell us to tighten our belts when senior Ministers, including the National Party Leader (Mr Anthony), claim they have been out of the country for over 300 days of the year at \$120 a day. It is time we looked closely at the situation.

Several members interjected.

Mr McIVER: As the Minister for Primary Industry appears to be very vocal today, I point out to him that I oppose strongly the Government's decision to close the research station at Northam.

No doubt the Minister for Primary Industry prepared the Cabinet minute and submitted to Cabinet the recommendation for the closure of that research station. He purports to be the representative of farmers and country people, and yet research stations in WA are being closed down. The region from Wongan Hills to Katanning plays a very important role in agriculture in WA. One of the reasons for the agricultural progress in the region has been the research station at Northam.

The Minister for Primary Industry has deceived the Parliament, because in answer to a question I asked him in this House on Wednesday, 25 November 1981, which followed the closure of the Avondale Research Station and which was to the effect, "Will the agriculture research station at Northam be curtailed in any way?" he said—

(1) No.

(2) Expenditure at Northam Research Station in 1980-81 was \$64 916. The vote for 1981-82 is \$94 600.

I accepted that answer in good faith and advised the staff at the research station that they need not fear the possibility of being transferred, because the research station would continue in its present form. Bearing in mind that vote, it was logical I should believe the research station would continue to make its contribution to agricultural research in the region. However, what do we find? We find now that the research station is to be sold.

The research station was established as a separate entity in 1969. At that time, fencing, stockyards, and watering points were minimal, pastures were poor, and productivity was low. In 1980 the station had been fenced adequately with electric fencing being widely used, three sets of functional cattle yards had been installed, and the station had been reticulated fully with most of the water coming from bores which were backed up by connection to the regional water supply scheme.

If we bear in mind past experience, we realise that this research station will be practically given away. That has been the policy of Liberal Governments in the Brand-Court era which disposed of Government instrumentalities. No doubt this research station will be given away for a song, irrespective of the contribution it has made, particularly to the beef cattle industry.

The staff at the research station have a wonderful liaison with the cattle producers of the region. They meet frequently to study further management programmes. That will all go down the drain as a result of this Government's decision, and one wonders why. The answer is obvious. We had the schemozzle at Katanning, in the Minis-

ter's own electorate, where a property was on the market for years, but could not be sold.

Mr Old: That is not correct and you know it—or perhaps you don't know it!

Mr McIVER: It could not be sold because of the salt content of the land.

Mr Old: That is a load of rubbish—like you!

Mr McIVER: That statement has been made not only by me, but also by reputable officers of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr Old: What rot!

Mr McIVER: Those officers prepared papers indicating why the station should not be established at Katanning. Full marks to the Minister if he can create something—

Mr Old: You are trying to mislead the House, but you are doing it very unsuccessfully.

Mr McIVER: I do not tell lies.

Mr Old: Not much! You mentioned the word.

Mr McIVER: The Minister told me he did not intend to curtail the research station at Northam, but now he intends to sell it; therefore, he should not say that I am misleading the House. Anyway, we have not started yet!

Mr Old: Settle down!

Mr McIVER: That property could not be sold privately, because of its salt content and the large area of rye grass on it. However, it was bought for thousands of dollars to be used as a breeding institute. The price paid for it was the highest ever recorded at that time for the establishment of a breeding institute in WA.

Not satisfied with that, the Government has paid over \$1 million for a property at Busselton.

Mr Blaikie: It was a very good decision.

Mr McIVER: Over \$800 000 has been allocated for expenditure on that complex this year. That property is a long way away from the Northam agricultural region. This is a scandal! In one way I suppose I should be very grateful to the Government for making the announcement before the election that it intends to sell this research station. This was an announcement made by people who are supposed to represent the farmers of this State and who are elected here to look after their interests.

Mr Blaikie: Are you saying you would not have had a research station in the lower south-west region?

Mr McIVER: I do not begrudge the member's having a research station in his area, but why close a station which has proved its worth?

I commend the Government for what it has accomplished at Merredin with its laboratory there which works in conjunction with the local office. Why cannot the Northam station be in parallel with the Merredin station? I know it does not matter how long I stand here and defend the Northam Agricultural Research Station—the Government has made its decision. However, I appeal to the Minister for Agriculture not to sell the station until after the next State election, which I understand is to be held in February or March next year, not too long from now. The sale of this very fine establishment involves no great urgency. The Minister should curtail his action till after the election so that we in the Opposition have an opportunity, when we are elected as the next Government, to retrieve the situation and to revise the whole structure of research stations in this State. Has the Minister been to the research station at Northam?

Mr Old: What would you think?

Mr McIVER: I would say he had not.

Mr Old: You would be totally wrong.

Mr McIVER: That is one way to get an answer.

Mr Old: You are such a know-all.

Mr McIVER: I know my comments probably are hurting the Minister, who displays a cavalier attitude to this question. It does not matter to him how many people he hurts. He would not accompany me to Beverley and discuss this matter in debate with the people of the area. He does not care about the families who have to be transferred to other locations. He said he had to stay in the House while it was debating some fiddling little item. I ask the Minister to come up to the area with me and attend a public meeting I intend to arrange so that he can talk to the farmers there. We will see then whether he continues to display the cavalier attitude he shows in this Parliament.

Mr Old: You might have egg on your face when it all comes out. You might get short-term benefit, but it will be short.

Mr McIVER: I can face any of the rubbish the Minister throws up at me. Members of the Country Party are lucky to save their deposit at elections. What does the Country Party represent in agricultural areas today? It represents nothing; it is a joke and is treated as such.

The Northam Research Station has a manager, a technician, three agricultural research station operators, three part-time cleaners, and provision for four months' casual labour. In November 1980, one officer resigned and a technician was transferred to Mt. Barker. The station can ill-

afford to lose senior people. Instead of selling the station, the Government should ensure it is retained and in fact expanded on the lines of the Merredin station so that the two stations can work in conjunction with one another. It should be allowed to make a further contribution to agriculture in Western Australia. I make no apology for standing in this Parliament and defending the Northam station. The officers who have worked at the station since it was established have made a wonderful contribution to agricultural research.

Before I conclude on this subject, I want to say how sorry I was at the passing of Mr McDowell, a man who was very respected in the field of agriculture. He always had the respect of country people and his passing will be a loss to the Department of Agriculture and the State as a whole.

Next year the Government intends to remove 19 passenger coaches from service and so deprive thousands of families in Western Australia who enjoy weekly excursions on our railways. In this instance I am referring to the Watsonia service. When the Watsonia coaches came to Northam recently they carried over 1 500 people on the 22 coaches. When that number of people are brought to a small country town there is a considerable injection of money into the economy of the town. Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), the town of Gingin in your electorate will shortly have 1 000 people arriving in it, so you can imagine the boost this will provide to the town. The train fare will include an additional \$1 so that the people on your committee in Gingin will receive a benefit.

However, this Government will take away the opportunity for this to happen in future and its excuse is that the coaches are not safe. I can assure members from my own personal knowledge and from contact with train examiners, that the underframe of the carriages is structurally sound. Because of lack of maintenance in the workshops, the panelling of some of the coaches is not as we would wish. However, to remove 19 of the coaches is an absolutely criminal act.

Every week in the Press we find the Government urging people to utilise public transport. However, we see the situation at Christmas where the *Prospector* service to Kalgoorlie is in chaos; Westrail has to run buses during the school holidays from Australind to Bunbury because there is not enough room on the trains. I understand the Government has arranged to remove its advertisements from *The West Australian* advertising the *Australind* service because Westrail does not have sufficient coaches to meet the patronage.

In a letter to the Watsonia group, Westrail officers have claimed that, because of the old panning, the coaches are not safe to be used for these excursions which are provided by two groups, the Hotham Valley Historical Society, which runs excursions to Dwellingup—excursions which are always packed—and the Watsonia organisation, which also has excursions which are packed. This again is a situation involving the Government's secrecy. It tries to deceive people. The Watsonia people cannot get an answer from Westrail and so they do not know whether they can carry out their 1983 programme. All they get is a lot of hogwash and wish-wash about the coaches being unsafe.

It is time the Government gave strong consideration to the overall future planning for the transport of people to and from the goldfields and our south-west regions, particularly during the peak periods of mid-year and Christmas school holidays. We will witness no change this year from previous years; there will be chaos this year as there always has been. People will not be able to get onto the *Prospector*, and that is happening even now.

Instead of the Government's purchasing land worth over \$1 million, it should give someone else a small slice of the cake. In particular, it should direct more money to transport planning to ensure our people will not be disappointed when they wish to go from one place to another. It is absolutely scandalous that 19 coaches will go out of use, and of course deprive the Government of urgently needed revenue. It is not cheap to hire a complete train. In particular, the crew are entitled to double pay if they work on a Sunday. The Government's record in these situations is not good at all. The member for Subiaco complained because someone might not have clean sheets. He complained about someone's laundry! Government members should visit country areas to see the situations experienced by country people, particularly in relation to transport.

We have had the battle in regard to Total West. From Monday, 26 towns will have their frequency of services reduced from the promised every-day-a-week service to two services a week. If my remarks when this Bill was initially introduced are read, it will be known that I said these services would be reduced. In addition, more employees will be retrenched; already 60 have been retrenched, and more retrenchments are on the way.

Unfortunately the Minister responsible for these matters is not in the Chamber, but he is the one who has stood up to say, "What a wonderful record we have", and has taken members of Par-

liament to the Commissioner for Railways to get an earbashing about the wonderful job the Government is supposed to be doing. Members have been told what a wonderful job the Australian Railways Research and Development Organisation is doing, and how good the management services division is. The top man in that division earns \$42 000 a year, and others in that organisation earn amounts tapering down to \$15 000 a year. But we are not told ARRDO is only a duplicate of the Federal Government organisation.

We are told by the Federal Minister for Transport that we must tighten our belts, and this State Treasurer says more funds are not available for transport and that certain services must be curtailed. It is no wonder that in elections throughout Australia, whether they be by-elections or State elections, Liberal Parties are being soundly defeated. It is quite evident to me that next year in this State the same change will take place. The fault will not lie with individuals in this State, but with this Government's Federal counterpart as occurred when the John Tonkin Labor Government was in power in this State. I have made that point on many occasions, and I am sure members would agree with me.

Mr Sibson: Whitlam's Government!

Mr McIVER: I will not continue on that line and I will not reply to the member's illiterate interjection because it is not worth replying to. Unfortunately, the Minister for Police and Prisons is not in the Chamber either. I know he will soon visit our region, and what I say now will be able to be emphasised by his personal examination of the area, and, particularly, the Northam Police Station. I have been complaining for about 15 years about that station. Smaller towns have proper facilities, but Northam does not. I do not deny such towns as Toodyay, York, and Beverley the elaborate police stations they have, yet the regional town of Northam does not have proper facilities.

The Northam police comprise officers from all divisions of the Police Force. We have a divisional superintendent, an inspector, 10 or 11 first-class sergeants, male and female constables, and a Criminal Investigation Bureau, but they must all use a shoddy and dilapidated building, the conditions in which are unbearable during the summer months.

I will make a sincere suggestion to the Government, a suggestion which would save it money. When the Road Traffic Authority was established in Northam, a new air-conditioned complex was constructed for it, and now that the police and the

RTA are amalgamated I suggest it would not take much foresight and planning to enable the construction of a cell block at that RTA complex. With an additional two or three officers, Northam could have a modern police station, and the police officers in that town would have a decent place in which to work. These improved facilities would encourage the officers to better carry out their duties. It is ridiculous that they should continue to use the present building. Before it was extended, it was a sergeant's quarters.

Every other town in the area seems to have been able to obtain proper facilities, and certainly the Northam police deserve better facilities than they have, especially in view of the vast area they must cover, the number of personnel stationed there, and the divisions they represent. I say to the Treasurer that this is an area in which not much money would have to be spent to provide a new police complex.

My final remarks are directed to the Minister for Agriculture. Now that a decision has not been made in regard to the Northam Research Station, I trust that he will give the farmers of my district the chance to debate the matter, and that no decision in regard to the sale of that institute will be made until after the next State election.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): The Minister for Agriculture, who would like to reply to certain questions.

**MR OLD** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [12.33 p.m.]: I feel I must make some reply to the matters raised by the member for Avon. I can understand his—

Mr Pearce: What about others who want to speak?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pearce: I want to clarify his right of address. There are other speakers.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing to clarify. I gave the call to the Minister for Agriculture.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: I do not question your right to choose between the Minister and me; however, you did say clearly, "The Minister, in reply".

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): I did not; I said, in effect, "The Minister would like to reply to certain questions that were asked." It was obvious that he would do so. There is no point of order.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr OLD: I can understand the concern of the member for Avon, especially as a result of his tenuous hold on his electorate. His outburst reported in the local Press—

Mr McIver: You probably wouldn't have said anything unless I asked the question. You weren't going to tell anybody.

Mr OLD: I had no real need—

Mr McIver: What about the people? Don't they rate a chance to make family arrangements?

Mr OLD: A final decision has not been made. It may be that the member needs to be careful that he does not end up with egg on his face when he finds out what will be the ultimate use of the Northam Research Station. I have stated on many occasions in this House that we must rationalise our research stations, and we are doing so.

Some of the allegations made by the member were not only grossly unfair, but also inaccurate—they were not becoming of him. Even he is one who illustrates that he can be fair sometimes, but he has not been on this occasion. Obviously, he sniffed strongly a little bit of political advantage in the wind.

At present we are negotiating, but I doubt a final decision will be made for some time. When the final decision is made, I assure him that it will be to the advantage not only of the department, but also of the people of Northam. At this stage I am not able or prepared to give any further details, except to say that I think the ultimate decision will please the local population. It is very easy for someone to race into print with banner headlines about what the Minister is doing, and supposedly how he is trying to pull down the research being carried out in an area.

We are aware of the value of the Avon Valley to agriculture and the economy. A lot of mischief was stirred up when the operations of the Avondale Research Station were scaled down, but the part of the operation that was scaled down was non-productive and the amount of research that has been conducted at the Avondale Research Station has been greater this year than in previous years. This fact was disclosed at a meeting with the PIA recently. I understand the PIA has had, or will be having, another meeting in the area to discuss the matter and it will calculate the amount of research and effort that is being put into the Avon Valley.

Some of the remarks that have been made are unfair, especially one comment in relation to senior officers of the Department of Agriculture.



By innuendo only, the member for Avon indicates that these officers recommended strongly against the purchase of a property east of Katanning.

Mr McIver: They were disgusted.

Mr OLD: I suggest that the member names those officers—

Mr McIver: Rubbish!

Mr OLD: —or at least produces some evidence; he is doing something which is totally dishonest in saying that officers of a department made certain recommendations. I can assure him that no such recommendations were made.

Mr Blaikie: He probably got an anonymous phone call from the member for Gosnells!

Mr OLD: I think he got it in his sleep. The decision to purchase the property at Katanning, which incidentally for the member for Avon's information I indicate belonged to Mr D. S. More and had been on the market for about five months—not forever—was taken by a committee which comprised senior officers of my department and people involved in livestock research in Western Australia, farmers, and scientists. They came to the decision to purchase the property, but they looked at properties from Narrogin to Gnowangerup before making the final decision.

Mr McIver: What is wrong with having it at Muresk College?

Mr OLD: They wanted it in the great southern where sheep production is at its peak and where stud stock breeders are domiciled. The member should know that, and if he does not, he should go home.

Mr McIver: The facilities are already there. It is a way of life.

Mr OLD: To say the property is not worth the money, is a lot of hogwash and is indicative of the member for Avon's mentality with regard to rural matters. It has salt on it and it did have some wimmera rye grass toxicity, and those things were taken into account because it is an animal breeding and research institute which afforded an opportunity for some research to be undertaken on a farm belonging to the Department of Agriculture. My department is criticised severely by farmers when extension officers go out and say, "This is what we are doing on such and such a research station". Invariably the cry is that the department always gets the best farm in the district, so we should be able to farm well. When we take a farm that is not the best one in the district we are then criticised by people of the ilk of the member for Avon.

I reiterate that there is no desire or intention to reduce the research input into the Avon Valley.

When we do decide on the fate of the Northam Research Station, it will be disposed of to best advantage to the Government and the people of the Avon Valley. I am hopeful that after Cabinet considers the proposition which has been put forward, we may be able to make a statement, albeit not detailed at this stage, to indicate to the people of the Avon Valley exactly what the intention of this Government is, and when those facts are publicised, and if the plan as I envisage it today materialises—and I have every reason to believe it will—it will be of great help and advantage to the people living in that district.

I am aware of the contribution which officers of the Department of Agriculture make to the community and it is unfortunate that occasionally we have to shift people. I have heard it put up to the Minister for Transport and the Railways Department that the shifting of five people from the town will have an effect on the town. I realise it will have an effect on the town; the Government is cognisant of that fact and will endeavour to ensure that there is no diminution of population in the district.

At this stage I do not intend to say any more about the subject. I repeat that I am terribly disappointed in the member for Avon's attitude. At times he is unable to take an objective outlook. I do not blame him because of the tenuous situation in his electorate.

Mr McIver: You can take only so much.

Mr OLD: He is trying to make capital out of something which he hopes will cause misery to me and the people of Northam; I have news for him—it will not cause misery to anyone.

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [12.41 p.m.]: I again raise the matter which I have been raising this week during question time.

Mr Blaikie: What have you been raising all week?

Mr PEARCE: During question time I have been raising the question of the placement of a tavern next to a primary school in the Heathridge area.

Mr Nanovich: I thought the answer by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning last night clearly clarified that the fault lay with the council.

Mr PEARCE: It did not clarify where the fault lay, if I can put it more succinctly and clearly than the member for Whitford. There was a good degree of obfuscation not only by the Minister—

Mr Laurance: Obfuscation? It is the ability to confuse one's audience, but I think your pronunciation is wrong.

