

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 24 October 1984

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

ACTS AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Carr (Minister for Local Government), and read a first time.

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Leave of Absence

On motion by Mr Williams, leave of absence for 21 days granted to Mr Grayden on the ground of urgent public business.

FEDERAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Urgency Motion

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman): Members, I have received the following letter from the member for Floreat—

Dear Mr Speaker,

In accordance with Standing Orders 47 and 48 of the Legislative Assembly, I give notice that at the commencement of the Sitting of the House today, 24 October, I will move "that the House do now adjourn" for the purpose of debating a matter of urgency, namely—

The Opposition expresses its grave concern about the Bill of Rights proposed by the Commonwealth Government and calls on the Government—

- (a) to immediately make public all the details of the Federal Attorney-General's proposition for public comment and judgement, and
- (b) to request the Commonwealth Government in the strongest possible terms to immediately discontinue any endeavour towards introducing a Bill of Rights which in any way can reduce or harm the State's traditional and constitutional sovereign rights.

Mr Speaker, this is a matter of public importance and immediate urgency and

in my view is properly brought forward within the Standing Orders.

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW MENSAROS, M.L.A.

Member for Floreat.

I have given consideration to this matter and have determined, as there are seven members standing, that there will be a debate for up to one hour: that is, up to 30 minutes for debate by the Opposition and up to 30 minutes for debate by the Government. It is up to the people proposing the motion, and the Whips to agree behind the Chair as to the speaking times.

Seven members having risen in their places,

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [2.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Premier of Queensland outlined fairly recently the endeavour of the Federal Government to introduce a Bill of Rights and detailed some of its provisions, some of which could cause enormous harm, not only to decent individuals, but also to the interests of the sovereign States of Australia.

I have already heard some comments from members which indicate that members believe the Queensland Premier is the arch proponent of State rights and they do not take him seriously. A statement was also issued by Senator Peter Durack, a Western Australian, who when he was the Attorney General—and I am not ashamed to state this—was sometimes on the other side of the spectrum from us in the matter of the defence of State rights.

The importance of this matter is underlined by the very fact that with the sole exception of Western Australia, I am sorry to say, all the printed media in the other States featured this statement by the Queensland Premier very prominently. *The West Australian* newspaper featured that statement only on page 62, with a small article which was connected with the Federal Attorney General.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: You people really are having a witch-hunt on the media.

Mr MENSAROS: The Queensland Premier stated that the situation had the capacity to destroy the concept of federation and the sovereign Governments of the States. Senator Durack said it would turn the Federal system on its head, and it would advance the cause of centralism by light years.

In view of those statements I do not think anyone could remain silent, if he thinks the States' rights and position have any importance. It was

further stated that the Commonwealth Bill pretends to ratify an international covenant to create a situation which prompted, some time ago, the High Court of Australia to subjugate the State of Tasmania's decision-making power to that of the Commonwealth Government, simply because it was thought that an international matter was covered in the treaty or in the covenant.

It further appears from the statement that the attempted Bill of Rights leaves out certain articles from the covenant and creates a jurisdiction to enforce these rights which would be conferred to the Federal Court which would have the power to review the legislative, executive and judicial acts by the States and decide whether these actions are according to the Bill of Rights. This of course creates a situation which is quite intolerable, at least to members on this side of the House.

The situation of ratifying international agreements also arose during the Fraser Government's time.

Mr Brian Burke: Have you a copy of the proposed Bill of Rights?

Mr MENSAROS: No, I asked the Premier to table it. That is provided for in the motion.

Mr Brian Burke: If you have not a copy—

Mr MENSAROS: I am quoting the Queensland Premier—

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr MENSAROS: If the Premier had read the letter he would know that we asked the Government to make the proposed Bill of Rights public so that people could comment on it.

During the time of the Fraser Government there were reservations and declarations when any covenant was ratified so that it should suit the interests of the States, but that appears to be not the case presently.

Indeed—and it was further stated, as an example—the covenant provides for the rights of freedom of movement, choice of residence, religious expression, and free speech, etc. and that they should be subject to limitations that can be prescribed by law in the interests of public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals, or the rights and freedoms of others.

According to the information I have, the ratifying Bill of Rights will eliminate these limitations and authorise the Federal Court to decide unilaterally about them.

Apparently, the very same situation occurred in the Federal State of Canada and the practice has

shown how many longstanding provincial laws have been invalidated by a Federal court, without the consent of the Provinces.

A Canadian judge was reported as saying that the sovereignty of the Parliaments of the Provinces—which are equivalent to the States here—as Canadians had known it, was a thing of history.

I have so far only dealt with some of the disadvantages which a Bill of Rights would create for the States. It must be emphasised that it would be tremendously disadvantageous to the individual citizens of Australia as well. I do not think anybody would argue that no other country has so many unlimited freedoms and liberties of individuals as does Australia. That is because of our British tradition. Our freedoms and liberties are not codified. We do not have a law which allows us to walk freely on the street. As soon as somebody tried to prevent us from doing that, however, it would be an infringement on that person's part.

As long as we have those liberties uncoded as the British legal system has them, we will enjoy them. As soon as we codify them we will face the situation which exists in the US. One only has to look at the US to see that liberties have become a matter of litigation and are not enjoyed any more except by a few people who have the enormous amount of time and money needed to prevail in courts over the provisions of the Bill of Rights. Many people who have gone to the US have seen the neighbourly attitude of the people virtually disappear because they do not dare to help each other any more. The simple reason is that to do so might lead to consequences which are written into the codified law, and at some time they might be disadvantaged because that codified law prevails.

That is the reason I did not make any comments on the Equal Opportunity Bill, but I view it in the same light. If one has to codify certain ethics our society has and has always had it will inevitably result in a worse, not a better situation.

My mother and grandmothers never worked outside the family home but they were able to discuss arts, literature, music, poetry or philosophy much more ably than women in the work force today. To top this they were much happier than women are today.

In view of the enormous disadvantages which would result from such a Bill of Rights we are asking the Government to publish the Commonwealth's propositions. If there is nothing wrong with them as the uproar from the Government side might indicate, there is nothing to hide. The Government should publish them and let the public see them and make their comments. If the

State or its people are disadvantaged, then the State has an obligation to protest to the Commonwealth.

RECREATION: DISABLED OLYMPICS

Western Australian Team: Visit to Legislative Assembly

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman): Before I call the next speaker I wish to advise members that on the floor of the House today are members of the Western Australian contingent of the Australian Disabled Olympics Team. I ask members to give them a hearty welcome.