Mr Bryce: It depends which school you went to.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr Laurance: I am only trying to be helpful, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr PEARCE: There were a couple of inaccuracies and omissions in the Minister's statement. I am particularly concerned at the attitude of the Minister for Education with regard to this question, particularly where he deviated in regard to his claims on this matter from those which were made by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning; the Minister for Education was clearly factually incorrect and possibly was making an effort deliberately to mislead the people with regard to the situation.

I mention firstly the way this matter came before the House. This makes a point about the degree to which certain Ministers are on top of their portfolios. On Tuesday I intended to ask the Minister for Education a question about this matter. He came to me an hour or two before question time and said he had an appointment and asked if I had any questions I wanted to raise with him. To be honest, he did say that if I had any questions he would miss his appointment and stay to answer them. I said that the question could wait a day and so I asked the question of the Minister on Wednesday; but it gave me the opportunity to put the question first to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning. Last Tuesday I asked her whether she had overruled a decision of the Wanneroo Shire Council not to allow a tavern in close proximity to the Heathridge Primary School. On Tuesday the Minister did not know. Her answer was, "In answer to the member for Gosnells, I have no knowledge of this matter". She did not know. On Wednesday I asked the Minister for Education whether he was aware that this had taken place and I sought his attitude to taverns being built next to primary schools, and the Minister for Education did not know anything about it. He said that if I wanted to find something out I should ask the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning!

*Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.*

Mr PEARCE: Before I was so rudely interrupted by the luncheon suspension I was canvassing the questions of the approval given by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning for a tavern to be built next to the Heathridge Primary School and of the way in which this matter has been dealt with in the Parliament this week.

On Tuesday, I asked the Minister for Local Government whether she had overruled the

Wanneroo Shire Council in this way and she said she had no immediate knowledge of it. On Wednesday, I asked the Minister for Education whether he was aware of the situation and whether it was Government policy to allow taverns to be sited next to primary schools.

Mr Sibson: It is not.

Mr PEARCE: At that stage the Minister for Education had no knowledge of it, but on Thursday everyone had become an expert on the matter and everyone knew about it.

The Minister for Education's attitude has shown a degree of irresponsibility and I am more critical of him than I am of the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning because under the circumstances she has outlined, I can understand that a tavern next to a primary school may have seemed a lesser issue in regard to the sort of matters she has to consider. However, the Minister for Education has a clear responsibility to look after the interests of schools.

Mr MacKinnon: Are there other places in this State where this occurs?

Mr PEARCE: I do not have any knowledge of that fact.

Mr MacKinnon: It shows your basic lack of knowledge.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: Liberal members may feel that taverns should be built next to primary schools.

Mr Nanovich: We do not see that you knuckle head!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whitford will not make statements such as that to other members, and I ask the House to come to order! I ask the member for Gosnells to direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: The Opposition does not believe it is good practice to site taverns next to primary schools.

Mr MacKinnon: Why not?

Mr Nanovich: This is only because your brother has taken part in it and is criticising the Minister.

Mr PEARCE: I am about to recount the facts of the matter if the member for Whitford can contain himself.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Whitford has a clear interest in this matter.

Mr Nanovich: Why have I an interest in it?

Mr PEARCE: I will explain in a moment. I think the member for Whitford made a foolish mistake last night in regard to the fight he is having with the council and he is trying to imply it is the council's fault. Councils are like Governments—they come and go—and the council which is operating in the Wanneroo Shire is a different council in 1982 from that which was operating in 1979 when this business started.

In 1979 when the original approaches were made with regard to this matter, the partners in crime, with the member for Whitford, were the people who constituted the majority of the council.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr NANOVIK: I take exception to those remarks that I was involved in part with the crime the member referred to and I ask that those words be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Whitford has taken objection to the words used by the member for Gosnells and I ask the member for Gosnells to withdraw those remarks.

Mr PEARCE: In fact—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member has taken objection to the words used.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: I am rising on a point of order. My point of order is that the words to which he has taken objection are not the words I used.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Whitford objected to the member for Gosnells using the words that he was involved with partners in crime. The member for Whitford raised that objection by way of a request that those words be withdrawn and I uphold that objection. The member for Gosnells will find that Standing Orders do provide for such a withdrawal, and I ask the member to withdraw those words.

Mr PEARCE: I will certainly, but—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Without qualification.

Mr PEARCE: I am seeking to clarify the matter because I understood the member for Whitford to say that I had alleged he was involved in parts of crime.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The remarks that I heard were "partners in crime" and I ask the member for Gosnells to withdraw those remarks.

#### *Withdrawal of Remarks*

Mr PEARCE: I withdraw. However, I say they are his associates in unsavoury practices.

Mr NANOVIK: I ask the member for Gosnells to withdraw that last remark, also.

Mr Sibson: Hear, hear!

Mr Hodge: Drongo!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already ruled on the first remarks that have been made by the member for Gosnells and he has withdrawn them. The member for Gosnells has restated his comments, and I do not see that those remarks are such that they ought to be withdrawn.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr PEARCE: The unsavoury practices to which I have referred are to site a tavern next to a primary school and that is something that ought not to be allowed under our town planning arrangements.

Mr MacKinnon: Can you understand the reason?

Mr PEARCE: If I could make some progress despite the interjections from the other side of the House! The point I am making is that it seems to be part of the member for Whitford's campaign that he diverts the blame to the council. My advice is that the records of the Wanneroo Shire show that no reference has been made to this proposition and no undertaking was given that a tavern should be constructed on that site.

Mrs Craig: I was careful to say yesterday that it was a verbal agreement.

Mr PEARCE: I am further advised that the council's officers at present are unaware of any verbal agreement having been made and the council records indicate no agreement has been made.

If a verbal agreement has been made on this matter, the agreement was made by people who are not involved presently in what might be described as a majority group on the Wanneroo Shire Council. The people who made the verbal agreement in 1979 are not the people who are in a position to make those sorts of decisions on the Wanneroo Shire Council now. They are the people in whose interests the member for Whitford has been fighting the present council.

Mr Laurance: I would like to interject to say that I would expect you to talk about things which relate to your electorate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: The member for Whitford is involved with those people in whose interests he is

conducting his campaign because they lost out, election after election.

Mr Nanovich: A complete untruth. You have a great habit of telling untruths in this House because you have a filthy tongue.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr PEARCE: I ask a withdrawal of the words that I am in the practice of telling untruths in this place.

Mr Nanovich interjected.

Mr PEARCE: You are compounding the felony now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: It is the case that to allege a member has told untruths in this place is a rather serious matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Gosnells and the member for Whitford, and all members of the House, that they be moderate in the terms they use. It could well be that because the Parliament has been sitting for a number of additional hours this week, it is making the members a little more testy than normal.

Under the circumstances withdrawal of remarks appear to be sought far more readily than they have been in other days. I ask the member for Gosnells to be a little more moderate in his use of adjectives.

Mr PEARCE: I asked for a withdrawal of a remark and you have now asked me to be moderate in the terms I am using. The member for Whitford said that I am in the practice of telling untruths in this place and I sought withdrawal of that remark. You did not seek to do anything about that, but you admonished me. I again seek the withdrawal of the remarks made by the member for Whitford that I am in the practice of telling untruths in this place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As I said earlier in response to the requests made by the member for Gosnells, I call on the member for Whitford to withdraw the remark.

Several members interjected.

Mr NANOVIK: I am not prepared to listen to the mobile bone from Swan. At your request, Mr Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr PEARCE: Perhaps we can now get on to the substance of this business—

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the member for Gosnells that he addresses his remarks to the Chair. If he does not, it could appear that he is attempting unnecessarily to provoke members. I ask the member for Gosnells to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: Certainly Mr Deputy Speaker, but I was merely waiting for the interjections to subside before I proceeded. I find it difficult to understand why waiting for silence can be treated as being provocative. I was waiting for the member for Clontarf to finish threatening me in an unparliamentary way.

The point I was making, before I was rudely and lengthily interrupted, was that I am advised that there is no record of the Wanneroo Shire Council's entering into an undertaking for a tavern to be built on that particular site.

Mr Nanovich: Has an officer of the Wanneroo Shire Council told you that?

Mrs Craig: You know that the Wanneroo Shire Council put forward an amendment.

Mr PEARCE: I am entitled to say, as Ministers say to me, that I am not intending to divulge the source of my advice.

Mr P. V. Jones: We say in answering questions, "I am advised by my Department", or whatever. All we are asking you is where you got your advice.

Mr PEARCE: When the Minister for Mines was Minister for Education, he never gave the information the Opposition sought. I often have sought the tabling of departmental advice, but it has never been forthcoming.

Mr P. V. Jones: I am not asking you to table it.

Mr PEARCE: I am advised by the Wanneroo Shire Council—

Mr Sibson: Which part of it?

Mr PEARCE: —that it has no reference to an undertaking for a tavern to be constructed.

Mrs Craig: The council initiated an agreement for that purpose.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister said by way of interjection, "I was very careful to say it was a verbal undertaking", which means that the Minister knows there is no reference to it in any documents.

Mrs Craig: There is an amendment that was initiated by the shire for the purpose of a tavern.

Mr Sibson: What is more, he knows that.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: In many ways I am getting myself cornered on a sidetrack because I am not con-

cerned whether the council made a verbal agreement or a written undertaking.

Mr Sibson: You are backing off.

Mr PEARCE: I am not; it is not germane to the argument I am putting. If, in fact, there were such undertakings, and I am not conceding that there were, I am unable to confirm that such undertakings were made verbally or in writing. The point I am making is that the council that constituted that was composed of friends of the member for Whitford.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr NANOVIK: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, those people are not friends of mine and I do not know why the member for Gosnells is trying to bring me in as an interested party.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr Nanovich: Let him say that again and I will bop him on the nose.

Mr PEARCE: I wonder whether that is contrary to some Act or law.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Gosnells that he address his remarks to the Chair and ignore the interjections.

Mr PEARCE: I am trying to do that, but there are so many of them and I am not getting a lot of protection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! For the several minutes that the member for Gosnells has been speaking, he continually has waited for interjections and has answered them. I take the view that at all times I will endeavour to give the speaker on his feet the protection of the Chair. However, if the speaker on his feet does not want the protection of the Chair, it becomes difficult to offer that type of protection.

I ask the member to address his remarks to the Chair and I will endeavour to ensure he is heard, but the member must realise that there is need for co-operation on his behalf as well.

Mr PEARCE: I understand that, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am prepared to do it. However, the point I am suggesting to you is that, if you seek for me to make my remarks to the Chair, it becomes your obligation to protect me from interjections. I am prepared to acknowledge interjections and deal with them—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Gosnells that he ignore the

interjections and direct his remarks to the Chair. I will not only give him some degree of protection, but also will listen to the remarks he makes.

Mr PEARCE: The situation is that the council running the Wanneroo Shire at the present time is made up of people who have been elected over the last two years. Their terms of office began after the time that any agreement was or was not made—whatever the case may be. It is not reasonable to suggest that the present shire council can in any way be held responsible for what has occurred in regard to the construction of a tavern. The Minister, in overruling the objection to the tavern, is the person placing the tavern there. It is not possible to deflect blame onto a previous council because shire councils change like Governments change and the change reflected in the Wanneroo Shire Council will be reflected here as well and we will not be holding ourselves responsible—

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: If I can speak over the member for Whitford's interjection! We will not be holding ourselves responsible for verbal agreements made by this present Government. The shire has properly objected to the siting of the tavern next to the primary school in Heathridge. The council is supported in that view by ratepayers of that area and most decent people in this State do not believe taverns should be built near schools.

Irrespective of what happened in 1979, the Wanneroo Shire Council, in seeking to prevent the tavern being built, is doing the right thing and it is being frustrated in that objection by the Minister who has sided with the developer, the Australian Guarantee Corporation, which is an offshoot of Westpac—the new banking supergroup. The Minister and the Australian Guarantee Corporation are building the tavern.

Mrs Craig: I have not discussed the matter with them and, in fact, until you mentioned the name then, I did not know who were the developers. That is a matter which I would normally consider on appeal. Please take my name out of the deals with people you find it convenient to say I am associated with.

Mr PEARCE: Despite our arrangement, I allowed that interjection.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: I am amazed that the Minister can say she does not know who are the developers. Surely someone had to appeal. Perhaps the Minister can point out by way of interjection who appealed if it was not the developer.

Mrs Craig: It was done through a legal firm which is very usual.

Mr PEARCE: And the letter starts, "We act on behalf of the Australian Guarantee Corporation." I have seen the letter.

Mrs Craig: Which letter?

Mr PEARCE: The letter of appeal to the Minister.

Mrs Craig: I did not have to read the letter of appeal. I had to read the report which was put before me. I am sorry the shire president passes documents of that sort to people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: The Minister is not in a position to prove that allegation; she should be more responsible. This is a subline to the point I am making about taverns being built next to primary schools. It is a question of how much the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning and the Minister for Education are on top of their jobs. When I asked the Minister on Tuesday, she had no knowledge of the matter.

Mrs Craig: Because it was determined on 6 September. You asked me without notice and you were not interested in establishing whether I knew: you were interested in hurling a bit of dirt.

Mr PEARCE: I was interested in establishing the reasons the Minister allowed a tavern to be built next to a primary school. Her answer was, "I do not know".

Mrs Craig: I said I was not aware of the immediate facts.

Mr PEARCE: On Wednesday I asked the Minister for Education the same question, and he was unaware of it, and referred me to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning.

Mr Clarko: That is not true. I did not say I was unaware of it. You should withdraw that remark.

Mr PEARCE: Rubbish!

Mr Clarko: The story was in the local papers; I had seen it there. I chose not to answer a question which I thought should go to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning.

Mr PEARCE: Now it has got the Minister into trouble.

Mr Clarko: How?

Mr PEARCE: It raises the question of whether the Minister is on top of his portfolio.

Mr Clarko: You are as inaccurate as this morning's paper which said I made comments about massage parlours in schools. You are the person who used those words.

Mr PEARCE: What a shocking untruth!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gosnells will resume his seat. I suggest he addresses his remarks to the Chair and the House will make progress.

Mr PEARCE: I am astounded at that shocking untruth. The Minister for Education was so intemperate and angry at the unfortunate situation in which he was landed during question time last night, he attempted to do what is becoming only too common on the Government side—to manufacture an ALP policy. The Minister for Mines is a prime exponent of manufacturing ALP policies.

Mr P. V. Jones: Can you tell me one?

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Education said very specifically to me in this House in question time—and I heard it—that the Labor Party would be putting massage parlours into primary schools.

Mr Clarko: You used the words "massage parlour".

Mr PEARCE: I did not use those words.

Mr Clarko: It is in *Hansard*. That is the reason I went on about the morals of the Labor Party, and homosexuality and drugs. It is in *Hansard*; you said "will there be a massage parlour there?"

Mr PEARCE: I did not say that.

Mr Clarko: Do you deny that? Go upstairs and have a look.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Education said it clearly in this place last night after having been asked about the desirability of taverns next to schools, and he sought to deflect the question by saying in a very intemperate way that the ALP has an attitude on homosexuality—I cannot remember the exact words—and that we will be putting massage parlours next to schools.

Mr Clarko: I did not say that.

Mr PEARCE: I heard that as clearly as anything.

Mr Davies: So did I.

Mr PEARCE: I was disgusted.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr CLARKO: The allegation that I used the words "massage parlour" is totally inaccurate. I request you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to prevent this person from grossly misleading the House.

Mr Davies: You are misleading it.

Mr CLARKO: I ask you to take steps to check the *Hansard* report where you will identify the words "massage parlour" as being part of an interjection by the member for Gosnells who said something like "Will you have a massage parlour

there?". The reason I referred to the issues of homosexuality and drugs was that he used those words.

Mr Pearce: Can my time be suspended while these points of order are being taken?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! What is the Minister's point of order?

Mr CLARKO: The House is being grossly misled.

Mr Pearce: Can I have the time stopped on my speech?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I believe the Minister for Education will have ample opportunity to deal with this point in the subsequent debate on this matter. I do not know whether the remarks that have been made are correct or incorrect. The Minister will have the opportunity to refute them at a later stage during the debate.

Mr CLARKO: On a further point of order, I am not making that point. I am asserting that the words "massage parlour" are shown in *Hansard* in the opposite way to that alleged by the member for Gosnells. I am asking you to take notice of that because he is telling a falsehood. It is important that it be put before the House.

Mr Pearce: My time is getting away. The clock should be stopped.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In due course I will do that. I call on the member for Gosnells, and I will see if I can arrange something.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr PEARCE: Three minutes went by. I appreciate the action of the Clerk on that occasion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gosnells will resume his seat. If the member wants to appreciate any action, he can appreciate that of the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: I appreciate the action of the Chair. It is impossible to assign credit from this far away, but I am prepared to say "Thank you" for that. I was not happy to see three to five minutes of my time taken up with points of order by the Minister for Education.

During question time last night and during the answer given by the Minister for Education, a lot of interjections were made. Presumably the only person who has seen the *Hansard* record is the Minister for Education because it goes to him for correction. I sought a *Hansard* proof of his answer before the House resumed after lunch. It is on the desk in front of me, but I have not had time to look at it. Interjections made by me or

other members are not sent to us in the normal way.

Mr P. V. Jones interjected.

Mr PEARCE: I will read it, but I want a guarantee of extension of my time. As I said, a lot of interjections occurred at the time and it may well be that the *Hansard* record was not correctly taken down.

My colleague, the member for Melville, has told me he interjected using the term "massage parlour". It seems that an interjection may have been ascribed wrongly. It is hardly a matter for which the *Hansard* reporters can be blamed because when interjections come from everywhere, and no backup system exists, interjections are often ascribed wrongly by a seat or so. That could have happened with the interjection by the member for Melville being ascribed to me. It happens occasionally with the member for Fremantle and myself because our speaking styles are of a comparable speed and have a rough similarity.

However, whatever the interjection about the massage parlour, it came from the member for Melville. There is no doubt at all that in picking that up and in making his claims about the Opposition's attitude to homosexuality and other things—that we would be putting massage parlours into primary schools—

Mr Clarko: I never said that at all.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister denies he said it. I heard him say it; members on this side of the House heard him say it.

Mr Clarko: This is false. I did not say, "massage parlours".

Mr PEARCE: Does the Minister say the Government is not putting primary schools—

Mr Clarko: You go on making all sorts of statements about massage parlours and so on. I think you are wriggling off the hook now. I am not saying you made it. It is ascribed to you; but I did not use the words "massage parlours".

Mr PEARCE: I say that I heard the Minister for Education say at the end that the ALP would be putting massage parlours into primary schools next. I ask the House to consider that I have been responsible for putting the ALP's attitude to homosexuality and other matters before—

Mr Clarko: You say it is not your interjection. I accept that. But, it is in *Hansard*—"Pearce"—and you have "massage parlour" there. That led me to talk about moral matters, because you used "massage parlours". This is why. I have been in the Chamber when you personally have been closely identified with the legitimisation of homosexuality and the same

thing with marihuana. That is why I led on to that because of the interjection, if not by one of your colleagues—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just resumed the Chair, and I am a little mystified. It would appear that the Minister for Education is making a speech, and that the member for Gosnells is attempting to interject. May I suggest that the interjections cease and that the member for Gosnells make his speech?

Mr PEARCE: I heard the Minister for Education say that. He wants to say he did not. We have gone through it four times; and I will not go through it again.

Mr Clarko: You are wrong, but you are backing down again.

Mr PEARCE: I am not backing down. I heard, and other members of the Opposition heard, the Minister say that the Opposition would put massage parlours in schools next. Now he is attempting to save himself or his ministerial colleague—

Mr Clarko: Why would I be defending people—

Mr PEARCE: The Minister would do that in an attempt to get himself off the hook. He is the one involved in the business of putting taverns next to primary schools.

Mr Clarko: The words were used by the Opposition. It is printed in *Hansard* now.

Mr PEARCE: Well, it is wrong. We have only the Minister's word. I am just trying to put a couple of points—

Mr Clarko: We have only your word that it is wrong; and it is not very strong.

Mr PEARCE: All we have is the Minister's word that it is wrong. I heard him say it; members of the Opposition heard him say it.

Mr Clarko: You are the one who is wrong, and you are squealing.

Mr PEARCE: It is reported in *The West Australian* of this morning that the Minister said that.

Mr Clarko: That is wrong. That is where you got it from.

Mr PEARCE: That is not where I got it. For heaven's sake, it is there—

Several members interjected.

Mr Clarko: You are saying you do not believe *Hansard*, but you believe *The West Australian*.

Mr Shalders: Who is right and who is wrong?

Mr PEARCE: I am not saying there is necessarily a contradiction, because I heard the Minister say it—

Mr Davies: I heard him say it, too.

Mr PEARCE: And the reporter for *The West Australian* heard him say it. In the dozens of interjections, it may have been that the *Hansard* reporter did not get it down. That is not an uncommon practice. I speak quickly, and sometimes I have to put into the *Hansard* record things which I said, but which the reporter did not take down. I am not attacking *Hansard*—

Mr Clarko: You have done it already.

Mr PEARCE: It comes back to the point that you, Sir, made a couple of days ago, that there is a very urgent need for a back-up tape system in this House so that these things can be clarified.

I heard the Minister for Education say those words; and the reporter for *The West Australian* heard the Minister for Education say them. If the Minister wants to deny that, I say that the *Hansard* reporter did not get it down. That is not a contradiction. The position is that the Minister said it; and if he wants to deny it, let him deny it at some other time and not during my speech.

Mr Nanovich: Absolute stupidity in the extreme.

Mr PEARCE: While we are dealing with the Minister—

Government members interjected.

Mr Clarko: You have said what I said. Where is your proof?

Mr Davies: I heard you say it.

Mr Clarko: I did not say it. It is in there as your interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr Davies: I move that the House do now adjourn!

Mr PEARCE: I have been speaking for nearly 30 minutes, and I am still on my first point. I would have been speaking for only 10 minutes of my time.

A further proposition I want to deal with relating to the Minister for Education—

Mr Laurance: You have become merely a puppet for the Shire of Wanneroo. You never talk about anything else!

Mr PEARCE: If the Minister for Lands is to start saying he supports the establishment of taverns next to primary schools, I will send a letter to every school in his electorate advising them that he would like to have taverns next to the schools.



Mr Laurance: It is a dereliction of duty. You never talk about anything in this House except the Wanneroo Shire.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: I am astounded that the Government should place a tavern next to a primary school. I am astounded further that it should attempt to defend itself in this manner. I would have thought that would be the kind of matter—

Mr Laurance: There is a place down the other end of the metropolitan area called Gosnells. Have you ever heard of that? Dereliction of duty!

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I had an arrangement with your predecessor in the Chair that I would address the Chair, and the interjections would be stopped.

Mr Blaikie: And what were you going to do?

Mr PEARCE: I am addressing the Speaker directly. I am not even looking at this fellow who was speaking a moment or two ago.

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Laurance: Pay attention to the Wanneroo Shire.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: If the Minister for Lands is unable to appreciate that schools are a part of education—and as the Opposition spokesman, I am responsible, for heaven's sake, for schools all over the State—he would be surprised—

Mr Clarko: But you are not responsible.

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bryce: He is. Nobody else is.

Mr Clarko: Why did you make that comment? This is gross paranoia! What are you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I called "Order!" at least three or four times, and the interjections continued from both sides of the House. If the interjections continue, I will have to take action.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Education suggested that, in fact, the tavern in this case was not next to the primary school; but the plans show very clearly that the land which has been extracted from the planned area for cultural purposes to which he has alluded, in fact, is behind the tavern site in this way: There is a street; then there is the tavern site; and behind the tavern site, looking along the school boundary fence, is the future cultural area or cultural facility that is to be built. It is a small part of the land which has been excised for this purpose. A nine-metre wide

strip runs between the tavern and the school boundary.

Mrs Craig: The school playing area, because the school building area is across another street.

Mr PEARCE: I have already said it is not where the buildings are. The school site, as I said, is an area of land bounded by boundaries, and I am talking about where the boundaries run. I am referring to the boundary of the school site—admittedly the playing fields, although in some ways that is worse, because it means that at recess times or at lunch time the kids will be playing near the tavern site; and in the classrooms they will not be able to see the tavern site. All the children would see in the classroom would be the classroom walls.

If the Minister for Education wants to protect his ministerial colleagues by saying that the tavern is not next to the primary school, he is not telling the truth.

Mr Clarko: Do not keep stretching it out. You have said it once or twice. You should remember that there is a nine-metre gap; and there is a community centre as well. Then on the opposite side of the school—I am not saying it is the most marvellous thing; but you have already gone on at some length about the matter. Haven't you made your point?

Mr PEARCE: I have made my point many times. More than half of my speech time has been taken on this matter. If members opposite had been prepared to be silent and listen, the whole thing would have been over a long time ago. That is why, in fact, this is taking a long time.

Government members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: I have other matters to raise during the course of this speech and I do not have a great deal of time during which to do so. However, let me say I am disappointed to find that not only is the Government unrepentant in its attitude with regard to placing a tavern next to the Heathridge Primary School, but also it is defending its stance in such a trenchant way that it must raise very grave questions in everybody's minds about its competence in either the town planning or education areas.

I shall deal with one other educational matter in the eight minutes left to me, and it relates to the Liddelow report of the WA College of Advanced Education. I have read the Liddelow report, which I understand is a distinct departure from the Minister's practice, because when I asked him a week or so ago whether he had read it, he said that he had not read it, but had sent it off for somebody else to read.

Mr Clarko: I did not say that. That is false.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister did say that, but I do not intend to spend the time left to me discussing the matter.

Mr Clarko: Why say it then?

Mr PEARCE: Because the Minister said it. If the Minister wants to debate this matter, he should stand up and use the time available to him to do so.

Mr Clarko: You are an angry little ant!

Mr Bryce: You are very vicious, aren't you?

Mr PEARCE: The Minister is vicious when he is losing. Unlike the member for Whitford, the Minister tries to start the argument and it is only when he loses the argument that he turns to petty viciousness.

The point with regard to the Liddelow report is not whether the Minister has read it—I hope he has, but, if not, it is to be hoped he will read it at some stage, although I do not care whether the Minister reads it, because, if he does not do anything about it before next March, that will be the best situation, as thereafter it will be ignored—

Mr Laurance: Get back onto your subject!

Mr PEARCE: Yesterday I spoke to a rally of 300 students of the WA College of Advanced Education.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: I am seeking to conclude my remarks in the six minutes remaining to me. I am not being assisted by members on the Government side.

Mr Sibson: You are not being assisted by that side, either. If you want to make a speech, why don't you do so, without expecting assistance?

Mr PEARCE: I have been trying to make a speech and members opposite have been so hurt that they have been attempting to shout me down. People, particularly those like the member for Bunbury, are not in the right league when they try that sort of thing in this place, and I suggest the member quietly goes back to sleep.

I refer to the WA College of Advanced Education and the attitude taken there, not only with regard to students—which is the point I particularly wish to raise—but also with regard to the whole institution. At the outset, I make my position quite clear: I have no confidence in the Director of the WA College of Advanced Education (Dr Jecks). Last year the Commonwealth forced a situation on the college. At least the former Minister for Education made statements which were almost as trenchant as mine on the concept

and opposed the forced amalgamation of the four Colleges of Advanced Education.

The amalgamation was carried out by the Commonwealth on the grounds of cost saving, but it is now costing something like \$125 000 a year more to run the institution and that money is all being spent on administration and not education. As a cost-saving measure, it had the normal lack of success that one has come to expect from the Federal Government's cost-saving measures—it costs a bomb!

That forced amalgamation has been an excuse for an exercise in empire building, the like of which the Government has not seen previously in the tertiary education sector.

The point I am making is that this exercise in empire building is very much a pyramidal-sort of empire which puts tremendous power into the hands of the director and council and that runs contrary to all decent educational practice, not only in tertiary education, but also, these days, even to some extent in primary and secondary education where a real effort is made to involve—

#### *Extension of Time*

Mr BRYCE: I move—

That the member for Gosnells' time be extended by 15 minutes.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

#### *Ayes 15*

Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr McIver
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Parker
Mr Davies	Mr Pearce
Mr Grill	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Bateman
Mr Hodge	

(Teller)

#### *Noes 21*

Mr Blaikie	Mr Mensaros
Mr Clarko	Mr O'Connor
Mr Court	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Stephens
Mr Grayden	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Williams
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Young
Mr Laurance	Mr Nanovich
Mr MacKinnon	

(Teller)

#### *Pairs*

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Mr I. F. Taylor	Mr Watt
Mr Carr	Mr Tubby
Mr Evans	Mr Coyne
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Spriggs
Mr Tonkin	Mr Sibson
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Sodeman
Mr Barnett	Mr P. V. Jones

Motion thus negatived.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr PEARCE: I am sorry the House denied me the opportunity to make up for the time I have lost as a result of interjections. Perhaps I could have an uninterrupted three minutes to finish off the point I was making.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Gosnells did not answer the interjections he would have a better chance to make his speech.

Mr PEARCE: I have not answered interjections for the last five minutes.

The SPEAKER: You have been very good.

Mr PEARCE: The WA College of Advanced Education, contrary to all decent education practice in tertiary institutions and elsewhere, which emphasises the need to involve not only students, but also staff in decision-making processes, is making a very real effort to centralise all power in the director and the council. Not only does it seek to ignore the views and wishes of staff and students, but also it seeks actively to exclude them from the discussion and decision-making processes at every level, to the point where 300 angry students came out yesterday—in the middle of examination time for some and days before the beginning of examination time for others—to express their anger in no uncertain terms.

Dr Jecks and the council of the WA College of Advanced Education are making a mess of that institution in their endeavours to build a very large empire. Something drastic needs to be done before the potential reputation of that institution and the past reputations of those four constituent members of the institution are destroyed forever. What sort of a teacher training institution do we have which does not even include student-centred activities as part of its own programme, but rigorously excludes them?

I ask the Minister for Education to take himself down to this college in the next day or two and tell the director and the council in no uncertain terms that it is not following educationally accepted practice.

Mr Clarko: What about specific points?

Mr PEARCE: Because of the way the Minister's friends voted just now, I do not have time—

Mr Clarko: Then you cannot say—

Mr PEARCE: The Minister cannot ask me to be specific when I have just a few seconds remaining.

Mr Clarko: You cannot give one.

Mr PEARCE: If the Minister were to move for an extension of my time, I could do so.

Mr Clarko: Why should I?

Mr PEARCE: Then the Minister cannot expect answers. The Minister should tell those people that if tertiary education in this State is to be served properly, they must pull their heads in and lift their game.

Mr Clarko: I won't be doing it.

MR HODGE (Melville) [3.07 p.m.]: I wish to comment on a matter included in this year's General Loan Fund under the heading "Public Works—Hospitals", and I refer to the ill-fated Royal Perth Hospital north block extension. I will briefly cover the history of this work. For those members who are not familiar with the project, I indicate that it is the grey skeleton of a building on Wellington Street, situated directly opposite the main RPH building.

The project to build the RPH north block extension was announced in 1975 by the then Minister for Health (the Hon. N. E. Baxter). He said the work would go ahead at a total estimated cost of \$25.5 million and would take five years to complete; that is, it would be completed in 1980.

In February 1976, an item appeared in *The Sunday Times* dated 22 February under the heading "Six storeys not seven", and the article read—

Government economy measures have forced a reduction in the size of the new north block planned for Royal Perth Hospital.

The State Government has decided that the building should be reduced from seven storeys to six, necessitating the deletion of some operating theatres and pharmaceutical and stores areas.

Further on it read—

"However, the north block will still cost about \$30 million and will be bigger in floor area than the existing main building of RPH."

Further on it read—

... but the building is not expected to be ready for use until 1982.

So, from the initial announcement in 1975 to February 1976 we see quite a dramatic change in the fortunes of the north block extensions. It had been reduced from seven to six storeys, the estimated cost had risen from \$25.5 million to \$30 million, and the anticipated completion date had moved from 1980 to 1982. This indicates a rather dramatic deterioration in the fortunes of this project.

In the 15 June 1980 edition of *The Sunday Times*, an article appeared under the heading

"Royal Perth Hospital's efficiency in danger" and it read as follows—

A go-ahead on urgent expansion to Royal Perth Hospital hinges on the WA Government loan program for 1980/81.

Major work on the planned north wing of the hospital ground to a halt over a year ago and patients and staff have suffered cramped, inadequate facilities.

Hospital authorities say the situation has become so grim the efficiency of RPH is at stake.

"The longer we leave things the more inefficient they become." Mr V. Driscoll, RPH administrator, said yesterday.

The hospital needs \$55 million, on today's figures, to complete the planned north wing of the hospital.

A little further on—

...the new wing could continue and it would be 1985 before the extension was operational."

So we see a further dramatic change in the circumstances surrounding the north block extension. The estimated cost of the work has risen from \$25.5 million to \$55 million and the completion date has been extended to 1985, when the initial announcement had indicated the completion date would be 1980.

A further article on this subject concerned an announcement by the then Premier (Sir Charles Court) and appeared in *The West Australian* of 14 August. Sir Charles was quoted as saying that eight per cent of the building had been completed to that date and the revised estimated cost was now \$68.650 million. He was further quoted as saying the delay had been caused by lack of funds and replanning because of technological change. So here we have a further indication of significant alteration from the period June to August 1980. The estimated cost had risen from \$55 million to \$68.650 million; this indicates a 200 per cent increase in the estimated cost since the initial announcement was made in 1975.

On 6 September 1980 an article appeared in *The West Australian* under the heading "Claims on Royal Perth Hospital untrue: Young" and the article read—

The Minister for Health, Mr Young, has described as nonsense claims that the expansion of Royal Perth Hospital will not be completed because of the rate of Government spending.

Completion of the north block was expected to take five years, he said.

The cost of the extensions was estimated at \$60 million.

Further on it stated—

Mr Young said that work had not stopped on the north block.

Changing circumstances had resulted in some areas being redesigned.

That article is contradictory to what the Premier had said some months before, because he had said the estimated cost for the work was \$68.6 million whereas the Minister for Health indicated it was \$60 million. At that stage the Minister for Health was still denying that work on the building had stopped; he was saying it would go ahead and be completed by 1985.

One of the most recent references to the north block extension was a report in *The West Australian* of 27 May this year relating to comments made by the Minister for Health when he opened the new ward and podium block at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. The article read—

NEW plans for the development of the north block of Royal Perth Hospital will be announced by the Minister for Health, Mr Young, next week.

The Minister did not announce the plans for the extension that next week or any other week that followed, and 24 weeks have expired since he made the promise that the plans would be announced the following week. The plans still have not been announced.

Dr Dadour: Can I tell you something?

Mr HODGE: Yes.

Dr Dadour: I was one of those responsible for stopping that.

Mr HODGE: Were you!

Dr Dadour: To put it into housing instead.

Mr HODGE: I draw the attention of members to the Loan Estimates Speech made by the previous Treasurer, Sir Charles Court, on 15 October 1981. Under the heading, "Hospital and Health Services" he said—

An amount of \$300 000 is to be provided to enable Royal Perth Hospital to engage a consultant to assist in re-assessing plans for the North Block with the aim of reducing the cost of the project before a commitment is made to proceed with further expenditure.

So, \$300 000 was allocated in 1981-82 for planning and design of the north block.

Dr Dadour: Too much!

Mr HODGE: It was too much, and it was completely wasted, because those plans and designs were never gone ahead with—they were scrapped and still have not been proceeded with.

In fact, the position is much worse than it appears. Instead of the Government's spending only the \$300 000 allocated, this year's General Loan Fund Estimates show for 1981-82 the actual expenditure of \$476 313 on design for the Royal Perth Hospital, and a further \$138 890 on replanning for stage two. So, last year the north block had approximately \$600 000 spent on it for designing and planning—money that was wasted, poured down the drain because no work proceeded—and this year a further \$500 000 has been allocated for more designing and replanning. Where will all this end?