[Applause.]

FEDERAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Urgency Motion

Debate resumed.

MR OLD (Katanning-Roe) [2.35 p.m.]: There seems to be a certain reluctance on the part of the Government to have anything to say, so I am pleased to support the motion.

Mr Davies: There is nothing to answer.

Mr Bryce interjected.

Mr OLD: The Government has plenty to answer for and so does its Commonwealth counterpart.

This is a continuation of the erosion of State rights by legislation, mainly by the Commonwealth. We had the era of the Whitlam Government when, with his worthy lieutenant, now Mr Justice Murphy, the Federal Labor Prime Minister was hell-bent on eroding State rights to such an extent that the States would have become nothing but mendicants and would not have any rights according to the Statutes as we know them today. The Murphy doctrine was oft quoted and is well known. It related to the external power he intended to use, and I might say that later Governments, including possibly one of our own colour, used it to the disadvantage of the States.

Here we see another nail in the coffin of democracy through this disgraceful Bill of Rights as circulated. I understand by that great champion of this sort of grubby deal, Senator Gareth Evans.

Mr Pearce: You are more at home with the League of Rights.

Mr Bryce: You have not seen the Bill but you reckon it is grubby.

Mr OLD: Has the Deputy Premier seen it?

Mr Bryce: No, I have not.

Mr OLD: Then the Deputy Premier has nothing to argue about.

Mr Bryce: You are asserting it is grubby and you have not seen it.

Mr OLD: I referred to the grubby gentleman.

Mr Bryce: You said the document was grubby.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members of Parliament have an obligation not to refer to their counterparts in such a manner.

Mr OLD: My apologies, Mr Speaker, he is not grubby.

Senator Gareth Evans certainly demonstrated his ability to carry on that great Murphy doctrine at the recent Constitutional Convention in Adelaide when most of the motions brought forward by the Federal Government were designed to erode any powers the States have left.

Centralism is obviously the aim of the Hawke Government, as it was of the Whitlam Government. No doubt exists whatever in the minds of most Australians that Hon. Gough Whitlam's ambition was to become the first president of the republic of Australia. This has now been taken over by Hon. Bob Hawke who not only has that ambition, but is clearly demonstrating that it must be done in a hurry while he has a chance of still being in office. The Whitlam regionalisation—

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate is concerned with a Bill of Rights.

Mr OLD: The Bill of Rights and Whitlam's concept are in my opinion leading to the same conclusion. If you do not feel so, Mr Speaker, you are certainly at liberty to tell me.

Mr Brian Burke: I'll say, he is the Speaker.

Mr OLD: Is the Premier in his seat? He should be setting an example to the House and not behaving like a larrikin as usual.

The Whitlam theory of regionalisation was designed to take away any power the States might have and vest it in regions. This fortunately was stamped out by the propitious timing of the defeat of the Whitlam Government. I hoped we would never see that sort of thing again, but today we are faced with it in a far more insidious form as a result of the actions of the Attorney General (Senator Gareth Evans) in bringing forward this disgraceful Bill of Rights.

Sure, I have not seen the Bill, but Senator Evans in his Press release which was publicised in *The West Australian* this morning is very cagey in his defence of the Bill. He certainly does not deny anything that was said by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen in his speech in the Queensland Parliament.

Senator Evans, in his Press release, said that the State Governments were asked to suggest improvements or opposition before Commonwealth officers drew up the Bill. Obviously, the comments which will come from the Labor satellites will certainly be in favour of such a Bill of Rights

because it will go a long way towards bringing their dreams to fruition, a dream which is for a centralised Government. There is nothing that Government members would like to see more than for that to happen.

Senator Evans was very stinging in his remarks regarding Sir Joh's interpretation of one part of the legislation and that was in relation to article 13 of the proposed Australian Bill of Rights which refers to article 23 of the international covenant. It states that the rights of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognised. The Bill of Rights states that the rights of men and women to marry shall be recognised.

The Queensland Premier suggested that all this does is to legalise that which many endeavours have been made in the past to legalise: namely, marriage relationships between lesbians and/or homosexuals. While that has been derided by the Commonwealth Attorney General, we have seen moves towards such legislation in this House. We have seen moves to decriminalise homosexuality. So far, fortunately, those moves have been repulsed by the Opposition and hopefully they will continue to be so repulsed.

However, I find that some of the ideas espoused in this precis of the document are repugnant not only to me, but also to any person in Australia with a decent set of morals.

The proposed Bill will take away from the States their sovereign rights. It will remove from them the right to ban pornographic material—something which we were able, at least, to get this Government to make a small step towards, albeit reluctantly. It will certainly legalise abortion on demand, a concept which I know is opposed by quite a few people on the Government benches. However, they will not cry out against that if it is incorporated in a Bill of Rights brought down by their central Government.

I am afraid that if we continue along the path upon which Australia seems to be travelling, Bob Hawke will have his wish and become the first president of the Australian republic. God help us when that happens because there will be no such things as States and certainly there will be no such things as the sovereign rights of States.

I guess some members have seen a \$1 note which has been circulated recently and which, I think, depicts only too well the ambition of our Prime Minister. His likeness appears in place of the Sovereign's. We see him in his regalia as the first president of the republic of Australia. We see our kangaroo, which I will talk about later, scratching his head in wonderment and we see the

emu with his head buried in the sand. It will be the States which have their heads buried in the sand if we continue along the path that this Government is presently taking.

It should be incumbent upon this Government to table that Bill and allow the people of Western Australia to see the type of action which is being contemplated by a Commonwealth Government which has demonstrated, repeatedly, its absolute contempt for the States and the rights of the individual, and for any decent moral standards in Australia.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [2.45 p.m.]: The Opposition is sparring at shadows and it knows it. The tragic thing is that, given the serious questions which confront this nation at this time across so many facets of the processes of government, this Opposition comes into this Parliament with an urgency motion without the substantive document and without its being able to trace back to the original sources the issue about which it seeks to complain.

I do not think it is very surprising that the member for Floreat, supported presumably by his Leader and the Leader of the Country Party, opposes the concept of a Bill of Rights. They and their predecessors have opposed fundamental political and democratic rights of all sorts in this country for generations. It is, therefore, nothing new to any of us that they should stand in their places today and express a sense of paranoia and opposition to a concept of an Australian Bill of Rights. We take that as read.

Mr Hassell: Do you support an Australian Bill of Rights?

Mr BRYCE: Yes, we do. What is more, we are proud to be Australians. It does not matter where we are, whether we are overseas or interstate, we are proud of the fact that we are Australians.

Mr Mensaros: Before a Bill of Rights?

Mr BRYCE: Before and after a Bill of Rights. In fact, it comes as no surprise to us at all that the Opposition will rely on that tired old warhorse, the specialist in hatred and division from Queensland. It will rely on old Joh as its source of inspiration and interpretation to allow it to come into this place with an urgency motion. Members of the Opposition have not seen the document. They have heard Joh Bjelke-Petersen's interpretation of it and that is enough to spring them into life, sparring at shadows.

Mr Hassell: You have not seen the document either. Yet you said you supported a Bill of Rights.

Mr BRYCE: I said that I supported the concept, as this Government supports the concept, of a Bill of Rights.

Mr Old: Without a referendum?

Mr BRYCE: The mechanisms will be sorted out. That is precisely the problem with which members sitting opposite are having difficulty. This is a normal part of the process of government. The Leader of the Opposition has, once again, forgotten that he and his colleagues lost the last election. There is nothing surprising about this process.

Let us have a look at what has happened. The Commonwealth Attorney General, as all Commonwealth Ministers are inclined to do from time to time, circulated a proposal to all of his State counterparts for an Australian Bill of Rights. He knows that it contains some very contentious material. He has asked his colleagues at the State level for their reactions to the proposals and has asked them to give him feedback. What is most important and fundamental to the whole process—the members opposite know this but they are conveniently forgetting it—is that the Commonwealth Government proposes to table the proposed Bill of Rights and to allow anybody and everybody who is interested in it to provide an input into it. I think it is reasonable to expect one's professional counterparts in the States to provide some reaction to this type of document. I would have thought that the former Minister sitting opposite would have accepted and recognised that it was par for the course for a national Government to seek the reaction of its State counterparts to a very important initiative.

Two members opposite have just spoken and have argued that the States have an important right and responsibility to present views on these sorts of questions. That is exactly what the Commonwealth has sought from its professional State counterparts.

Mr Hassell: Has there been an input from the States?

Mr BRYCE: There has in fact, and the Premier will explain that to the House in a minute.

Mr Peter Jones: How is it that you have not seen the Bill?

Mr BRYCE: The State Attorney General has handled the matter.

Mr Peter Jones: All right, you have never seen it.

Mr BRYCE: I might say that when I receive a request from the Federal Minister for Technology asking me about something that may be fairly all-embracing and which might affect six or seven

departments, I do not always cross government, but I give him the feedback and the response that I can. I do not necessarily go to every one of those departments and ask everyone across the board when I am going to make a response.

Mr Peter Jones: In this issue the Attorney General is speaking for the Government.

Mr BRYCE: The Attorney General has responded to his Federal counterpart. That is a very basic point because the Federal Government is then going to table this document so that everyone in the nation has an opportunity to react. The scaremongers sitting opposite, the people who have been chock-a-block full of hatred for a decade: the people who have sought to put the country person against the metropolitan person, employer against employee, State against State and State against the national Government: the people who have lived politically and have thrived on stirring hatred between States and Governments in this country are now seeking to do precisely that with something which they have never seen and which they are going to see in good time. "Good time" is the appropriate time that the Federal Government decides that it will receive feedback from the State Attorneys General, after which the document will be tabled.

I know that members sitting opposite would like the Commonwealth Government to handle everything that comes into their minds and meets their hearts' desires politically before the next election. It so happens that the Hawke Government will be in power for more than a decade. A long programme of reform is necessary and this is part and parcel of the process.

Mr Hassell: Even you do not believe what you are saying.

Mr BRYCE: I happen to be very comfortable in the knowledge that that is quite true: as long as members opposite and their colleagues in Canberra keep putting up the wimps as representatives of their organisations, people who seek to hark back to the days and the strategies of the 1960s and 1970s, we are guaranteed at least a decade, which is not a bad spell for the beginning of the new era.

This really is part of the normal process of government. I think members opposite really do not do themselves any credit at all to come to this place with a so-called urgency motion—

Mr Old: I am surprised you think that.

Mr BRYCE: —based upon what that old warhorse in Queensland interprets as being the position of hatred and venom that he has aimed at Canberra—the person who has become the absolute archetypal political animal in misrepresent-

tation in this country. The Opposition has used his interpretation to come to this place and say, "We have not seen it, but old Joh says, and, therefore, we are terrified and insist that you table it before the due process of consultation between the Commonwealth Government and the States has transpired as it normally does". That is the whole point. Just hold your horses and do not spar at shadows because, in fact, as some former Ministers opposite would know, this particular Bill will be tabled by the Commonwealth Government to give them ample opportunity to provide their input. If the Opposition chooses to misrepresent it and if it chooses to pervert the interpretation it will have ample opportunity to do so because the Commonwealth has no desire whatsoever to rush it through the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr Hassell: It will not let anyone know what it is up to until after the election.

Mr Mensaros: Tell us one piece of freedom we do not have now, which will be secured through this Bill of Rights.

Mr BRYCE: I am afraid I am verging on the point of becoming delinquent with time and I know members opposite would not want me to use more than my fair share of time.

From the point of view of members on this side of the House it really is disappointing to find someone as professionally experienced as the member for Katanning-Roe hopping on the old band wagon of the spectre of "Whitlam the Terrible" and talking about Hawke, as the man who wants to become the president. Is it not extraordinary indeed that we could have the most amazing dictatorial disciplinarian as a Prime Minister of this country for 8½ years in the form of Malcolm Fraser and the moment there is a change in Government we are being told that the man who has, in fact, introduced into this country for the first time, in the memory of most of us, a spirit of consensus and consultation is about to become the second most terrible prospect for a president of the country, presumably a dictator?

Mr Old: He is probably the worst.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Katanning-Roe might go down very well in the front bar of the Katanning Hotel or in the local deli when he talks about "Whitlam the Terrible" and "Hawke for President" and exchanges his little pieces of funny money. It might give him a great deal of satisfaction and he may cut a great deal of ice in that part of the country; but believe me anyone who has half a brain or half a political intellect would take absolutely no notice of that nonsense.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [2.58 p.m.]: The motion before the

House is important and is urgent as indicated by the mover of it. It seeks to bring before the attention of the House and the public of this State a situation which is very important to the future of the State—whether we are going to have a State Parliament which is sovereign within its areas of responsibility or whether those sovereign powers are going to be finally extinguished and taken over and dominated by the Commonwealth.