There is an obvious absence of any allocation for construction work; each year the Government merely allocates a few hundred thousand dollars for replanning and redesign, and at the end of each year it scraps the new plan and design and allocates another few hundred thousand dollars to start the process all over again. As I have said, in the 1981-82 financial year more than \$0.5 million was wasted on planning and design for that north block, and for the best part of two years no practical work has been carried out on that building.

In this Budget the Treasurer allocated a further \$0.5 million for more planning and design work, but what will happen at the end of this year? Will that new plan and design be scrapped again? Will the plan be torn up and the Government next year provide another few hundred thousand dollars for more planning and design? The situation is ludicrous; we already have spent well over \$1 million by way of the last Budget and this in planning and design work while the Government knows very well it has no intention and no money to proceed with the building.

It is time the Government came to a decision and announced its intention. The Minister made the announcement to which I have referred way back in May that he would make the big announcement about the future of the north block "next week". He never made that announcement, and merely another \$500 000 was allocated to keep everyone quiet and to give the Government a bit of breathing space and to save it more embarrassment because it would not proceed with any construction work. The time has come for the Government to come clean and to announce whether it intends to build that building or it finds itself embarrassed financially and not in a position to proceed with the building and, therefore, will permanently abandon its construction.

The Government should not each year continue to waste the money of taxpayers on planning and design work just to scrap those plans and designs in order to start the process again the following year. This process is probably a lucrative source

of income to the companies or individuals who manage to get the contracts each year to replan and redesign this building.

With health funds so short in this State each year, and with all the cut-backs in hospital operational fields and staff levels, the funds wasted in last year's Budget and this year's could well have been put to a much better purpose if the Government in fact has no real intention of ever completing that building.

The Government should come to grips with the problem. If it cannot find the money after exploring every avenue, and determines that to complete the construction of the building is not realistic, it should make an announcement to that effect and stop wasting further allocations on quite senseless and useless plans and designs.

If the Government were to try to finish that building by 1985, as the latest promise seems to indicate, it would have to start allocating enormous amounts of money in each Budget until 1985, and probably in the area of \$30 million in each of the next three years because the cost is escalating at an alarming rate. To finish that building we now need in the vicinity of \$70 million on top of the roughly \$10 million already spent. The rate of inflation is escalating the cost at such a rate that unless those vast amounts in the order of \$30 million are provided each year in the next three years, that building will never be completed.

The building seems to be doomed to be an embarrassment, a white elephant, a monument to the ineptitude and lack of foresight and planning of this State Government.

**MR STEPHENS (Stirling)** [3.23 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to make a few remarks about quarantine matters. I know that in another debate the member for Merredin expressed how important it is that quarantine matters should be handled efficiently.

Last night I attended a public meeting at Northam at which many farmers were present, and at which a motion was carried which more or less congratulated the officers of the Agriculture Protection Board and the Department of Agriculture on the work they are doing at this stage to try to protect Western Australian farmers from the introduction of unwanted pests.

The farmers went on to say that perhaps the situation could be strengthened to help those officers to carry out their very important responsibilities on behalf of all farmers, and Western Australians generally. It is this matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House.

I am pleased the Minister for Agriculture is in the Chamber. Perhaps he will take action on these suggestions, or, certainly, have them investigated to determine whether he can support them with the same degree of enthusiasm as they were supported at the meeting I attended last night. I reiterate that the people at that meeting were not critical of the work being done at this time by the officers to whom I have referred; the people at the meeting were really seeking extra assistance to be given to those officers to carry out their work.

At the meeting it was felt that the penalties for breaches of quarantine regulations should be increased substantially. At the moment, the maximum penalty provided under the Act and the regulations is \$500. Considering the value of today's currency and the fact that the people who might offend these regulations could believe that the amount they would gain by bringing in stock or machinery from the Eastern States illegally would justify the risk of \$500, the maximum penalty should be reviewed. I believe that to be so, and I consider I have the support of all thinking people, especially farmers, when I say that the maximum penalty should be reviewed upwards from \$500.

At that meeting it was felt also that greater responsibilities should be placed on the shoulders of the Eastern States inspectors. After all, they give the certificates to allow stock—possibly machinery as well, but certainly stock—to come into this State. I do not know how greater responsibility could be placed on their shoulders, but I think the suggestion has merit. Recently a shipment of sheep with foot rot came into the State, and presumably that shipment had been inspected and certified before it left the Eastern States.

Another point raised at that meeting was that the cost of surveillance of properties on which stock are held eventually should be borne by the person importing the stock from the Eastern States.

It was pointed out at that meeting that these properties on which the stock finally arrive are under surveillance and the funds presently available do not compensate these people. If they feel that by purchasing stock from the Eastern States they are economically advantaged, they should meet the costs of the surveillance.

Another point for consideration was that machinery be cleaned before its departure from the Eastern States and if it fails to pass the inspection tests in Western Australia, it be returned to its point of origin. We all realise the tremendous incentive that will provide for people

to ensure that the job is carried out efficiently in the Eastern States. The cost of returning this machinery to the Eastern States would be prohibitive and if the onus were on the person importing the machinery, he would ensure it took place. This will ensure risks are further reduced.

Mr Blaikie: The other thing that is important to the Western Australian Act is that the most satisfactory and adequate methods of detection should be available because the infiltration of those things could cost tens of thousands or millions of dollars.

Mr STEPHENS: I thank the member for Vasse for virtually supporting my remarks. Nobody should underestimate the value to Western Australia's economy of the agricultural industry nor the costs of eradicating any of these pests which could be introduced by people who may only be trying to save a few bob for themselves and who do not have an altruistic motive of trying to help people in drought-stricken areas in the Eastern States. They are trying to make or save money. The farmers' meeting last night clearly adopted the opinion that, in cases where that is indeed their aim, the onus and the costs for this should be borne by the people concerned.

I am drawing these points to the Minister's attention. We are in the dying days of this Parliament, but perhaps the Minister could rush this through and take any necessary action. Certainly what is permissible under the regulations could be rushed through as it would receive the support of both Houses and would not delay us in any way.

Mr Blaikie: Further to that point, the most important—

Mr STEPHENS: The member for Vasse has not spoken yet and if he thinks that my speech is so good, he can get up after me and make his own contribution to the debate.

Mr Blaikie: I am a good supporter.

Mr STEPHENS: I think the people would like to read my speech and not the one the member for Vasse is trying to make from his seat. I point out that nearly all the points I will mention received unanimous support at the farmers' meeting.

The next point was that additional staff be provided in areas of increased work load. This particularly refers to the case where a large consignment of stock comes in from the Eastern States and additional staff may be sent to Kalgoorlie; this is done by withdrawing those staff from existing positions within the State, and that is not desirable because it is essential that the APB inspectors are scattered throughout the State conducting surveillance and when they are sent to

Kalgoorlie, this represents a weakness, so additional staff should be available.

Another point made at this meeting was that the inspection fee is only 3c and it is considered that this is totally inadequate in today's economic climate; I do not mean that the farmers are getting a great return on their stock, but that the purchasing power of 3c is ridiculous. The cost of inspection should be borne by those people who are bringing stock into this State, and the inspection charge should be lifted. The farmers felt strongly that the costs of eradication of any weed infestation should be borne by the farmer responsible.

That is the situation under the existing regulations. It is unfortunate that a property could be affected because of machinery being imported from other States, but these pests could spread from property to property and presently there is no provision under which the farmer responsible can be charged to pay the costs associated with eradication of these pests on adjoining properties.

Another point on which the farmers feel strongly is the length of wool on sheep. The sheep should be strictly supervised. Mention was made that, with some sheep, the coats are not trimmed properly, and perhaps greater attention should be given to that area.

I strongly support the recommendations made at the farmers' meeting in regard to quarantine. This had unanimous support at the meeting and I trust the Minister will give urgent attention to this problem and see that the suggestions made are taken up.

I repeat that we are not being critical of the work that presently is being done. The farmers just want to ensure that the people responsible will more adequately protect farmers and the agricultural industry in Western Australia.

I am pleased that the Minister for Education is here because I now mention the Mt. Barker hostel which has been a problem in the district since the Mt Barker High School's status was raised to a senior high school in 1973. A district hostel committee was associated with the high school, and the Government has consistently refused to give it assistance. The committee has shown great initiative and after being refused the hostel, the people came up with the idea of a four-night hostel. The committee had the financial support of the shire and the local people and for several years they funded and ran a four-night hostel containing 16 beds. The hostel runs at a marginal profit, but it requires further assistance and support. Additional beds are required and the local people do not have the capacity to provide them.

There has been a continual appeal to the Government to provide funds for these extra beds and the argument the Government always advances is that there is surplus accommodation in Albany. Because someone made a mistake in Albany, is no justification for denying the Mt. Barker Senior High School its right to have a four-night hostel. If the Government is sincere, why is it not giving the Mt. Barker hostel financial assistance? Finance apparently is being provided to the Katanning hostel which originally had 40 beds and now has 100 beds. The argument could be advanced that the people in the Katanning area could have taken advantage of the surplus accommodation in Albany. It seems that the Government can use that argument in one situation, but not in the other. I do not want to deny the Katanning people that facility; I am just pointing out that a double standard argument is being advanced by the Government. I do not intend to rest on this subject and I feel confident that the results of the next election will be such that the people of Mt. Barker eventually will achieve their wish of finance for their hostel. A change in numbers in this House will no doubt ensure that.

The final matter I wish to raise relates to decentralisation. Much has been said about this subject over the years and the public has come to accept the fact that decentralisation is talked about; and politicians and Government are strong on rhetoric, but very weak on action.

Anyone who has read the report *Transport 2000* must be concerned about the direction in which this Government is headed. That report predicts that by the year 2000 the population of Perth will be 1.5 million. At present our population is in the order of 850 000, so that is an increase of 750 000 people. I could not see any reference in the report to the total population of WA, but I think the country population will continue to decline. An area of one million square miles will have a concentration of population from Bunbury to Moore River and no advantages or services for people living outside that area, unless there is anything left over. This is a frightening situation and it is another area where politicians will have to take greater action to ensure that effective decentralisation is carried out.

I come from the southern area of the State, which has no suitable industrial complexes. Years ago an area was set aside, but it was found that it was in the area set aside for bore water so it could not be used as an industrial site. It seems that whenever an area of land is considered for an industrial complex, such problems as pollution or the existence of an underground water stream

mean that the area cannot be used for that industrial complex.

The area close to Albany has some of the most picturesque country in this State and it is a great tourist attraction. I do not think we could associate an industrial complex with that popular tourist area so I hope the Government will consider Narrikup, which is situated between Albany and Mt. Barker. It is closer to the rail service and not far from Denmark so a complex could be accommodated there without causing a problem to tourism or with pollution of underground water. A complex in that area would be more regional than the one at Albany because the areas of Denmark and Mt. Barker would service it. People could live in the picturesque area of Denmark. I believe the Narrikup area would be ideal for that centre.

I know that an industrial complex would not create industries. Incentives create industries and I always have advocated that capital incentives in themselves are marginal. We should be looking at freight rates and continuing advantages to industry. I hope the Government will pay attention to the remarks I have raised. I support the Bill.

**MR JAMIESON (Welshpool)** [3.40 p.m.]: I wish to draw attention to a few matters during this debate, the first of which relates to the section of Albany Highway which has been the subject of a consultant's report. The section is between Welshpool and Nicholson Roads, and most of it is in my electorate. Parts of this road system are located in the electorates of Victoria Park and Canning.

Several evenings ago I was fortunate that the three members concerned with this matter considered that one of us should be at the meeting called by the consultant and the council to gain an input from the people in the area, to assist them to make a final decision.

It was decided I should attend the meeting and I was rather pleased because this House sat until 2.00 a.m.! I gained some knowledge about the thoughts of the people concerned and noted that this section of Albany Highway is considered to be the worst in Australia for traffic congestion. That being the case the Main Roads Department and the MRPA should provide money immediately to realign the road in order to solve this problem.

At the meeting the consultant asked the people to place their input on paper. The people came up with a solution that would probably solve the problem. If a certain section between Manning and Nicholson Roads is not bypassed in the near future, additional chaos will occur. The Carousel Shopping Centre is building up and Australia

Post has opened a new postal centre with the operations transferred from Bentley. All this is generating more traffic to the centre.

If members wished to travel there now they would not have a good run through from the time they left the Bentley area. They would run into a traffic block and take up to half an hour to proceed to Nicholson Road.

No alternative route is available if one wishes to travel to Gosnells, Thornlie, and the region east of that section of the road. It would seem that the Government should give consideration to the allocation of funds for roads where necessary. I ask the Treasurer to give this matter urgent attention because it is causing considerable congestion to traffic.

It is all very well for engineers in the MRPA to have grandiose ideas for extensions to roads and extensions to the northern suburbs, but there is no area which cannot wait until the problem of Albany Highway is solved. This would undoubtedly be worth millions of dollars in time to commerce and to those people who constantly use that section of the highway. I have drawn the Government's attention to this matter because in my opinion the highway should be upgraded or bypassed this financial year. I do not raise this matter because it is in my area, but engineers are saying it is the worst section of highway in any capital city in Australia. Government departments and the local authority concerned should consult with one another in order to solve this problem immediately.

**Mr O'Connor:** I cannot disagree with you. It is a dreadful piece of road, particularly that two-mile section.

**Mr JAMIESON:** The two-kilometre section between Manning Road and Nicholson Road is the worst section of the highway. The remaining sections have arterial roads leading from the highway and the problem is not as great.

Recently an overpass was constructed in front of the Carousel Shopping Centre and this greatly assists the pedestrians, but it does not help the motorists. If there is an accident on the offending section of the highway, the traffic becomes chaotic and motorists are held up for at least an hour.

I always have been careful in broaching the subject of the determination of the parliamentary salaries and allowances tribunal. For some years now I have been advocating that the Leader of the Opposition experiences at least the same pressures as those members in ministerial positions. When I was Leader of the Opposition I considered that the pressures were greater than the pressures on a Minister.



The Leader of the Opposition is always in demand and he does not have the support groups that the Ministers have in their various portfolios. I investigated the salary ranges of politicians in other States and I found that on not one occasion was the Leader of the Opposition paid less than a ministerial salary. I corresponded with the tribunal and advocated that the Leader of the Opposition's salary should be increased to that of a Minister. However, I ran into a situation where Sir Keith Townsing of the tribunal told me that he had examined the salaries structures of other States and that what I had said was not correct.

I carried out further research and found that technically I was wrong. Under the Federal Government's salaries structure there is a difference between the salary of a Minister and a Cabinet Minister, but in the other States all Ministers receive the salary of a Cabinet Minister. We have now been advised that Sir Keith Townsing has agreed with the proposal I have put forward and from 1 January 1983 the Leader of the Opposition in this State will receive the salary of a Minister.

I always have been careful in raising the subject of salaries. I never have liked the idea of one's setting one's own salary and often, if it is set by someone else, it is not a satisfactory situation. I think it is comparative justice that the Leader of the Opposition's salary should be increased and the present position has not been to the credit of Sir Keith Townsing. He should not have adopted the "dog-in-the-manger" attitude that he did in resisting requests for this increase.

Members of this House heard the member for Ascot speaking of a number of electronic devices that could be introduced in this Parliament for the benefit of members. We were informed that electronic devices were installed in Parliaments in the United States and that video systems are used for the comparison of Statutes. I would like to remind members that the only electronic device that we have in this Parliament is the digital clock and it is a handy device.

Since I came into this place I have been advocating an electronic voting system. Before we introduce any fancy systems into this place, this matter should be considered in order to stop the nonsense of our crossing the floor during divisions. It is absolute stupidity. We have followed the House of Commons which does not have enough seats for its members and operates under a different system. It is high time that we had a facility which would enable us to record our votes rather than the current system. Perhaps you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Trethowan), could ask the Speaker to investigate this matter again. It would

not take any genius to design a circuit which would amply cater for this provision.

The systems that the member for Ascot advocated would not work very well in this place unless it were air-conditioned. I am sure that members of Parliament would not have been working too well over the past few days because of the lack of air-conditioning. I am sure that members of the public must think that Parliament House is air-conditioned. We do not receive the benefit of the prevailing winds in the evening and we do not have access to the internal quadrangle any more. Steps should be taken to overcome the problem of the stifling atmosphere in the Chamber. The building became very hot this week and the Minister for Local Government told me that she was surprised that it had become so hot so quickly and that the building had remained hot for so long. Both Chambers certainly need air-conditioning and, with due respect to the member for Ascot, this provision is required before the provisions he has suggested. I remind members that in most cases electronic equipment must be installed in air-conditioned premises in order that they might work satisfactorily.

We need to have a good look at this aspect. When I first came here we did not have the silicon chip; we had a box of valves. After all the years of advocacy I hope that before I go from this place—and I hope it will be a few years yet—the digital clock will not be the only thing that has been introduced. I have had some satisfaction because I recall indicating in my first speech in the House that when I had been in the gallery at night and needed to use toilet facilities, none was available in those days. The galleries did not have a toilet, and one had to go into the Hale School yard. It was as bad as that. We have improved since then; we have so many toilets that it is not funny. One could not use them all. That provision has been made, probably to excess, but before long we must also have a more comfortable place in which to work.

No civil servant has to work in office conditions where they have to assemble for a long time without it being much more pleasant than the conditions to which we are subject. Some complaint may be made by the public or the news media that we are going ahead with this at this stage.

Mr Sibson: Perhaps they will not object in the gallery. All our hot air goes up there.

Mr JAMIESON: The gallery gets the hottest air; even in winter when the heaters are on it is quite pleasant up there because the hot air rises. Some of the hot air is not pleasant, of course, for those in the gallery, but their needs must also be

considered. I believe it is time to give serious consideration to this proposal. Then we will be able to consider other proposals which may be necessary for the better running of the ship of State.

Certain facilities have been installed in the Library, including microphotography equipment, which gives us access to material we could not get before. This is appreciated, but we must also appreciate the environment in which we work. The Library with its facilities is air-conditioned.

Mr Sibson: Do you think the overabundance of toilets is the result of your overzealous advocacy?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know. I tried to sell the bell-punch system of voting quite often, more so than the toilets, but it has not had the resultant sales effect. Perhaps we may achieve something if I get the member for Bunbury on side with his undoubted ability to sell cars in all states of ill health.