Despite all the invective that the Deputy Premier has sought to heap on the head of the Premier of Queensland I support the things he has said about this Bill of Rights. I also say to the Deputy Premier, who suggested that the Opposition had relied only on what the Premier of Queensland said, that we have received considerable information from the shadow Attorney General, Senator Peter Durack, who has studied the matter carefully.

I say in opening that I stand with the Premier of Queensland in one of his opening statements as follows—

The basic principles contained in the Bill of Rights were never in dispute. No one argues against legislation to protect freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, the right to a fair and public trial, the right to life and freedom from slavery. But, such rights are already enshrined in the Constitution and laws of Australia making the Bill unnecessary unless it was for some centralist purpose.

The urgency of this issue is clearly established by these facts. This draft Bill which Senator Gareth Evans tried to brush aside when he was confronted with it publicly for the first time has been in the possession of the States since last March. The Attorneys General have met on the Bill twice and the present draft of the Bill, the draft referred to by the Premier of Queensland and by the shadow Attorney General in Canberra, is a draft resulting from discussions which have taken place and, therefore, is not, as Gareth Evans attempted to represent it, a preliminary draft which has not gone some way down the track.

The real point is this: We have proposed here a Bill to extend massively the power of the Commonwealth and to undermine further the Constitution of this State.

It is acknowledged that this Bill can become law only using the external affairs power; it can become law only if it relies on a power which was never intended to be used for such purposes and which should never be used for such purposes. Its precise form does not matter; it is a Bill which seeks unilaterally to vest in the Commonwealth

the control and determination of all these issues. The Premier acknowledged in this House last night, in answer to a question, that he knew nothing about it. The Deputy Premier has acknowledged today that he has not seen the Bill. We have a Bill which is about the future of this Parliament and its powers and its authorities; it is about the Constitution of this State and the survival of that Constitution and its integrity; yet the Premier and the Deputy Premier have never seen or considered it. Therefore, one assumes that it has not been to Cabinet. The implications for Western Australia have not been considered by the Cabinet. Even if it is correct that the Attorney General of Western Australia has made some submission to Gareth Evans in Canberra it is also correct that the implications of this Bill for the future of Western Australia have not been considered either in Cabinet or in the public arena.

This Bill aims unilaterally to introduce laws relating to the States, including legislative, executive and judicial powers of the States, by the Commonwealth. It is not proposed to hold a referendum; it is proposed that there be a reliance on the external affairs power. We will have the ludicrous situation that the Commonwealth will have constitutional power under the external affairs authority to impose a Bill of Rights on the States; to impose the restrictions and controls on the States; and, it will have the power to exempt the Commonwealth or its agencies and to amend the Bill so that the Commonwealth does not have to comply in some respects. However, the States will not have that power.

It is not as though the Commonwealth proposes taking this fundamental change to the Constitution to a referendum of the people and binding both the Commonwealth and the States. The States only will be bound and not the Commonwealth. It will leave the States in a mendicant position in relation to the great substance of their laws.

Secondly, going to the very substance and heart of the issue, what is the Bill of Rights about but the transfer from the elected Governments of this country to non-elected judicial bodies of massive amounts of legislative power?

The following example cited by Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland is one about which we should all be concerned. He said—

I turn now to Article 24 of the Australian Bill of Rights. It states:—

"Any person charged with a criminal offence shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law".

This appears on the surface to be a legitimate civil right. However, it has been used in Canada to strike down a law providing that where a person is proved beyond reasonable doubt to have been in possession of an illegal narcotic or drug, he shall be presumed to have been in possession of it for the purpose of trafficking unless he establishes, on the balance of probabilities, that such was not his purpose.

In other words, the Canadian Charter is being used to protect drug traffickers.

We have heard the Premier saying how concerned the Government is about drug use and drug trafficking. We saw this Government when in Opposition support the Misuse of Drugs Act introduced in this Parliament which contained similar provisions. Those provisions will be struck down by the Bill of Rights, and all sorts of other provisions in our criminal and quasi-criminal law will be struck down, not by a determination of this elected Parliament representing the people of this State, but by the non-elected judiciary appointed in Canberra. The simple question is: Are the State Government and the Deputy Premier aware of the problem? Are they genuinely concerned? The Deputy Premier says that he supports the Bill of Rights unilaterally introduced by Canberra without referendum. Can the Premier guarantee to the State that there will be a referendum to give the people of Australia a chance to decide. Or, will the Premier go down the path that so many Labor Governments have followed; that is, he is not prepared to stand up to Canberra and insist on protecting the State's rights? Much as we disagree with the people who sit on the other side of the House at the moment, much as we will challenge their policies, debate them, and on occasions reject their proposals in this Parliament, nevertheless we stand by the principle that as the elected Government it, and not the Government in Canberra, is entitled to govern this State and have the decisions of this Parliament determine the outcome of issues.

This Bill of Rights proposal is a prime example of the failure of this Government to act or to have the matter considered by Cabinet. The Premier and the Deputy Premier, with no knowledge of the Bill, have tried to castigate the Opposition. However, they have had the Bill since March but it has not been considered by Cabinet. No-one seems to know anything about the Bill. What kind of representation of the interests of Western Australians is that? What kind of activity is it when we have this secret coalition of Labor Governments plotting to break down and finally destroy the Federal

nature of Australia's Constitution and to leave us with total power vested in Canberra?

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balgownie—Premier) [3.07 p.m.]: It is difficult to accept the credibility of the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, particularly as they relate to his new-found enchantment with the proposition for a referendum attaching to this piece of legislation proposed by the Commonwealth Government. It was only last evening that the Opposition was arguing so strongly that there should not be a referendum to allow people to decide as to the fairness or otherwise of proposals to change the electoral laws of this State.

Mr Hassell interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: With due respect, I did not bother to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking; he was doing a fine job by himself.

Last night a referendum was considered unnecessary; today a referendum becomes a holy grail that we shall seek out without exception.

I refer to some of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition: He brands himself as something less than honest when he talks about urgency and acknowledges the importance of the action taken by the Premier of Queensland one sentence before he refers to the House the fact that this Bill was in the hands of the Queensland Government in March of this year. What is the sudden urgency that caused the Premier of Queensland to publicly state his opposition in respect of a draft Bill that has not been finalised, that has yet to come before the Federal Parliament, that has yet to pass through the period of debate that the Commonwealth has promised will attach to this legislation, that suddenly emerges today and was not present last March? I will tell members: It is the fact that there is a Federal election on 1 December. That Federal election has caused the Premier of Queensland to break the confidentiality of a piece of legislation that was passed to him and to the other States by the Commonwealth Government. That is the sole reason for the present furore attaching to this particular matter. Even worse than that, the Leader of the Opposition attempts to maintain that because we have not formed an attitude on a piece of legislation, somehow or other we are remiss in discharging or failing to discharge our obligations as the elected Government of this State.

The truth is that during the normal course of events the Attorney General will recommend to Cabinet his views in respect of this legislation. Cabinet will make a decision about the legislation,

and then we will convey our views to the Federal Government.

If we are to take at face value the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, we are to take at face value the arguments of a man who has not even seen the legislation. We are not talking about final legislation; this man has not even seen a draft.

Mr Hassell: Nor have you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Of course I have not seen a draft, but I am not criticising something I have not seen, and that is the difference—

Mr Hassell: You have had it since March.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —between the Opposition and the Government on this matter. The Opposition is prepared to move a motion on the basis of its criticism of a draft it has not seen. Where is the credibility attaching to that position in a political party?

Mr Hassell: You have not given us a copy of the draft.

Several members interjected.

Mr Hassell: Others have seen the draft and told us what is in it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This is a critical motion based on a draft Bill, not a final proposal, which the Opposition has not even seen. Not having seen the legislation, they refer to clauses which they have not seen; the Opposition sets up its own arguments on the basis of things unseen and knocks them over.

Mr Hassell: Are you saying the Premier of Queensland told lies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I would not be surprised at what the Premier of Queensland has done, because I can remember his pumping hundreds and thousands of dollars into a scheme to turn water into fuel to drive a car. The Premier of Queensland supported Milan Brych who now languishes in a Californian gaol, so I suggest the Opposition should not draw credibility from the Premier of Queensland.

Worse than that, assuming, what the Premier of Queensland has had to say is correct, this is a draft Bill subject to an extensive period of consultation, negotiation and public inspection. It is a Bill which will go before the Federal Parliament following that process, and once again it will be subject to the same sort of procedure. What stands beside the name of the Leader of the Opposition in particular is the trenchant criticism he makes of something he has not seen.

Mr Burkett: He criticises everything; that is why he got the name "Whingeing Willie".

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If we are to believe the Opposition, we would much sooner have a statement from the Opposition that it has seen the legislation it is criticising; that it has some evidence to support the contentions it makes about the contents of the Bill.

Mr Hassell: Any Federal Bill of Rights—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Whether a draft Bill—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition, in his rush to judgment, once again has failed to cover his back and he has not even had sent to him a copy of the Bill by the Premier of Queensland. Had he done that, we might be tempted to believe some of the things he had to say: to attribute the credibility he would like to have attributed to the arguments he mounts. But I ask members on this side of the House, how can we believe an argument mounted by three speakers from the Opposition, each of whom said in turn, "I have not seen the Bill"?

Mr Hassell: The Premier has not seen the Bill and he has had it since last March.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have not moved a motion condemning the Bill.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition moved the motion. It has sought to move the motion because it failed to understand that one of the things—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It failed to understand that one of its failures in Government was to prevent people on this side of the House from speaking. It would have been a lot easier with the sort of arguments raised had we not had the right to reply, but we have the right to reply, I intend to exercise it, and I intend to underline time and time again the foolishness of a man who would stand up and say, "I object to all these things which are in this Bill I have not seen".

Mr Hassell: I said I objected to having a Bill which—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition has not seen the Bill, so how does he know?

Several members interjected.

Mr Hassell: You know damned well it overrides the States; it has to override the States; it would not exist if it did not override the States.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It was all right for the Leader of the Opposition to go on uninterrupted, but now he is getting very tetchy.

Mr Hassell: Look who is talking. You are talking absolute nonsense, telling people they are foolish if they have a different point of view from yours.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is very difficult to attach any credibility to the Leader of the Opposition's argument about a draft Bill which he has not seen.

Mr Hassell: We know what is in the Bill; we have had it from the Premier of Queensland.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We have it from that paragon of objectivity in the defence of a Federal election that this Bill is a bad Bill.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I shall quote to members what the Attorney General had to say. I was not going to bother because that is as politically partisan as the strength which the Leader of the Opposition draws from the Premier of Queensland's argument; but this is what the Attorney-General had to say—

The Queensland Premier's statement in the Queensland Parliament today condemning the Government's proposal for an Australian Bill of Rights is a farrago of shameless nonsense.

That is what he had to say, but what I said—

Mr Hassell: He avoided the issue: he did not deny what had been said.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not sure how the phrase "farrago of shameless nonsense" concerning the statement of the Queensland Premier can be taken, but I would have thought that was a fairly frontal attack on the statement made by the Premier of Queensland. As I say, I do not draw strength from the Attorney General's statement, because it is a politically partisan statement in the context of a Federal election. We have a Leader of the Opposition here who wants to draw strength from statements by the Queensland Premier, who has had the Bill since March, according to the Leader of the Opposition—

Several members interjected.

Mr Hassell: A factual statement.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —but until now, with the Federal election—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—knowing that the draft has to go through an exhaustive consultation and discussion period—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—why has the Premier of Queensland not had something to say previously?

Mr Peter Jones: Why did the Labor leader in Queensland not say something?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I may be fairly inexperienced in political problems, but what has happened is that in Canberra somebody has said, "We will get Sir Johannes Bjelke-Petersen to look at this confidential document. Forget about the dealings between the Commonwealth and the States; we will get everybody around the country to move a motion in his Parliament to create an election issue". The problem is that they forgot to send the Leader of the Opposition here his copy, so he has been put into the position of standing up and condemning something he has not seen.

Mr Hassell: You are supporting something you have not seen.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition says, "This Bill will say this, that and something else, and when I see it I will have more to say".

Mr Hassell: You have been supporting something you have not seen.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If we are to have an urgency motion on a draft Bill which the Leader of the Opposition has not seen, what will happen when he has a copy? We will have a war! There will be a war when he gets a copy.

Mr Hassell: Why don't you tell the public if you insist on having a referendum?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition does not need to become so angry. War is the only recourse left.