Mr Sibson: Perhaps we could buy a secondhand unit.

Mr JAMIESON: The Government probably would do that, and then complain about it. A lot of capital has been spent this year on the refurbishing and rebuilding of the kitchen facilities. This had to be done. When people look at the price, they may think it excessive, but the only reason the kitchen had not been condemned was that it was in the Houses of Parliament. It was not condemned by the fire brigade despite the fact that most of the ventilators had accumulated so much grease that the whole place would have gone up rather quickly in the event of a fire. If a fire had occurred, we would have found the money to build a new one which included every convenience. We were not so lucky. We have to spend money on these various facilities; it does not come easily, but it is the people's House. It is not my house; as I am the member for Welshpool, it is my house temporarily.

Mr Sibson: You have been here a long time.

Mr JAMIESON: It is the Blacks', the Smiths', and the Johnsons' House until eternity. The provision of reasonable facilities in which to work should be supported by the media and others who are only too quick to say we spend all our time looking at Perth over the Barracks Arch. The argument is put that just because we do not like something being there, it should be removed. I do not think I ever go out the front of this building; very few of us do. However, many visitors do go out there and are able to enjoy the view. There is always plenty of space in the Press for a crummy thing like that—whether members should have their view eliminated or improved. It does not mean a thing to me because I drive in on the

other side of Parliament House, and I never worry about it. The arch can stay there until every brick crumbles.

Improvements must be made if we are to be able to sit in this Chamber in reasonable comfort at any time of the year, not only in autumn and spring. We must control our environment. Recently I attended a House Committee meeting in the Select Committee room. It was a very cold day in September. I believe that as a result, it caused me to be off ill for a few weeks. We are moving piecemeal to have that venue controlled because we often have Select Committee meetings, at different times of the year, and it is appropriate that they be held under controlled atmospheric conditions.

Mr Sibson: Do you think perhaps a number of mouth muzzles also should be provided?

Mr JAMIESON: Sometimes the most appropriate mouth to be muzzled is that of the member for Bunbury. On other occasions he might think I should be muzzled. We had better not get involved with mouth muzzles; let us keep to the environment so that tempers are reasonable and the temperatures of Opposition and Government are not raised because of the bad conditions under which we work.

MR BRIDGE (Kimberley) [4.03 p.m.]: I will not delay the House very long. In the three years I have been a member of this House, I have not been one to extend the debate for any length of time.

Mr Laurance: It has been appreciated.

Mr BRIDGE: I hope that good opinion prevails for another five or 10 minutes.

Mr Sibson: We have always been given a very colourful picture of what is going on in the north-west.

Mr BRIDGE: I thank the member. I want to refer to three or four matters which I have raised from time to time and which affect people in the Kimberley, which area I represent. They are all matters of concern.

I refer firstly to the transport situation in the Kimberley. I have had discussions with the Minister, and have expressed my concern about the decline in bus service operations between Wyndham and Kununurra. I know the Minister has examined the matter and has assured me that it has been monitored since Airlines of Western Australia decided to withdraw the service totally. A service operates at present which is funded by Ansett Freight; 10 services a week are provided between Wyndham and Kununurra. That means effectively that all north-bound flights are met; so

a service is available for those flights. The problem at the moment for Wyndham residents is that on four days of each week there is no connection between Wyndham and Kununurra. That applies on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Saturdays, and Sundays.

This causes a considerable problem because passengers travelling out of Wyndham on those days must make their own private arrangements to get to the airport in Kununurra. It is not very difficult for families who have vehicles of their own; but it creates all sorts of problems for people who do not have transport.

The Government and the Transport Commission have to accept that the service should be restored on a 14-services-a-week basis. That is the number of services required to meet the transport needs of the people of Wyndham adequately.

The Transport Commission has indicated to me, in my discussions with the Minister and the director, that this operation is not one that can be considered in terms of economics, because of the low patronage at the moment. However, that is not good enough. Somehow the service should be considered in terms of the isolation of Wyndham, and the logistics of people using other means of transport.

It is very difficult for people to travel the 100 kilometres between Wyndham and Kununurra that is necessary to make the connection with the south-bound service. In this situation, the Government should examine its priorities in terms of funding and look sympathetically at the need to provide and maintain this kind of service. This service fits into the category of an essential service, and nothing more.

I understand there is the possibility of a reduction in the RPT service which operates between Derby, Fitzroy Crossing, and Halls Creek. The economics of the service are starting to put into jeopardy the very good service that has existed since Jan Beers took over the operations. The one flight a day for six days could be reduced by one, two, or even three flights. That would be a blow to the people in the area; and if this kind of thing happens, the Government must give it consideration. It should study the need for the service and the need for places like the Kimberley to be supported by some type of funding assistance in the form of a subsidy. For various reasons, it is necessary for the Government to make an exception in a region like the Kimberley.

There are many logistical, historical, and geographical reasons that it is a very costly area in terms of aviation. Planes must be taken to places like Port Hedland or Darwin to have routine services carried out, and that means that

considerable costs are incurred. There are hidden costs which members of the public just do not understand apply to aviation, and they are of major concern to the aircraft operators in the Kimberley.

I urge the Government to examine the problem and to consider the special circumstances of places like the Kimberley. It is not practical to expect any operator to go it alone in the provision of that kind of service. The hidden costs relevant to the region invariably place the operators in the position in which they have to reduce services.

We have seen this happening over the last six or eight years. We had MMA, which withdrew its Otter service because of the cost and its inability to continue operating the aircraft. Then we had Trans West which came in with the idea of establishing an ongoing high-frequency service. That company found itself in a situation similar to that of MMA. More recently we had Amity Aviation which came in with the intention of providing a regular service in the Kimberley. Again, because of the economics, it had to withdraw.

I understand, although I have not had it confirmed officially, that the present operator is examining the economics of his operation. It would be a sad thing if we had a reduction in the services to the towns of Halls Creek and Fitzroy Crossing, and the surrounding stations.

Mr Laurance: The service that goes up on Monday and comes back on Friday, does it get any business?

Mr BRIDGE: To date, that has been the best service. It is the best paying one. There is no doubt about that one. Of course, it is a seasonal situation. The mining companies support that run; but as the wet arrives, it might be a different situation.

The Minister for Lands is now in the Chamber, so I will deal very briefly with a subject I mentioned the other day, and that is the need for the Government to examine ways and means of keeping down land prices in the Kimberley. I applaud the Government for its decision to release many blocks in the Kimberley. Such a move has been needed for a long time. That has taken place; and no-one is criticising the fact.

What worries me about this is that because of the high cost of the blocks when they are put on the market, effectively a fair percentage of the local people are squeezed out. It does not necessarily worry the people who are coming in. The mining companies and people of that kind are prepared to pay that sort of price to obtain land; but the local people—the family men—are invariably in trouble obtaining land in the Kimberley

nowadays. I am not sure what the answer is; certainly I do not have one. However, the situation should be studied by the Government, with the thought that the interests of the local people should be considered.

Another occurrence in the Kimberley is the withdrawal of the airmail service to the stations. I appreciate that this is the responsibility of Australia Post; but the Government in this State should bring pressure to bear on Australia Post, to have that organisation examine where the service could be made available to residents in the Kimberley. At the moment, a number of properties do not receive any mail service at all. That means simply that the residents of the outlying stations have to travel 100 or 200 kilometres or more to places like Derby, Fitzroy Crossing, and Broome to receive their mail.

In many cases, the mail includes correspondence lessons, and that sort of important material for the school children on the pastoral properties. The Government should give consideration to this area, because the people are having great difficulties in going into the towns to pick up their mail.

Members will recall that many years ago a mail service was provided. Ten years ago, every station in the Kimberley had a regular mail service. When the DC3 aircraft were taken out of service, the Twin Otters came into operation, and provided a service to nearly every station in the Kimberley. Today, apart from those few stations in the north Kimberley which were lucky to have their service restored last year, most of the stations do not have a mail service.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trethowan): Order! I draw the attention of members to Standing Order No. 65 which provides that no member shall pass between the Chair and any member who is speaking on his feet, nor between the Chair and the Table. I request that members observe that Standing Order, in consideration for the member delivering his speech.

Mr BRIDGE: I had just made the point that previously these pastoral stations had a service, but nowadays it is not available to them. The service was the subject of a considerable amount of discussion between the Transport Commission, Australia Post, the Minister for Transport, and me and the issue is of concern to me. I express my concern to the Parliament, because the small people in the north are being affected. I urge again that, regardless of the deliberations and plans considered by the Government in relation to the total development of the State, we must never neglect the needs of the people who make up the

strength of those remote areas—the people who reside there, who want to stay there, and who have made a commitment to that area of the State. These people need a fair go and I am concerned to see that their interests are brought to the attention of the Parliament at all times.

MR NANOVICH (Whitford) [4.16 p.m.]: I would be remiss if I did not make a few comments about the speech the member for Gosnells made earlier today. It was absolutely disgusting to see a member taking advantage of the privilege of this House to deliberately try to discredit me and the Minister regarding the approval of the tavern at Heathridge. Let me make it quite clear to the House that I was not aware an appeal had been lodged with the Minister by the owners of the centre. I emphasise that I was not aware of it.

The member for Gosnells said he obtained advice from the shire that there was nothing officially on the record to state that a tavern would be permitted in the area or that indicated previous negotiations between the shire and the developer.

I made some inquiries and the following was revealed to me: Originally I am told the developer was not interested in developing a shopping complex there, let alone a tavern. From my inquiries into the matter, I have been informed—

Mr Pearce: Who has informed you?

Mr NANOVICH: —that the developer was told—

Mr Pearce: You are suddenly quiet, aren't you? Who informed you?

Mr NANOVICH: The developer was more or less instructed by the shire to the effect that a shopping complex would have to go in that area and the development would have to include a tavern.

Mr Pearce: Who told him that?

Mr NANOVICH: The developer was told that by the shire.

Mr Pearce: Rubbish!

Mr NANOVICH: By the shire.

Mr Pearce: Rubbish!

Mr NANOVICH: Rubbish has come into the Chamber since the member for Gosnells walked in!

Mr Pearce: You are one thing when you are sitting in your seat, and you are another thing when you are standing up making a speech.

Mr NANOVICH: At least I am not a coward like the member for Gosnells who has a great habit of telling untruths in this place!

Several members interjected.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trethowan): I ask the member for Whitford to withdraw that remark.

Mr NANOVICH: At your request, certainly, Mr Acting Speaker.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr NANOVICH: Let me assure members that what I say in the House I am prepared to repeat outside. I do not use the protection of the House to slander and deliberately denigrate other members. If I wanted to do that, I would do it outside the House rather than come in here and do it under privilege.

Mr Pearce: You would do us a favour if you stayed outside the House instead of coming in here.

Mr NANOVICH: I have just set out the situation that pertained when the Heathridge area was developed. The shire decided that the development would have to go there and a tavern would have to be included in that development. The developer challenged that ruling and said that the complex would not be a very large one—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trethowan): Order! I would request members not to indulge in cross-Chamber conversation. The member for Whitford is substantially addressing his speech to the Chair and I would ask that the level of conversation be reduced, so that members of the House may clearly hear what the member for Whitford has to say.

Mr NANOVICH: The developer expressed some concern as to whether the development of a shopping complex and the other aspects that go with it would be a viable proposition. The developer was concerned about this. However, the shire was of the strong opinion that that should be the case and a shopping centre and tavern would have to be established. That is going back three years to 1979. The developer submitted an application for that area to be zoned for a tavern, based on the previous negotiation and understanding reached with the shire.

This is the aspect which worries me: A commitment was more or less made by responsible people in 1979 and we now have a council that is not prepared to apply the conditions that were laid down some three years ago. It is very bad when councils start to get into these sorts of situations.

Mr Pearce: The people who did it all lost their seats.

Mr NANOVICH: Objections were lodged and council did not proceed with recommending the

rezoning, but the area was rezoned. The zoning was changed to a "non-retail area"—

Mr Pearce: Like a squash court, for example.

Several members interjected.

Mr NANOVICH:—with other development to take place and, on the basis of the town planning scheme, such developments as a tavern were allowed.

Mr Pearce: Or squash courts.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr NANOVICH: It is on those grounds that the developer has pressed ahead. Three years ago the proper procedures were followed in that the development application was advertised, and a sign was erected to give people the opportunity to object. It is a democratic system.

Mr Tonkin: It is not—the Minister uses vetoes.

Mr NANOVICH: Of course, when the application was lodged this time, no signs were erected. That is a fault of the local authority.

Mr Pearce: Yes; they have all lost their seats since then.

Mr NANOVICH: Who have lost their seats?

Mr Pearce: Most of the people on the council at the time you were talking about.

Mr NANOVICH: Let me assure the member that things will change there—

Mr Pearce: They have changed already.

Mr NANOVICH: They have changed for the worse.

Mr Pearce: You have a council which is concerned about the people.

Mr NANOVICH: Things have changed for the worse. Ever since the member for Gosnells started sticking his nose into the area, it has gone from good to bad and the ratepayers are now sensing this. My office is inundated with phone calls from people wanting to know what can be done about the operations of the Wanneroo Shire Council.

Mr Pearce: I would have had more phone calls about this tavern from your constituents than you have had. They ring you and get no joy.

Mr NANOVICH: I shall ignore the member for Gosnells. He comes in here and represents himself as being an expert on everything, but he does not do anything. God forbid that the member for Gosnells should ever become a Minister of the Crown! He has never in his life had to make a decision and he would not know how to! But here he is with great aspirations to become Minister for Education. The member for Gosnells goes out of

here and says, "I will be the next Minister for Education".

Mr Young: Wrong!

Mr NANOVIK: The member for Gosnells is wrong.

I have set out the current situation. This problem has occurred, because the shire has allowed it to and now the shire is shirking its responsibilities completely and is trying to place the blame on the Minister by saying, "It is the Minister's fault". It is not the Minister's fault. Right from the start, the shire put the developer in that situation when negotiations were taking place and the shire told the developer that a shopping complex would have to be built in that area.

For the member for Gosnells to say that we on this side of the House encourage and fully support the building of taverns or other liquor outlets opposite schools, is total rubbish.

Mr Pearce: You have been doing it all day.

Mr NANOVIK: I point out to the member and to the House generally that the concept of a Wanneroo tavern was supported by the late Herb Graham when he was Minister for Town Planning. When the people involved later lodged an application with the Licensing Court, Mr Graham was the chairman of the court that granted the licence to the tavern which is now right opposite a school. The member for Gosnells ought to be more careful when he makes stupid statements in this place. It is totally irresponsible of him—

Mr Pearce: I don't approve of taverns next to schools in any circumstances.

Mr NANOVIK: It would have been remiss of me had I not taken this opportunity to divorce myself from any suggestion of an association with the developers of the tavern or the shopping centre. I do not know who the owners are.

Mr Pearce: Of what?

Mr NANOVIK: I have an idea I might know one person who may have an interest, but I could not be sure. I could not name the owners. For the member for Gosnells to try to involve me in this situation is to indicate he is taking a small-minded attitude and trying deliberately to discredit me and the Minister by trying to tie us to this situation and to say we were involved and that we influenced the decision. The member should ask the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning whether I had made an approach to her.

Mr Pearce: I said it was your mates on the council who set this up in 1979 and who have lost their seats since.

Mr NANOVIK: The member would not know what he was saying.

Mr Pearce: And you will lose your seat in six months.

Mr NANOVIK: My informants tell me the member will lose his seat. For the Wanneroo Shire Council now to be saying it is not responsible and that the Minister has done something wrong, is totally incorrect. The shire allowed that type of development to take place in the first instance simply by more or less directing the developer that a shopping complex would go there and nowhere else. The councillors knew this; they had the opportunity to learn it would be next to a school site. However, they insisted the shopping development and a tavern were to be built there at some future time. The developer has taken that to be an agreement with the shire and today we have the shire being unprepared to fulfil the previous obligation and agreement that were made between it and the developer.

With those few remarks, I hope I have clarified the situation in a manner unlike that of the member for Gosnells, who was trying to mislead the House this afternoon.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [4.28 p.m.]:  
Mr Acting Speaker—

Mr Pearce: Your constituents ring me all the time.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Trethowan):  
Order!

Mr Pearce: You made the mess.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt. Hawthorn has only just commenced his speech and I request the member for Gosnells to pay some respect to a member on his side of the House, even if he may not agree with members on our side of the House.

Mr Pearce: That is a remarkably biased comment from the Chair. That is a disgraceful thing to say.

Mr Shalders: Don't be stupid. You are a fool.

Mr Pearce: "On our side of the House" is a disgraceful thing for the Acting Speaker to have said.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I did make a mistake by indicating while I was in the Chair that I was a member of the Government. I apologise to the House for that as I should have said "the Government side of the House". I hope that satisfies the member for Gosnells. However, I request that he remain silent while the member for Mt. Hawthorn makes his speech.

Mr BERTRAM: The following comments were made on 6 October 1976 and appear on page 2896 of *Hansard*—

The reason I chose to criticise the Government's actions and to resign before I could do so was simply that in law and in society's philosophy generally there runs a thread of "fair go". In law it is well recognised that if a heavyweight boxing champion, for example, finds himself in conflict with somebody else, he cannot use the skill, the force, and the power he possesses relentlessly to put the other man down without taking due care that he uses that skill, force, and power to do no more than defend himself. If he were to put down another man by using his professional skills and the force at his disposal he would be dealt with much more forcefully and firmly under the law than a person who does not possess those skills.

The spokesman was the member for Scarborough who, shortly prior to his uttering this statement, had resigned his position as Parliamentary Secretary to the Cabinet; he was not a Minister at the time, but merely the member for Scarborough.

Those remarks arose out of his extraordinary displeasure with what the then Premier and Cabinet were doing to the people who happened to be residents at Tresillian. At the time he hotly opposed what was being done to them. His remarks continued as follows—

Likewise, when we refer to a big fellow pushing around a little guy or a person beating a woman we simply ask that the same premise of justice should apply and we ask for a fair go.