The last point I wish to deal with is the sanctimonious accommodation of the Leader of the Opposition when he referred to the right of this side of the House to govern. He said that while we may have our differences and while it is true that we may take exception to Bills and on occasions we will vote against the legislation put forward from the other side—the people I think he said—we still acknowledge their right to govern. I think the man has forgotten about the Legislative Council because last night without our new found love of referendums we were intent on embedding the same power in the same hands that have held it for 91 years and will do so for the next 91 years if the situation is unchanged. Do not be misled by the humbug of the Leader of the Opposition! The Op-

position has not accepted that it is in Opposition. The Opposition refuses to accept that we were elected as the Government on 19 February 1983 and the Opposition refuses to contemplate that at the next election it is likely that we will be returned.

Let me conclude by saying that the Bill of Rights in draft form as communicated to the States is an early draft which is to be the subject of the most exhaustive and detailed discussion, negotiation, and consultation between the States.

Mr MacKinnon: The Premier of Western Australia did not even know it existed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: When finally that Bill of Rights is introduced into the Federal Parliament it will then be laid on the Table for a period sufficient to allow the Opposition to take exception to it and to allow this Government to take further exception if we have taken previous exception to it and to allow the public to study and digest it. That seems to me to be an eminently fair process through which this Bill should pass. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition once again saw fit to stand upon shaky ground and to move an urgency motion based on a Bill that he has not seen. I think that is another giant stride towards the destruction of this man's credibility.

Mr Hassell: You have not seen the Bill. You have had it for six months. Why don't you release it to the public of the State?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition supports the destruction of the Constitution with a weapon he has not seen. It may be a marsh-mallow!

Let me conclude by saying as quietly and as reasonably as I can that I do believe that a strong Opposition is an essential part of good government.

Mr Hassell: You are not going to start your pompous stuff again!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: A strong Opposition is an essential contributor to good government, but an Opposition that moves urgency motions on the basis of Bills that it has not seen is neither strong nor credible. I am very much afraid that by the look on the faces of those who sit behind the Leader of the Opposition the lack of credibility has filtered through to those nether reaches, too.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ACTS AMENDMENT (CONSUMER AFFAIRS) BILL

Second Reading

MR CARR (Geraldton—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) [3.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill principally gives statutory recognition to the establishment of the Department of Consumer Affairs which was created following the election of the Labor Government in 1983.

The Bill seeks to amend the Consumer Affairs Act by replacing reference to the Bureau of Consumer Affairs by a reference instead to the department, and by giving to the department the additional and proper functions of assisting the Minister in the administration of the Consumer Affairs Act and other legislation for which the Minister for Consumer Affairs is responsible. This is in addition to the existing functions carried out by the Bureau of Consumer Affairs and now transferred to the department.

In addition, it is proposed to strengthen the penalty provision contained in section 21 of the Consumer Affairs Act by altering the level of the penalty from \$200 to \$1 000.

Section 21 creates an offence for failing to respond to a request made by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs or his authorised officers. The reports of the Commissioner indicate that formal requests for information or for answers to questions are infrequently used and then only as a last effort in the course of attempted resolution of consumer complaints.

The section currently imposes a penalty of \$200. Such a level is inappropriate, recognising that the level of penalty was set many years ago and its deterrent effect has now been whittled away by inflation. A penalty of \$1 000 is considered more appropriate in today's context.

The Bill also provides for the permanent head of the department, as well as the Minister for Consumer Affairs to have authority to appoint authorised officers under the Consumer Affairs Act, the Hire-Purchase Act, the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, the Petroleum Products Pricing Act and the Petroleum Retailers Rights and Liabilities Act.

In addition, section 48 of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act is amended to permit the delegation by the commissioner to an authorised officer of the power to waive warranty entitlements. These provisions will assist in facilitating the administration of the respective Acts.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Trethowan.

BAIL AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Grill (Minister for Transport), and returned to the Council with an amendment.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT BILL

Report

Report of the Committee adopted

Third Reading

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balgua—Premier) [3.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [3.29 p.m.]: I take the opportunity on the third reading of this Bill—bearing in mind the Parliament has some 30 minutes left of this debate—to make some final points and comments. Let me say from the outset that this is the final stage of this Bill through this House and I want to clearly indicate again to the Parliament that this is controversial legislation. It is a bad Bill. It is a Bill that has been conceived in confusion. The Bill was the result of an ALP Conference in 1982. The people of Western Australia are now being subjected to political interference in the proper management of land in Western Australia.

During the Committee stage of this Bill the confusion that reigned on the Government's side was interesting, and it was evident that the Premier did not know and did not understand the Bill.

All I can say is that the Bill was the subject of poor drafting. This is indicated by the number of amendments made to the Bill, and the number of amendments put forward by the Opposition that were accepted by the Government. Suffice for me to say that had the Opposition chosen to propose other amendments, many others would have been put forward and accepted. That indicates the very poor way in which the Government actually put the Bill forward, and the very poor manner in which the Bill was handled within the Parliament and outside it.

This legislation highlights the deficiencies of the Government. It identifies properly the concern we have about when political advisers take over the role of Government and attempt to run Government affairs. I will have more to say about that later in my remarks.

I make it very clear that while this Bill was subjected to a time management motion, it was done in such a set of circumstances that the Premier, at the conclusion of one part of the Committee stage, indicated to me, that the Government would give one further hour to complete the Committee stage. I indicated to the Premier that really that would not be enough.

Mr Brian Burke: You agreed to the time management motion.

Mr BLAIKIE: I have more to say about that. I will put the record straight.

Mr Brian Burke: Put it straight now.

Mr Williams: Do it in your own time.

Mr Brian Burke: Who are you going to listen to—him or me?

Mr BLAIKIE: The Leader of the House indicated that we could have two hours of debate at the Committee stage, and one hour of debate at the third reading stage. I indicated to him that that was not good enough, so the Leader of the House said, "Well, you can either agree to two hours, or have one hour".

That was the sort of co-operation that the Opposition faced. What subsequently happened was that had I been prepared to agree to three hours, I could have had it, but if I was not prepared to agree to three hours, the Government would enforce two hours for the Committee stage.

Mr Brian Burke: That is not true.

Mr BLAIKIE: I assure the Premier that it is true.

Mr Brian Burke: I am just telling you it is not true!

Mr BLAIKIE: So much for the Government's time management programme.

The Government has shown little regard for the Opposition, and scant regard for the Parliament. This legislation is controversial, and it needs to be understood properly. Numbers of areas should have been clarified.

With regard to the comment about when Sir Charles Court was here, I would like the member who made the interjection to think of the number of occasions on which time management motions were imposed on the Parliament then.

Mr Pearce: He used to keep us sitting here until 5.00 a.m. That is the difference.

Mr BLAIKIE: But without time management motions; and that is the difference.

Several members interjected.

Mr BLAIKIE: This is controversial legislation. It is of great concern, and it will change the struc-

ture of land management in Western Australia. There is a need for the Parliament to understand fully all of the clauses in the legislation.

Mr Brian Burke: We would have had to leave it with you for five years.

Mr BLAIKIE: If that were necessary so that it was properly understood, so be it.

Mr Brian Burke: We are not going to meet the lowest common denominator, surely!

Mr BLAIKIE: First of all, there was not enough time to consider all of the clauses contained in the Bill. Of approximately 150 clauses, the Committee considered only about 55, so 100 clauses were still to be considered. They did not receive proper consideration by the Parliament so that members did not have an understanding of what the Government was proposing.

Clauses 99 and 100 relate to produce being taken from a national park not to be used for any commercial purpose. That could well mean that roads could not be built in national parks using gravel and sand from park areas. That is only one instance of a clause on which an explanation was not given.

Another area with radical or dramatic changes relates to penalties. The monetary and gaol sentence penalties have doubled or trebled in certain instances. However, none of those clauses was debated or explained, because the Government imposed a time management motion at the Committee stage and refused the Parliament the right to make a determination on those matters.

Another matter relates to fire controls. The clause relating to fire controls was taken out of the Forests Act; and as far as I am aware, the relevant section has been in the Act for some 40 years. When one is considering new legislation, the opportunity should have been taken to decide whether those controls should be updated, upgraded, or rejected. However, that opportunity was not given. The same could be said of the provisions relating to firefighters. Once again, this is a direct lift from the Forests Act. Under that Act, any person within eight kilometres of a fire could be summoned to assist at the fire by a forestry officer in the course of fighting the fire. That may well have been ideal legislation in the 1950s, but it could pose problems for the 1980s. However, that is another matter that was not considered.

The Government has given no undertaking as to how the new legislation will work, and how the new department will work. It has not said how national parks and the wildlife service will be improved. No detailed information has been given by the Premier or the Government on how savings

will be achieved, yet the Government expects the Parliament to rubber-stamp its decisions. The Parliament has been denied the right to question the Government on its proposals, because the Government embarked on a time management programme to ensure that the debate was cut short.

Judging by the way the Premier handled the Bill during the Committee stage, I am fairly certain that he was pleased to be rid of the legislation because he did not understand it. The Premier tried to grasp the legislation, but in fact it was the brainchild of his political adviser, who is the person who has been in the bush giving explanations, and not the Premier. The Government will rue the day that political advisers took over the running of this country, because the Government, through its advisers, has made a mess with this legislation. I will have more to say about that later.

Let me now deal with the genesis of the legislation. Once again, points raised during the second reading debate and the Committee stage were never answered by the Government. A task force was commissioned by the Government to bring down a report on land management, but the task force was politically based and politically directed. It could not do anything but come out with the report at the behest and direction of the Government. It had no other way to move. However, that is the report that was the genesis of this conservation and land management legislation—the legislation that will bring about a most significant and dramatic change in land management in the history of this State. That is how this Bill was born.

In its endeavour to give credence to the task force and people appointed to it, the Government claimed that its report was the best ever produced on this matter in Western Australia. To support that comment, I refer to the Minister's second reading speech where, at page 856 of *Hansard*, he said—

The Government established a task force to carry out a comprehensive review of land resource management. The task force produced its interim report in October last year and its final report in February this year.

This was the most comprehensive review of land resource management ever undertaken in the history of the State and involved extensive consultation with community groups, industry, local authorities, and Government agencies.

The Opposition has constantly rejected the claim that the review of land management in Western Australia carried out by the task force was the most comprehensive ever undertaken in this State.

As has been indicated already, the task force met in May. It brought down an interim report of 98 pages and that was circulated to the public of Western Australia in November. Finally in January—not February—its final report was delivered to the Government.

I ask members to look at these two reports which, according to the Government, represent the most extensive inquiry ever carried out into land management in Western Australia. I ask members to compare those reports with the report which resulted from the investigations carried out in the conservation System 6 study. Members should compare the reports of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee and the task force on land resource management in Western Australia. The sheer volume of the System 6 report must impress members. The study extended over a period from 1972 to 1983. The people on the Conservation Through Reserves Committee were impressive and the committee structure was devoid of political appointees or influence.

Mr Brian Burke: And they recommended the reservation of the Shannon.

Mr BLAIKIE: The members of the committee included Dr Ride, Director of the WA Museum; J. F. Morgan, the Surveyor General of Western Australia; Dr Balme, a reader in geology at the University of WA; and Professor Appleyard. They produced a series of recommendations which were considered by a technical review committee which consisted of people such as Professor Appleyard; Dr Burbidge of the Fauna Research Branch of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife; A. S. George of the WA Herbarium; B. W. Logan, a reader in geology at the University of Western Australia; and J. H. Lord, Director of the Geological Surveys Branch of the Mines Department.

By the time this matter was considered by the technical review committee the public of Western Australia had been asked for and involved with all submissions. Indeed, throughout the inquiries of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee the public were involved. That was one of the highlights of the work of that committee. However, that has not been the case in respect of the task force, which has much to answer for. Notwithstanding all the representations and comments which have been made about the interim and final reports of the task force, no further time was given to the people and organisations throughout the State who appealed to it to enable them to consider the final report. Various organisations asked the task force and the Government to ensure that the final report was treated as an interim report only so that more time was given to consider it and to enable more people to be involved in

this mammoth proposal. However, the Government ignored all the comments and requests made to it.

I ask members to look at the work carried out by the task force on land resource management and the so-called in-depth investigations in which it was involved. It is sheer hypocrisy for the Government to say the work of the task force represents the most comprehensive inquiry into this matter in Western Australia.

Members should look at the work carried out by the Conservation Through Reserves Committee. I have all the documents here as all can see and clearly they indicate the Government is attempting to dupe the people by making false statements. The Government's statements are intended to be misleading and they are certainly not factual.