I interjected then and asked, "Who is the big guy you are referring to?" The answer I received was in the form of the usual rebuke we get here. Obviously we know that the big boys to whom he was referring were the Premier and the Cabinet Ministers.

What an extraordinary volte-face, although it was a very laudible attitude for a man who is now Minister for Health and is using his force, strength, and such professional skills as he may have to cover up stories on the Penn-Rose affair. What an extraordinary change of circumstances; it is so different as to be almost unbelievable.

The cover-up is on because, quite clearly, the Minister is concerned that the Government is in difficulties; he is concerned that something very serious and bad has happened which could bring discredit not only to the Government, but also to himself if the public were to learn the full facts.

He really does not want too much more personal condemnation; over the past 12 months he has had more than his share.

When we read the notice paper, we realise he is only the pretending Minister for Health, as the biggest single health issue confronting this State in fact has been taken out of his hands because of his refusal and neglect to deal with the problem of tobacco smoking over years past.

The device he is using to cover up—and he really thinks it is a clever device when, in fact, it is a rather absurd, petty device because it is close to exhibiting what one could refer to as a clear breach of parliamentary process—is that of refusing to make available to this House the evidence, the documents, the material, and the transcript which he gathered up when he presided over the Penn-Rose inquiry, an inquiry over which he should not have presided in the first place. Having done so, he has since concealed from the people of this State the material presented to him.

Why would a person do that? Why would a person who has taken evidence conscientiously and reasonably efficiently and then drawn conclusions in a report, want to conceal the material placed before him?

Can anyone think of any good reasons? Possibly there were good reasons, but if there were they would have been advanced. In this case no good reasons have been advanced; the so-called reasons can be regarded only as bad and unsatisfactory. The Parliament would be aware that this matter is a continuing saga so far as I am concerned.

One must have regard for this place and the dignity that is supposed to pervade it. It was as long ago as 21 September this year that I first inquired from the Minister as to whether he would make the material available. Of course, he used an old dodge—it is as old as Adam—by putting on the shoulders of the Attorney General the responsibility of determining whether the material would be produced. That is called "passing the buck".

With the effluxion of time—weeks and months—nothing further has developed. As of today—I have checked my office today—I have not received the answer that was said would be sent to me. The Minister, with a wink and a nod would have said to the Attorney General, "This is merely a device. I pretended to the people through the Parliament that I will supply an answer to this, but I really don't intend to. Just ignore my inquiry. Shortly the Parliament will run its course and that will be the end of the matter, because the people have short memories. We all know that."

That is the apparent thought process involved in this matter—a rather different thought process to that which he adopted on 6 October 1976.

This speech will probably be my last opportunity this session to raise this matter. I have been told that the Parliament will run its course by some time next week. It seems to be odds on that the original intent of the Minister will reach fruition; namely, that the people of this State, and members of this Parliament—the representatives of the people—will be denied the truth regarding the Penn-Rose inquiry. That situation is extraordinarily unsatisfactory.

I could not imagine anybody would think seriously that the Minister has acted correctly, particularly when this matter is brought into focus with that stand down situation a few years back involving a mere back-bencher. It is interesting how people's views change once the responsibility for something shifts a little. At the time of that stand down, I believed that the attitudes he adopted and the resignation that followed were thoroughly bona fide. However, I do not have access to the mind of the Minister—I do not know what his thought process was. Of course, others felt that the action taken was a political ploy as a result of a difficult election coming up. When one compares the stand taken in 1976 with the extraordinary levels of cupidity and humbug pursued in respect of the Penn-Rose Nursing Home inquiry, one begins to wonder about the merit of the initial stand taken.

Another matter I will raise concerns the closure of the Tuart Hill Senior High School. That closure was traumatic for the district concerned, and particularly for the parents involved, and the students and staff of that school. I do not intend to traverse all that occurred at that time, but we know that a fairly significant and sustained uproar occurred as a result of the summary closure of that school; it occurred without consultation or notice—merely a directive was issued, disregarding the people involved. It was an extraordinary show of unbridled and unimaginative power, which was perhaps typical—we now have it as a legacy—of the era of the previous Premier.

Of course, we all can be strong and adopt standover tactics if we have unlimited power as the Government has in this Parliament. If the people permit a Government to have such a power by allowing it to fiddle with the electoral laws so that it retains power for all time, the people must accept the consequences. I object to this situation occurring, but all I can say is that I, for one, do not approve of it, which is fairly well known.

During a recent visit of a number of school children to this place, members exhibited their usual lack of decorum. The children heard from the public gallery the Speaker ask members to behave themselves and to set an example for behaviour. I will give an example of behaviour from the Minister for Education. Recently I asked the Minister this question—

(3) Is he aware—

(a) that his predecessor gave the following unqualified undertaking, namely—

“Students affected will be able to travel to and from school in 1982 and 1983 at no added cost to parents.”;

(b) that the parents accepted this undertaking in good faith and acted upon it;

The elements of a contract were obvious; the words were not loose and meaningless. Information was given, and there was an acceptance of it; the intention was obvious, and parents acted upon that.

I asked further—

(c) that some parents have in fact been and are being forced to pay bus fares by reason of the Government's breach of the above undertaking?

The answer to 3(a) was—

Statements on free bus travel for 1982 and 1983 were related to nominated area schools which were gazetted later.

No-one of whom I have inquired or who is interested in this question has ever heard the expression “nominated area schools” let alone know what they are supposed to be. It is interesting that these schools were gazetted after the undertaking was given, accepted, and acted upon.

The answer to 3(b) was in part—

Children who were attending Tuart Hill or were in year 7 at one of the contributory primary schools in 1981 and who now attend a nominated area school are provided with free travel.

One must compare the words of the previous Minister when he said that students affected would be able to travel in 1982-83 at no added cost to parents with the rest of this Minister's answer to 3(b), which stated—

It was never intended that the Government would meet travel costs, regardless of the school to which parents elect to send their child.



The words "It was never intended" refer to the former Minister for Education, but his words were clear, unmistakable, and unequivocal—they cannot be misunderstood. People acted upon those words and this present Minister for Education, on behalf of the Government, welched on the deal. In fact, we had two welches to exculpate the Government, and that is an example of this Government's fair dealing. That situation is ironic when one remembers that the Speaker has said that we should set an example. The Minister clearly is welching by saying, "But we did not intend that." Let us take it a step further. No-one has suggested that the Government should pay bus fares for students travelling, for example, from Tuart Hill or Yokine to a school at Mandurah or some other outlandish place.

Mr Shalders: It is a very good place.

Mr BERTRAM: I suppose Mandurah has some good attractions, but I do not know about those who represent that area. A handful of students have been and will be attending schools other than nominated ones. It is estimated that the bill for bus fares for students being forced to attend schools in other areas would be approximately \$1 000. The Government receives in excess of \$2 000 million each year and baulks at the prospect of spending \$1 000. Is that an example of good leadership? That high school will soon be closed down—it might have 12 months to go—in order that a senior college can be operated there.

When the Tuart Hill High School was at its peak, it had about 1 700 students, and it is interesting to note that in March 1982 there were 608 full-time and 302 part-time students, and, as at 4 November, the numbers had dropped to 394 including 201 part-time students.

The projected figures for 1983 for the Tuart Hill senior college will be 740 students, 350 of whom will be part-time students. These figures may be a little high, for obvious reasons. It is projected that, at the end of the year 490 students will attend the college, 230 of whom will be part-time students. It appears that the experiment or idea of putting a senior college on the Tuart Hill Senior High School site will fail; the figures I have just quoted are good indicators of that.

I brought this matter forward on behalf of the people concerned about the closure of the Tuart Hill Senior High School and I urge the Government to look at the possibility of reinstating that high school. Not only have families of students who attended the Tuart Hill Senior High School been upheaved, but also they have lost a substantial sum of money, some in hard cash and others in prospects, because they have purchased their

home near the high school; they now discover they have to move elsewhere and are being put to great inconvenience. Students have been sent to Mt. Lawley, Mirrabooka, Balcatta, and other high schools. That is not a good situation in the eyes of the community.

Knowing this Government as I do, my pleas will not get very far, but I have an obligation to put forward my views. The prospect of reinstating the Tuart Hill Senior High School is feasible.

I now comment about the intersection of Main Street and Karrinyup Road which becomes Morley Drive at that point. That intersection has to cope with heavy vehicular traffic and many accidents have occurred at that site. Of course this causes me great concern. The situation has existed for more than four years and no steps have been taken to improve that intersection. The costs involved will be justified. It might involve resumption of land, the widening of Main Street, the placing of median strips, and the installation of lights. In approximately 18 months the fourth stage of the Mitchell Freeway will be completed and traffic at that intersection will diminish substantially once that is in operation. People who hold that point of view point know that a similar result occurred in Main Street, south of Hutton Street, down to Scarborough Beach Road. That area experienced a heavy traffic flow until the third stage of the Mitchell Freeway was introduced. The freeway has opened up the areas in the immediate vicinity and has caused a considerable amount of inconvenience to the people in the region.

I would have thought that at a time of financial stringency a better use of funds would be made if extra manpower were placed on the intersection at the times when the traffic flow was heavy. That would not create a heavy capital expense. The people have travelled over that intersection for four years, so they could not complain about waiting a little longer for the new freeway. Traffic flow onto the freeway from Main Street and Hutton Street is of considerable volume. Why not, at this time of financial stringency, wait another 18 months for the freeway extension? If, contrary to the expectations of some, the traffic flow at the intersection is still heavy, no great harm will have been inflicted, because there would be no additional cost, except perhaps only for additional manpower.

Another matter which has concerned me for some time relates to sewerage and septic tanks. The septic tanks installed in new areas are efficient and cause no real problem. However, it seems to me wrong that other housing estates developed after the Tuart Hill and Yokine areas

should have a mains sewerage supply when people in the areas I have mentioned still lack those services. It is most unfair.

The demands placed upon the Treasury by my electorate are relatively small, especially when we compare them with the demands made by new areas. For many years the taxpayers in my electorate have paid their taxes and received very little in return. For that reason, they should be given some priority on this matter. They should at least be given a fair go.

It has been of concern to me that we do not have an effective record in this State of who owns land registered under the Transfer of Land Act. This matter seems to be of great concern to others at the moment because wealthy people from overseas are moving to this State because the prices for land have fallen and now is the ideal time to buy. These wealthy people do not have any problem in raising capital and can just sit on the land while it gains in value and then they obtain an extraordinary rake-off.

We are reaching the end of the 30th session of Parliament and have heard talk of committees, positive action, etc., on this matter, but we are still in a position where we do not know who owns land in this State. This matter has been handled in Queensland, which State is way ahead of us. It may have been at a time when Joh Bjelke-Petersen was away from Cabinet and the other Cabinet Ministers took over and took some action about maintaining a record of land ownership in that State.

I recall that, during war time and for some time afterwards, when a transfer of land was carried out a certificate or declaration was required to identify the nationality of the purchaser of the land. That was a simple system which worked well and I feel if the Government wishes to do something about this issue it could be done simply. At this stage I place on record my dissatisfaction at the fact that this Government will go out the door and into an election without its having taken this matter seriously and without its doing what would be in the best interests of the people of the State.

People have expressed publicly the need for speeding up the completion of the fourth stage of the Mitchell Freeway and the next stage which involves the extension of the freeway to Wanneroo. I believe it is desirable this stage be completed as soon as possible, and I support the views of the public. I understand the Commonwealth Government is making funds available for various ventures and I think the least this Government should do is to seek additional funds from

the Commonwealth Government in order that not only the fourth stage, but also the remaining stages of the freeway might be completed.

Recently some young people visited Parliament House and we were discussing the Legislative Council in relation to what it does; why it is supposed to be there; what it costs; when elections were held; and how many elections had been held. I do not know whether I was accurate in my statistics, but I was obliged to tell them that something like 40 elections have been held for the upper House and all of them have been won by one side of the political spectrum and of course lost by the other. In these circumstances they could not understand the reason for the elections, and the extraordinary expense, and considered it was unfortunate that the results of elections were a foregone conclusion. We are all able to say now, without any money being spent on an election, who will have the majority in the upper House after the next election. What an extraordinary absurdity it is for the member for Bunbury and others to encourage workers who are receiving a fraction of the salary of members of Parliament, to be satisfied with the pay they are receiving and to do more work for it. The salaries of members of Parliament continue to increase, and the Government members of Parliament themselves, without permission from anyone, increase the number of members so they may do less work!

That is an extraordinary state of affairs. The young people to whom I referred could not cop that at all. They thought it was extraordinary and did not know why it should be. I could not give them an explanation of the reason for elections when the result was a foregone conclusion. It is a waste of money and it goes on year after year. Millions of dollars are being squandered for no meritorious purpose, so that the Government may continue in control.

It is an extraordinary thing for an adult to have to explain to a young person who laughs at the situation. While the Government allows this sort of thing to continue, at the same time it asks these young people to be nationalists, to show the flag, and to be good Australians. What an example!

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Treasurer) [5.11 p.m.]: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr Bryce: Are you going to give a detailed reply to the last 10 speeches?

Mr O'CONNOR: If I may proceed! I have listened intently to most of the speeches during this debate and while I concur with some remarks made, I certainly do not agree with others. When the Consolidated Revenue Fund debate was held, the Leader of the Opposition made a number of

remarks that were inaccurate and I brought them to his attention. In spite of the Government's assistance in pointing out the errors and the error of his ways, in his speech on the General Loan Fund he made no improvement. As a matter of fact, the speech he made would have shamed an amateur.

I will give details—briefly at first and more detailed at a later stage—of some of the errors he made. I believe the first test in the CRF of the Leader of the Opposition was a failure and his second test deteriorated and was, in fact, a dismal failure being a mixture of dishonesty and insincerity. I will list the points.

Mr Bryce: It sounds like a headline, "O'Connor attacks Burke".

Mr O'CONNOR: It could be put another way, "O'Connor attacks bungling Brian". What he constructed most of his speech on—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr TONKIN: I notice that the Treasurer just referred to the Leader of the Opposition as being dishonest. I do not particularly object to that because, if we cannot criticise one another here we may as well shut the place up. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to this because when my colleagues have made such comments of a far less serious nature than this, such as "dirty trick", they have been forced to withdraw those comments and on occasions have been suspended from the House. I have drawn your attention to this, not to ask the Treasurer to withdraw his remarks, but to point out to you that I accept his right to make such comments and I would hope that when you are in the Chair and such comments are made, you do not take any action.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition's speech was constructed almost around a false attempt to say that I had made a statement to the House which I had, in fact, not made. The Leader of the Opposition stated that I had said—

"The difficulties in the economy, . . . ought not to be our priorities".

It is a statement that I never made and when he first made his statement, I asked him on what page of *Hansard* it was stated. It took him two hours to bring forward details of that and I will deal with that matter at a later stage. In that particular instance the Leader of the Opposition was bowled for a duck.

Secondly, he claimed that had the SEC budget been omitted from the works programme, the al-

location would be less than last year. Wrong again. A further false statement.

He said again—and all in one speech, which is difficult to believe—that last year's allocation for works other than SEC was \$470.5 million. Now we have a hat trick—he was bowled out three times for none. This speech was comparable with his previous speech.

He continued and said that the works programme of \$1 021.8 million, minus \$597.9 was \$432.9. His arithmetic is bad because again he is inaccurate. He stated that I had boasted that 800 State Housing Commission homes would be built this year. He claimed that would not happen, but he is wrong because more than 800 State Housing Commission homes will be built. He said that I had said—

"I believe the ingredients for a Treasurer to bring down a good Budget are sincerity and honesty. . .

If he had shown sincerity and honesty, he would have used the exact words. He left out a word. I said "among" these things. He left out that word and made great play about what I said. Again he was wrong. It is very convenient for the Leader of the Opposition to leave out words and to mislead the House and the public. It should be brought to the attention of the House because it is happening much too often. I have mentioned six errors in the areas with which I have dealt already. It is a double hat trick; he has been bowled out six times for nought, and knocked for six.

Mr Tonkin: Just because the test cricket is on!

Mr O'CONNOR: Those are part of the errors he made. I will deal with each in perspective.

I refer first to his claim that I said that difficulties in the economy ought not to be our priority. The *Hansard* report came back and indicated the word "not" was never used by me. It never was used by me. When the Leader of the Opposition quoted this in the House he had a copy of *Hansard* in front of him which contained my remarks and which was not in accordance with what he said.

Mr Tonkin: He had the other one—the incorrect one.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Morley ought to know that one is not allowed to quote from uncorrected copy.

Mr Tonkin: He genuinely believed you had said it.

Mr O'CONNOR: He did nothing of the kind; it was incorrect and the member for Morley and the Leader of the Opposition knew it. I am not

saying the Leader of the Opposition is dishonest, but I ask whether it is honest to quote when he has a copy of *Hansard* in front of him which says the opposite. The next day he recorded the incorrect statement in his political notes in the paper; he has not had the decency to rectify that. He placed *The West Australian* newspaper in a difficult position because no privilege exists in this House, and comments are quoted out of context and are not recorded in *Hansard*. I do not suppose anything will be done about it. However, *The West Australian* desires accuracy as I do, and it is a great pity that this blatant misleading is occurring to such a great degree. When the Leader of the Opposition made his speech he mentioned this point no less than 10 times in two hours. It took me the best part of two hours to find out where he was misquoting and misleading the House. I was then able to ask that the incorrect report not be taken into account, or words to that effect. The Leader of the Opposition should have the decency to apologise for putting into the newspaper something that was incorrect.

Mr Tonkin: Why wouldn't you apologise when you were wrong years ago about the cash refund?

Mr O'CONNOR: He should apologise for putting in the newspaper something which was incorrect, and which he knew was incorrect. The Opposition is prepared to mislead people—

Mr Nanovich: He has been absent from the House for the last two days.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is something which can happen to all of us from time to time. However, the nature of the inaccuracies is something we should not tolerate. The Leader of the Opposition made a serious and false allegation against me and he should rectify it.

I turn now to the second point—the Leader of the Opposition's claim that if we omitted the SEC works programme from the GLF, it would be less than last year. Why should we delete the SEC works programme from the GLF? It is creating work for people, and what is wrong with money being spent to ensure SEC supplies? In any case, the Leader of the Opposition was wrong again. If the SEC works programme is taken away, the figure was up \$64.2 million, or 18 per cent. I am not saying he is dishonest; is it incompetence or dishonesty? I leave it to the House to decide.

His next claim was that last year's works programme apart from the SEC totalled \$470.5 million. The House should bear in mind that all these errors were contained in one speech. How can this man be the Treasurer of the State if this is an example of his financial capacity?

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: In what condition would the State's finances be if he were Treasurer?

Mr Tonkin: He would buy and sell you.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is almost unbelievable. It is recorded in *Hansard* and it will show how incompetent this man is as far as finances are concerned. He does not understand mathematics. He claimed that last year's works programme apart from the SEC totalled \$470.5 million, and I claimed at the time that that was false, because I knew it was. He said "What I say is accurate". It was inaccurate; the figure was \$359.6 million. How can a man mess up those figures and claim to be a financial expert? If that is what he does, he borders on incompetence. In order to arrive at the figure he quoted, he would have had to take last year's actual figure away from estimated expenditure. Would any man who understands finance, do that unless he wanted to mislead the House? Is that honest? It is up to the House to decide. He made an error in relation to the works programme. He subtracted \$579.9 million from \$1 021.8 million and came up with \$432.9 million. He could not even make the correct deduction. I accept that he may have made an error and I give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr Nanovich: You are too fair.

Mr O'CONNOR: On 30 September and 2 November in this House, I advised the Leader of the Opposition that the actual works programme was \$561.3 million. I ask the House to take note of the date. On 4 November he made this startling claim. He said, "This information has been revealed by investigation by my staff in detailed reading of the Budget papers". I ask the House: Is that honest? I ask members opposite whether they would do the same sort of thing; I doubt whether any of them would.

Mr Bryce: He is a very honest individual.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is in the papers.

Let us go further because it is important that people should know the way the Opposition tries to mislead in so many ways. The Leader of the Opposition promised \$25 million to provide jobs if he became Premier. He said it would provide 2 000 to 3 000 jobs for 20 months. If that \$25 million were taken up totally in wages, and nothing was allocated for materials, administration, or equipment, and 2 500 people were involved, they would receive \$125 a week. I wonder what the Industrial Commission would say; I wonder what the unions would say.

Several members interjected.

Mr Tonkin: Are they direct jobs?

Mr O'CONNOR: He said he promised \$25 million—

Mr Bryce: Perhaps they would be non-unionists.

Mr O'CONNOR: —to provide jobs for between 2 000 and 3 000 people for 20 months. How good is the arithmetic? People would receive \$125 a week if no allocation were made for materials, equipment, and administration. Mr Deputy Speaker, you and I know how much equipment and administration cost. If they were taken into account, people would receive much less than \$125. That shows the financial competence of the Leader of the Opposition.

In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition blamed the North-West Shelf project for an alleged reduction in general works programmes. That project is the greatest engineering feat in the whole of Australia. He stated that the works programme shows "the massive accommodation which is having to be made within this State's economy for the North-West Shelf project." He went on to say, "What we are saying is that the North-West Shelf project is distorting the economy of this State." Does he mean by that that if he became the leader of the Government he would not have that sort of operation going because of its distorting the economy of the State?

Then the Leader of the Opposition accused me of not being straightforward. This almost makes me smile. If I had made the allegation he did and it was false, I would have risen in this House and apologised, and I would have tried to rectify it outside. He has not done so.

Mr Tonkin: We will believe it when we see it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition in referring to my remarks said, "For him to say that we have a massive capital works programmes and not to explain that, apart from one area of expenditure, it is actually a reduction across other vital areas, is not being as straightforward as he should be." As the Leader of the Opposition was wrong in that, and we have not seen a reduction but, in fact, a significant increase, I say that his comments are nothing more than a hollow sham. It makes one wonder. In this House, we are supposed to speak the truth and give details fully; and the people outside are supposed to respect us. How can the Leader of the Opposition get away with that sort of statement and all of these errors in one speech?

I am not talking about one error over a long period of time. One can forgive an error because everyone makes them. However, if a person makes an error, he should go back and indicate that it was an error. Of course, when somebody

makes a number of errors, in my opinion it is gross incompetence.

Let us go a little further. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Treasurer had boasted in the Budget papers that 800 houses would be built this year, and he claimed that that was not the case. Again he is inaccurate because more than 800 houses will be built.

One of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition was in connection with the devaluation of the Australian dollar. Members will recall his saying that he thought the Australian dollar should be devalued by five per cent or possibly 10 per cent. In that, he is obviously out of step with the rest of his colleagues. Do they believe that it ought to be devalued by five per cent or 10 per cent, or do his colleagues not believe that? Here is a man making a comment like that when, quite frankly, he is out of touch with almost everyone in the State.

Mr Bryce: Are you against devaluation in all circumstances?

Mr O'CONNOR: No, I am not; but he said this would be one of his prime moves.

Mr Bryce: So you do not think it ought to be considered?

Mr O'CONNOR: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition think it should be?

Mr Bryce: It is an option that has to be seriously considered.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does the Deputy Leader's party believe in that?

Mr Bryce: I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr O'CONNOR: Let me read some notes from one Ralph Willis, dated 6 November. Ralph Willis is the Federal Labor spokesman in connection with financial affairs.

Mr Bryce: You are not going to shove the opinion of a Canberra person down our throats, are you?

Mr O'CONNOR: Not necessarily. I will just point out—

Mr Bertram: Are you in favour of centralism?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: No, I am not.

Mr Bertram: You are a chronic centralist.

Mr O'CONNOR: This is how it was reported—

The Labor Party has ditched its commitment to a 5 per cent devaluation of the dollar. Economic spokesman Ralph Willis says: "Given the movements since we last called

for devaluation, I do not think at this stage we would be pursuing the need for any such action."

Mr Bryce: What is the date of the article?

Mr O'CONNOR: I continue—

"Our international reserves have improved quite markedly in the past two or three months and, indeed, in the September quarter quite spectacularly."

This is contained in the *Business Review Weekly* of 6 November.

Mr Bryce: Do you appreciate that if you take a stand on devaluation in the month of November, you may completely reverse your opinion and your decision within a month or so?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr Bryce: Seriously, that is the role of devaluation. It is very volatile.

Mr O'CONNOR: The article would have been written at about the time the Leader of the Opposition was speaking.

Let us consider how many errors have been made. I would not say that the last one was an error—it is something that, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition believed—but it shows he is out of step with almost everyone.

In connection with the Victorian Budget, the Leader of the Opposition was confused; and I can well understand his confusion in this area, because while he allegedly said there was a \$33 million surplus, one of the things that the Victorian Government did was to take \$97.7 million from pooled assets of the public sector, including statutory authorities. It took the \$97.7 million from those areas to finance temporarily a revenue shortfall.

Mr Bryce: Did you say Victoria?

Mr O'CONNOR: That is correct.

Mr Bryce: They did not. They invested it in loans.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have checked this with officers of our Treasury and with Victoria; and they say that is correct.

Mr Bryce: I have their Budget papers; and I am not sure they did that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I say again, in case the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has it wrong, that the Victorian Government took \$97.7 million from pooled assets—

Mr Bryce: Is this their management plan?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes. The money came from the statutory authorities to finance temporarily a

revenue shortfall. A revenue shortfall is another way of saying a Budget deficit.

Mr Bryce: Which they inherited from Thompson. Thompson left it as a legacy.

Mr O'CONNOR: I mention these points because they are relevant. That sort of approach is the same as New South Wales selling \$221 million worth of equipment to a finance company and leasing it back to try to balance its Budget. That is the sort of thing we would not do in this State, because we want a sound foundation for the people of the State. The people are the ones who would have to finance that sort of thing in the future.

The Leader of the Opposition praised Victoria and New South Wales for the tax on financial transactions. He said, "I think it was widely acclaimed by all sectors of the business community." I will quote from *The Age* of Friday, 5 November, as follows—

The financial institution's duty as proposed in the recent Victorian and New South Wales Budgets would bankrupt all merchant banks and authorised money market dealers or send them interstate. The tax has turned into a monster because not enough time was spent on analysing the effects of the tax on financial institutions.

The tax has now been deferred.

Here we had the Leader of the Opposition indicating that is the sort of thing he liked. Obviously it is one of the things he would impose on the people of this State.

Mr Hassell: It was his great white hope for the State.

Mr O'CONNOR: That shows how the Leader of the Opposition's slavish devotion to "Big Brother" in the Eastern States would bring him and this State down. The Leader of the Opposition misquoted me regarding the qualities needed to bring down a Budget. He distorted the meaning of what I said at a Premiers' Conference. Although he has had more than a month to peruse the Budget figures, he has shown he is utterly incapable of understanding elementary mathematics, as indicated by me. The Leader of the Opposition lacks honesty to deal with arithmetical accuracy. This is indicated by the number of errors he made, all the way through his speech.

Mr Bryce: Are you prepared to publicly debate this with him on television?

Mr O'CONNOR: I debate in this House. This is my place.

Mr Bryce: So you would not do it off the cuff, without being surrounded by notes and advisers?

Mr O'CONNOR: I did not say that.

Mr Bryce: You would not debate him publicly on it, would you? Of course you would not.

Mr O'CONNOR: Consistently and deliberately, the Leader of the Opposition has misquoted members' comments in this House. He claimed on a radio broadcast recently that the average age of the Cabinet now is about 55. He knows full well that he distorted the figure.

Mr Davies: What is it? Is it 54?

Mr O'CONNOR: I am bringing this point forward, because it is time the Leader of the Opposition realised that he must quote accurately in the comments he makes.

Mr Hassell: He is the master of the half truth.

Mr O'CONNOR: Our capital works programme is a good one. We have tried honestly and sincerely—

Mr Bryce: You are able to say what you like when he is not here.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition has been here hardly at all this week.

Mr Bryce: He has hardly been absent. You are setting a great precedent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I cannot wait for the Leader of the Opposition to return. He had ample time within which to get back to the House, if he thought it was important enough to be here.

Mr Bryce: You won't accept his invitations to debate it publicly.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have not had an invitation from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: You do not have the gumption. That's what it is!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bryce: He has had at least five invitations.

Mr O'CONNOR: The points I have made are accurate. They have been checked and the Leader of the Opposition ought to feel disgraced—

Mr Bryce: Punching away at a vacuum.

Mr O'CONNOR: —by what he has done over a period in this House. The Budget we have presented is honest and sincere. It is an effort to try to create work for the people of this State. It is a capital works Budget far in excess of what has ever been presented previously. A great number of jobs will be provided as a result of the SEC pipeline. Jobs also will be created in the areas of housing and as a result of capital works programmes.

It is a good Budget and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

**Votes—Agriculture, \$646 000; Forests, \$5 400 000; Industrial Development, \$70 000; Mines, \$420 000; Public Works—Engineering and Associated Works, \$22 620 000—put and passed.**

**Vote: Public Works—Buildings and Associated Works, \$85 078 000—**

Mr GRAYDEN: It is proposed to spend \$23 472 000 in respect of hospitals under public works—buildings and associated works including furniture and equipment. My suggestion relates to the effects of cigarette smoking which is a very serious matter. A total of 1 200 people die annually in this State as a consequence of cigarette smoking.

A representative of the Cancer Council of Great Britain has been in this State recently and pointed out one of the planks of that council's campaign against cigarette smoking is the dissemination of material stating that tobacco is the only widely promoted product in the world which kills 25 per cent of those who consume it. The council stipulates that, if a person smokes 20 or more cigarettes a day, he or she falls into the category of cigarette smokers who have a 25 per cent mortality rate.

I suggest that, in view of the fact that 1 200 people die annually in this State from diseases associated with cigarette smoking, we construct a mausoleum in Western Australia. I do not stipulate where it should be located. It could be constructed in Kings Park, on the Esplanade, on Burswood Island, on Heirisson Island, or anywhere else.

Not only would that mausoleum be constructed in memory of those who have died as a result of diseases associated with cigarette smoking, but also it would be a museum in which some of the effects of cigarette smoking would be depicted very graphically. Depicted in that museum would be the fact that the number of people who die annually as a result of tobacco smoking is four times as great as the road toll in this State. We would compare the number of deaths from tobacco-related diseases with the number of casualties which resulted from the world wars and Vietnam and the number of people who die from alcohol-related disease. All this would be portrayed graphically in the mausoleum.

Members who visited the Royal Show would have seen the police exhibit which had a number of gory items and attracted many people. I suggest we construct a mausoleum in this State in which to display that sort of material relating to cigarette smoking. A large number of Western Australians would visit it and parents would be able to take their children there to see the effects of cigarette smoking. It would become a tourist attraction and would help to bring home to the people of Western Australia the significance of the statement to which I referred earlier and which is circulated widely by the Cancer Council of Great Britain.

It can be seen that, when one smokes cigarettes, one is playing Russian roulette with a revolver with four chambers, one of which has a bullet in it. If a person smokes a pack of cigarettes a day—that is, 20 or more cigarettes—he falls into the category of smokers who have a 25 per cent mortality rate.

I will not go any further, although I would welcome the opportunity to develop my argument more. I will satisfy myself by reiterating that, if we are to spend over \$2 000 million this year on public works and if we are able to allocate \$2 000 million for Consolidated Revenue Estimates, a total in excess of \$4 000 million, surely we could make available a small amount to enable us to construct this mausoleum which would serve to remind us of the 1 200 people who die annually in this State and which would serve also as a museum in which we could depict all that to which I have just referred.

**Vote put and passed.**

**Votes—Treasury, \$3 790 000; Business Undertakings, \$17 132 000; Housing Authorities, \$21 600 000; Technical and Further Education Colleges, \$3 920 000; Other Authorities, \$440 000—put and passed.**

Schedules 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

### QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [5.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 10.45 a.m. on Tuesday, 16 November.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.*

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### STOCK: SHEEP

##### *Noxious Weeds*

1988. **Mr COWAN**, to the Minister for Primary Industry:

- (1) How many Eastern States sheep other than stud stock have been imported and sold in this State?
- (2) In what saleyards have the stock been sold?
- (3) Have records of livestock sales been made available to Agriculture Protection Board officers in order to allow them to establish a register of farms which may be at risk from the introduction of noxious weeds from this source?
- (4) Are quarantine and inspection facilities adequate to carry out efficient inspection of livestock from the Eastern States?
- (5) How many officers have been assigned to this task?
- (6) How many used harvesters have been brought into Western Australia from the Eastern States?
- (7) Have all of these machines been inspected by the Agriculture Protection Board?
- (8) (a) Where is the inspection carried out; and  
(b) what guarantee is there that all of the imported machines are being inspected?
- (9) Will the Agriculture Protection Board maintain a register of farms where these machines operate?
- (10) Is it possible for landowners who have purchased livestock or used machinery to be made liable for the full cost of eradication of any noxious weeds introduced to their properties from these sources?



Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Since 1 September 1982, 7 150 approximately.
- (2) Northam.
- (3) The buyer's property is under surveillance quarantine for footrot and liver fluke. The records are available to the Agriculture Protection Board.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Up to 4.
- (6) 15.
- (7) Yes.
- (8) (a) Norseman, Kalgoorlie, and Esperance;  
(b) the Eyre Highway is the only road suitable for heavy transport so it is virtually certain that all trucks carrying machinery will pass through Norseman. Surveillance east of Norseman is maintained by local staff and the observed entry of vehicles coincides with arrivals at Norseman.
- (9) The destination of the machines will be recorded and use monitored as far as possible.
- (10) Landholders are responsible for the control of declared plants (noxious weeds) on their properties.

## TRANSPORT

### *Passengers: Unemployed*

2026. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

Referring to a report in *The West Australian* of 1 November indicating that he had rejected a suggestion that fare concessions on public transport be extended to the unemployed on the basis that such concessions would impose a substantial burden on State finances, and which appears to be in some conflict with the answer by the Deputy Premier to my question 1785 of 21 October 1982 indicating that he had recently asked the Co-ordinator General of Transport and the MTT to review the matter of travel concessions for unemployed people and that when the results are available he will be making recommendations to Government and that it is not possible to indicate what cost would be involved until he received the report—which of

these two responses represents the actual view of the Government regarding public transport concessions for the unemployed?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

As the member is no doubt aware, with the exception of the Commonwealth scheme for free travel passes for eligible persons attending job interviews, free public transport for the unemployed is not available at this time.

However, this is a matter that the Government keeps continually under review.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Denham*

2027. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Which department is responsible for the provision of water supplies to the town of Denham?
- (2) Is it correct that water is supplied through two water meters, one being bore water for garden use, and the other being desalinated water for home use?
- (3) Is it correct that ratepayers pay rates on both meters of over \$60 per meter?
- (4) In view of the ratepayers of Denham having no option over the number of meters required, why do they have to pay for both meters?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Public Works Department.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes. Water rates are payable on each property dependent on the rating valuation, and usage classification of each property. The minimum rate is \$40 per annum, and domestic properties are subject to a maximum rate of \$67. In return for rates, each property is entitled to one service without additional charge. Additional services are subject to an additional service fee of \$67.

- (4) Additional service fees apply throughout the State and are in accordance with the policy applying under the Country Areas Water Supply Act. There is a very high cost to the State in supplying potable water at Denham. Consumers who wish to take advantage of the benefits arising from the two supplies and thereby receiving potable water for a price which is only a fraction of the cost to the Public Works Department, must expect to make some small contribution to that cost.

### HOUSING

#### South-west

2028. Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Housing:  
How many units of each separate type of State Housing Commission accommodation have been built in—

- (a) Bunbury;  
(b) Collie;  
(c) Narrogin;  
(d) Pinjarra; and  
(e) Busselton,

in each of the past five years?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

The number of units built for the State Housing Commission in each of the past five years for the specific towns referred to are—

	2 BR Dup. (a)		3 BR Dup. (b)		2 BR SDH (c) TH		3 BR SDH (d) T/H		4 BR SDH (e)		A.P.U.	
	C/S	A/H	C/S	A/H	C/S	A/H	C/S	A/H	C/S	A/H	C/S	A/H
(a) BUNBURY												
1977-78	—	—	—	—	13	—	8	—	4	—	10	—
1978-79	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	—	—	—	—	—
1979-80	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	—	—	—	8	—
1980-81	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	4	—	2	—	—
1981-82	—	—	—	—	13	—	3	—	—	—	18	—
(b) COLLIE												
1977-78	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
1978-79	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	3	—
1979-80	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—
1980-81	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—
1981-82	4	—	—	—	—	—	10	—	—	—	—	—
(c) Narrogin												
1977-78	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
1978-79	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1979-80	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	2	—
1980-81	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1981-82	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—
(d) Pinjarra												
1977-78	4	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	2	—
1978-79	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1979-80	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—
1980-81	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
1981-82	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—
(e) Busselton												
1977-78	2	—	2	—	—	—	8	—	3	—	12	—
1978-79	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1979-80	2	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	—
1980-81	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	—
1981-82	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—

LEGEND: C/S—Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement  
A/H—Aboriginal Housing Scheme

# TOWN PLANNING: BOARD

## Chairman

2029. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) What were the initial terms and conditions of the appointment of Mr L. O'Meara as Chairman of the Town Planning Board?
- (2) Have these been since changed?
- (3) If so, in what way?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The terms and conditions of appointment are—
  - (a) salary for three and one-half days per week \$21 000 per annum;
  - (b) expense allowance—\$600 per annum; and
  - (c) normal public service rates for travelling allowance and motor mileage when attending board business in country areas.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by (2).

# HEALTH: TOBACCO

## Smoking: Treatment Costs

2030. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

In view of the fact that it has been estimated that at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in South Australia it cost \$12 000 000 annually to treat smoking related diseases, will he advise the approximate costs of treating such diseases at—

- (a) Royal Perth Hospital;
- (b) Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital;
- (c) Fremantle Hospital;
- (d) other Government hospitals?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (a) to (d) In the short time available and without knowing the criteria used in the Royal Adelaide Hospital study, it is not possible to give an immediate estimate. It is thought however that the amount involved would be substantial. The information required will involve considerable research and an answer will be forwarded as soon as studies have been carried out.

# TECHNOLOGY PARK

## Location

2031. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

Will he table a map showing the proposed location of the land to be used for the technology park?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

The two maps tabled show the location of the site with relation to the City of Perth and the proposed subdivision of the estate. The subdividing line has yet to be surveyed and must be taken as approximate only.

The technology park will occupy approximately one half of the total estate known as the Collier plantation.

*The maps were tabled (see paper No. 575).*

# EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

## Government Initiatives

2032. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that in the past 12 months no full time jobs have been created in Western Australia and that, in fact, 1 300 were lost?
- (2) Does he know that the Queensland Government increased its full time work force by 8 600—and was the only State to record any increase?
- (3) Can he explain his statement that Western Australia's job creation today remains the best in Australia when Western Australia's male work force was reduced by 1 000?
- (4) Can he explain the loss of 300 full time jobs for females?
- (5) Can he explain why 3 600 part-time and full-time jobs for young people were lost?
- (6) Is he aware that Western Australia has the highest proportion of its work force in part-time employment?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Member's wording of his question does not describe the position adequately, but nevertheless it is a fact

that Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that at the end of September this year there were 1 300 fewer people in full-time employment in Western Australia than 12 months earlier. The same figures show that there were 12 200 more people employed in this State at the end of September than 12 months earlier.

- (2) Yes, and to present the position fully it should be noted that the decline in full-time employment in the same period in New South Wales was 45 100, in Victoria 13 000, in South Australia 12 100, and in Tasmania 7 300.
- (3) The statistics available from the ABS demonstrate the truth of the statement that Western Australia's job creation is the best in Australia. In the 12-month period under review, the latest for which figures are available, the number of people employed in Western Australia increased by 12 200. In Queensland the number increased by 11 100. In New South Wales there was a decrease of 43 800, in Victoria a decrease of 16 000, in South Australia a decrease of 12 800, and in Tasmania a decrease of 4 700. It should be noted that part-time employment constitutes nearly 20 per cent of all employment and is therefore a very important part of overall employment and overall economic activity. It is a growing form of employment which is a natural expression of many of the changing circumstances and changing priorities in today's society. It should not be excluded in any assessment of the employment situation.
- (4) No. It is not possible to provide an explanation for each of the 300 employment positions mentioned.
- (5) See above.
- (6) Yes.

#### POLICE: FIREARMS

##### *Registrations*

2033. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

- (1) (a) How many persons hold firearms licences in Western Australia;
- (b) how many weapons are registered with the Police;
- (c) what is the number of each type registered?

- (2) (a) How many new licences were granted in the last year;
- (b) how many new registrations of weapons were approved;
- (c) what was the number of each type of weapon registered?
- (3) (a) How many weapons were surrendered to the police in the last year;
- (b) what was the number of each type?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) (a) At June 30 1982—total 98 169;
- (b) 193 533 (Private); 2 547 (Corporate), total 196 100.
- (c)

	Private	Corporate	Total
Shotguns	49 988	189	50 177
concealables	6 620	1 575	8 195
Other	136 945	783	137 728
	193 553	2 547	196 100

- (2) (a) 6 213;
- (b) 6 687;
- (c) shotguns 1 579—concealable 109, other 4 999.
- (3) (a) 2 290;
- (b) this information is not readily available, however, details could be supplied to the member within a few days, if required.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

##### *Telephone Calls: Toll-free*

2034. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Premier:

Would he please advise what Government or semi-Government authorities other than the Small Business Advisory Service provide toll-free (INWATS) telephone access to the people of Western Australia?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The information requested is being collated and a considered reply will be forwarded to the member as early as practicable.

2035. *This question was postponed.*

#### GRAIN

##### *Handling Charges*

2036. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the present charge per tonne for grain handled, levied by each of the State grain handling authorities?

- (2) (a) Has the handling charge for grain been set by the grain handling authorities for the 1982-83 year; and  
 (b) if so, at what levels have they been set?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) -

#### HANDLING CHARGES—1981-82 SEASON \$ PER TONNE

	WA	NSW	Victoria	Qld	SA	
Wheat	11.67	14.40	10.35	16.00	11.35	
Barley	14.01	14.40	11.00	13.34	10.25	(+ wharfage & belt charge of \$2 per tonne approx)
Oats	14.01	14.40	11.00	-	11.35	(+ wharfage & belt charge of \$2 per tonne approx)

(2) (a) and (b)

	WA	NSW	Victoria	Qld	SA	
Wheat	12.00	14.90	12.00	16.50	11.95	
Barley	14.40	14.90	12.60	N/A	10.95	(+ wharfage & belt charges)
Oats	14.40	16.30	12.60	—	11.45	(+ wharfage & belt charges)

#### EDUCATION

##### Students: Recurrent Cost

2037. Mr HERZFELD, to the Minister for Education:

What is the average recurrent cost in Western Australia—

- (a) per pre-primary pupil;  
 (b) per primary pupil;  
 (c) per secondary pupil?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (a) \$692.30;  
 (b) \$1 138.21;  
 (c) \$1 828.98.

#### BANKRUPTCIES

##### Number

2038. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Would the Attorney General please advise the number of bankruptcies declared in Western Australia in each of the last three financial years?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

I am advised that there has been a decline in the number of bankruptcies over the last three financial years.

However, bankruptcy being a Commonwealth responsibility, I would suggest that this request for detailed information should be addressed to the Commonwealth Attorney General.

#### APPRENTICES

##### Apprenticeships: New

2039. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Premier:

Would he please advise how many new apprenticeships his Government will be providing to commence in 1983, together with details of the departments involved?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The projected intake of apprentices into State Government departments and instrumentalities for 1983 is as follows—

Employing Authorities	Proposed Intake 1983
Department of Agriculture	1
Forests Department	5
Fremantle Port Authority	4
Fremantle Public Hospital	4
Government Printer	12
Hospital and Allied Services	43
Department of Labour and Industry	1
Main Roads Department	4
Metropolitan Water Authority	37
Mental Health Services	12
Metropolitan Transport Trust	20
Mines Department	1
Perth Dental Hospital	5
Public Works Department	58
State Energy Commission	58
State Housing Commission	4
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	7
University of Western Australia	1
Western Australia Fire Brigades Board	3
Western Australian Institute of Technology	5
Westrail	104
Zoological Gardens Board	1
	<hr/> 390

#### PUBLIC SERVICE

##### Positions: New

2040. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Premier:

How many new positions, other than apprenticeships, will be available through the State Public Service in the New Year?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Provision has been made in the 1982-83 budget for 167 new CRF funded positions under the provisions of the Public Service Act, 1978-82.

## LOTTERIES COMMISSION

### Agencies

2041. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Would the Minister please advise if it is the intention of the Government to ensure that persons currently holding lotto and lottery agencies will be given first right of refusal to sell the new instant lotto?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) The Lotteries Commission advises that it intends to invite all existing agents to be agents for the new instant lottery.
- (2) Not applicable.

2042. *This question was postponed.*

## SWIMMING POOLS

### Drownings

2043. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) How many persons drowned in private swimming pools in the last year?
- (2) Would she, in consultation with local authorities, ensure that action is taken to police the safety of private pools and initiate a campaign to warn of the dangers, particularly to children, of private swimming pools, to limit as far as possible the incidence of drowning in the ensuing summer period?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Three persons drowned in private swimming pools in the year ended 30 June 1982, comprising one pre-schooler, one primary school child and one adult.
- (2) It is the responsibility of all local authorities in the State to ensure that the provisions of the Uniform Private Swimming Pool By-laws are strictly enforced.

I will ensure that they are reminded of this requirement. In addition, the National Safety Council will shortly be commencing its summer swimming pools safety awareness campaign which has now been in operation for four years.

## ELECTORAL

### Enrolments: Metropolitan Area

2044. Mr TERRY BURKE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Would the Minister please advise the total number of persons over 18 years of age, based on census figures, residing in the area defined as the metropolitan region for the purposes of the Electoral Act?
- (2) What is the total number of persons enrolled in that area?
- (3) On the same basis, what is the total number of persons over 18 years of age, based on the census figures, in the rest of the State?
- (4) What is the total number of persons enrolled in the rest of the State?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (4) The Australian Bureau of Statistics is unable to provide figures which relate to the new State electoral boundaries.

2045. *This question was postponed.*

## POLICE STATION

### Nollamara

2046. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

- (1) Referring to his answer to question 2001 of 1982 in which he indicated that police strength at Nollamara Police Station had been boosted by the supply of an additional constable, can he confirm that the station is three men down on its normal strength due to annual leave entitlement and sickness and injury?
- (2) If "Yes", is it not misleading to the Parliament and the public to suggest that the supply of one additional police officer would boost overall police strength at the station, particularly in view of the extra workload imposed by the growth of the Mirrabooka town centre and the upsurge of vandalism and violence in the residential area in the same vicinity?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) and (2) Whilst it is correct that two men are on annual leave, the normal staffing of Nollamara Police Station, as with other stations, has an inbuilt component to allow for annual leave. At present a relief has been provided for a constable on sick leave.

Although, as stated in my answer to your previous question, a constable has been supplied to Nollamara to assist with the workload, it is the additional attention to this area by patrols other than the regular patrols from Nollamara Police Station that is the major initiative to combat this particular problem.

The additional constable has been provided as a supplement to police strength at Nollamara.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### ECONOMY: WESTERN AUSTRALIA

#### *Debate*

802. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) In view of the obvious satisfaction the Premier has just derived from condemning the Leader of the Opposition in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr O'Connor: His place is here.

Mr BRYCE: —will the Premier guarantee to accept the challenge from the Leader of the Opposition to debate general economic issues in public, on television, or in any other public forum?

- (2) If the Premier is not prepared to meet the Leader of the Opposition to debate these matters in those public forums, would he explain to the House why he is afraid of the challenge?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I spend enough of my time in this House debating issues with the Leader of the Opposition.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: But you won't do it publicly. The only way you could possibly win would be to challenge a vacuum.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member has criticised me for speaking when the Leader of the Opposition is away from the Chamber.

If the Leader of the Opposition is away from the House, that is his fault, not mine. His place is in the House. I knew the Leader of the Opposition was away, but I was unaware of how long the debate on this issue would last. I had every right to reply to it. If Opposition members think I am wrong in my assertions, it is for them to come to this place and make accusations against me.

Mr Bryce: You won't do it; you are a squib.

Several members interjected.

Mr Bryce: Take him on publicly.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Sodeman: Pay for your own advertising.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Pilbara should remain silent.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have tried to make the point to the House that oratory and acting are not what we need in Government; what we need is honesty and sincerity.

### REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION

#### *Administrator: South-west*

803. Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

Is the Minister in a position to provide information to the House about the pending appointment of an administrator for the south-west region?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

I am pleased to advise the member for Bunbury that the position has been advertised. The broad range of applicants have been assessed by a departmental committee and I understand it is down to the last few of those applicants. In the next two or three weeks I hope to be able to announce the appointment of the new regional administrator for the south-west.

### EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

#### *Job Creation Schemes*

804. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) In light of the crisis which has developed—

Mr Nanovich: Are you standing up?

Mr BRYCE: The member may think himself humorous but he is certainly not original.

Mr Rushton: Accurate, though.

Mr BRYCE: Eyeball to eyeball we are about the same, but not intellectually, I would hope. To continue: In light of the crisis which has developed in Western Australia associated with such high levels of unemployment, is his Government prepared to make representation to the Fraser Government to urge it to implement meaningful job creation schemes to provide employment for Western Australians?

(2) Is his Government considering the appointment of a Minister for employment and training?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) This Government already has undertaken some action. Everyone throughout Australia is concerned at the unemployment situation, but this Government already has taken action through its loan programme and in other areas to make sure every cent we can get is diverted into work-creating areas, such as housing, capital works, maintenance and so on. Already on other issues which are work-creative we have drawn up details with which to approach the Federal Government. We will be seeking assistance from the Federal Government. If a Premiers' Conference is requested to consider this matter we will participate if it appears something concrete could be done to assist the unemployed. However, we have taken action already in line with what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has suggested.

#### MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

##### *Overseas Trips*

805. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

What members of the Cabinet, apart from him, are contemplating overseas trips between now and the next election?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I cannot say offhand; the only ones I know of are the Minister for Mines and me.

Mr Davies: The Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development

said last night that he was going to New Zealand.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister for Mines and I will be going to Japan and Korea to discuss vital issues for this State which we hope will provide additional jobs in the long term.

I do not look forward to the trip; it will be for six days and will include quite a bit of travelling. I have more than enough to do here, but I believe the matter is important enough to warrant both of us taking the trip. As the member suggested, the Minister for Resources Development may be taking a trip to New Zealand, but offhand I am not aware of any other trips.

#### HEALTH: TOBACCO

##### *Smoking: Deaths*

806. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) According to Public Health Department estimates, does cigarette smoking cause the death of at least 1 200 Western Australians each year from lung cancer, coronary heart disease, emphysema and chronic bronchitis?

(2) Is cigarette smoking the largest single cause of preventable death and disease in Western Australia?

(3) Is the proportion of adult male and female smokers in the population falling?

(4) Is the proportion of regular smokers amongst children rising rapidly?

(5) Does he know what percentage of—

(a) men;

(b) women; and

(c) children

in Western Australia are regular smokers?



Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) In 1981, 442 deaths resulted from lung cancer, 2 249 from coronary heart disease, and 333 from chronic bronchitis and emphysema in Western Australia, a total of 3 004. It generally is considered that 75 per cent of deaths from lung cancer, 25 per cent from coronary heart disease, and 80 per cent from chronic bronchitis and emphysema would not have occurred in the absence of smoking. On this basis 1 145 deaths in 1981 from lung cancer, coronary heart disease and chronic bronchitis and emphysema are attributable to smoking. The figures for 1979 and 1980 were slightly lower.
- (2) Yes, in the sense that the largest single factor causing death and disease which is potentially preventable is cigarette smoking.
- (3) No. The rates are stable at present.
- (4) No accurate information is available in Western Australia but data from elsewhere suggests some increase among adolescents, particularly female adolescents, the rate of increase being uncertain.
- (5) The latest readily available and reliable data relating to the population of Western Australia as a whole is that obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics survey in 1977. The figures are—
  - (a) men—45.9 per cent;
  - (b) women—31.3 per cent; and
  - (c) children—not known.

## HOSPITALS

### *Jamison Report*

807. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health:

A circular recently was sent through the mail from the Australian Hospitals Association to draw attention to some of the recommendations of the Jamison report which are considered to be vital for the future of health delivery in Australia, but have not been acted upon. I ask: Is he able to tell us, as a result of the Health Ministers' conference, whether the report still is under review,

and whether it is being pursued with the Federal Government from whence much of the initiation for some of the recommendations will have to come? In other words, what has happened to the remaining recommendations of the Jamison report?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Basically the recommendations of the Jamison report were aimed at the Commonwealth Government at the time of the writing of the report. The reason for that obviously was that the Commonwealth Government virtually determined the method of delivery of services through the hospital system in Australia because of its control over the money put into that system. Since then, and arising out of the Jamison report, the Commonwealth has changed the system—imposing a few other pressures as well, I might add—of funding for the hospital system, and the derivation of revenue for that system. To a great extent the States now are on their own in respect of administration of hospitals and the like.

The major thrust of the Jamison report originally was aimed at Commonwealth matters; therefore the States could not act unilaterally in respect of the recommendations. The Health Ministers' conference, of which the Federal Minister is a part, looked at the Jamison report and quite a number of specific items in it. To the best of my knowledge, many of those items still are being considered by the standing committee of the Health Ministers' conference which will report back to the conference. If the thrust of what the member suggests is that now that the Commonwealth has changed the method of Commonwealth-State funding, the States could be acting unilaterally on some of the decisions, I would be inclined to agree with him.