As a result of the work of the task force we now have this bad legislation before the House. The Government has claimed constantly that the only opposition to the Bill has come from the South West Forest Defence Foundation. The Premier claimed that in his second reading speech, in Committee, and also in a radio interview in the south-west. He asked, "Where are these other organisations which are opposed to the legislation?" Other organisations are opposed to it and I am surprised the Premier did not refer to them. It is possible that opposition of any nature was effectively attempted to be suppressed.

I shall mention three or four of the organisations which are opposed to the Bill. The Tree Society is opposed to it, and I would not regard that organisation as being radical or left wing. In its report of September 1984 it said, in part—

We would greatly prefer to see the amalgamation of the NPA and Wildlife and other similar bodies, that could be charged with managing all land resources (apart from productive State Forests) for recreational, scientific and nature conservation purposes.

Mr Brian Burke: Do you support that?

Mr BLAIKIE: A number of other comments were made in that report and reference was made to a meeting which was held with the Conservation Council of WA (Inc.). At that special general meeting to discuss the new department, the Conservation Council said that anything was better than the present state of affairs as far as national parks were concerned.

The Conservation Council comprises a group of environmentalists who are interested in conservation. However, I do not believe that organisation speaks for all conservation and environmental movements.

The Premier is welcome to examine this report. No doubt he has read it already and certainly his advisers have read it *ad infinitum*.

The final comment of the Tree Society was as follows—

It would thus appear that anything would be better, but we would rather see a different approach that is more likely to succeed, than settle for a short term gain and have things deteriorate in the long run.

That society has indicated it is not prepared to settle for a short-term gain while the position deteriorates in the long term. It would far prefer a different approach to be adopted.

We were advised that the Premier had information from the Australian Conservation Council. I would be surprised if, with his media machine, that information was not passed on to him. That body sent a telex to the Leader of the Opposition which said, in part—

We urge you to oppose proposal in Parliament to allow for greater public discussion.

It also said—

... conservation and land management in WA will be more efficient in economic terms than a separate national parks and wild life service and a forests commission.

That is another organisation which is not pleased with the Bill, yet the Premier had the gall to tell Parliament that no organisations oppose the measure. He says, "Name them; who are they; where are they?" I said at the time that the Premier had been improperly advised, or at least I hoped that that was the case.

Mr Brian Burke: You said that the Manjimup Shire Council was one of them.

Mr BLAIKIE: I will come to the Manjimup Shire; the Premier should not go away; he will be interested in what I have got to say.

Mr Brian Burke: It will be the first thing you have said today that will be of interest to me.

Mr BLAIKIE: I refer now to the last two paragraphs of a letter dated 25 September 1984 and written by the Western Australian National Parks and Reserves Association—

WANPARA urges that the Conservation and Land Management Bill be opposed outright, and that the State Government be encouraged to establish a National Park and Wildlife Service, as has been done in most other States and at the National level.

The association referred also in that letter to an amalgamation that had been taking place in Victoria and it indicated that the process of fragmentation was proving to be less efficient than the work done by a consolidated department. Yet the Premier claims that there has been no opposition to the Government's legislation.

The Conservation Council wrote to the Premier and to all members of the Opposition time and time again while the legislation was being drafted, and in January 1984 it noted—

Final report of Task Force released. Despite wave of opposition to the initial proposals, they were essentially retained.

It was referring to the interim report. The council went on to detail the letters that had been sent on 18 April and 6 June of 1984, and I quote as follows—

As a result of discussion of the issue by Branches, the Premier's advisor on forestry and the environment re-opens discussions with the Conservation Council.

On 19 June it detailed a list of safeguards it requested of the Government in its discussions with the Premier's adviser. Between 19 June and 5 July a further series of discussions took place and then on 11 July it said—

Final date for receipt of communications from the Premier passes without the Conservation Council's concerns being satisfied. Council therefore recommences its efforts to inform the ALP of the conservation viewpoint on this question, in the hope that the Government's decision will undergo a full review at the September State Conference.

That is the State Conference of the ALP.

The Conservation Council subsequently said that it did not oppose the legislation, but it did not say that it supported it. I believe the Conservation Council will have a lot to answer for to its affiliate members, because it is far too involved in the realms of politics rather than in the realms of conservation and environment for which it was structured.

The Premier wrote a letter to the Shire of Manjimup, and I quote as follows—

Please thank your Council for the generous support as expressed for the establishment of one Government department to be responsible for Crown land within the shire.

Mr Peter Jones: That is a fatuous comment.

Mr BLAICKIE: Yes it is, because in a letter from the shire to the Premier it is stated on four separate occasions that the shire opposed the legislation, that it did not support the legislation and

that it did not agree with the legislation as it was structured. Yet the Premier had the gall to write back to the shire and say, "Thank you for your support". What a lot of rubbish and what a further indication it is of the Government's not being factual.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with the resolution passed on 8 November, I indicate that I was given 30 minutes within which time I must put the question, "That the Bill be now read a third time". While I am telling the member this I have had the clock stopped because I want him to know that I will have to put the question prior to his having had a full 30 minutes in which to make his remarks, because I want the third reading completed by the end of that 30 minutes. If the member has something of importance to say he has about one minute in which to do so.

Mr BLAICKIE: A number of matters in the Premier's letter to the Shire of Manjimup are incorrect and improperly based.

The Bill should be rejected. The Government has put forward no cause or proof in this debate to show that land management will be improved by having this central control. The Government gave no reasons for destroying the Forests Department. It gave no factual or positive reasons to show that national parks and wildlife areas will be improved or that a Lands and Forests Commission should be established in WA, bearing in mind that a similar structure has been dismantled elsewhere within Australia.

Today I received a letter from the former Conservator of Forests and I ask that it be tabled.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The letter will be tabled for the remainder of this day's sitting.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 23

Mr Bateman	Mr Hodge
Mrs Beggs	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr Pearce
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Read
Mr Brian Burke	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Burkett	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr Troy
Mr Davies	Mrs Watkins
Mr Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Grill	Mr Gordon Hill
Mrs Henderson	

(Teller)

Noes 15

Mr Blaikie	Mr Mensaros
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr Stephens
Mr Court	Mr Trethowan
Mr Cowan	Mr Tubby
Mr Coyne	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr McNee	

(Teller)

Ayes	Pairs	Noes
Mr Tonkin	Mr Thompson	
Mr Bertram	Mr Grayden	
Mr Parker	Mr Laurance	
Mr McIver	Mr Crane	
Mr Tom Jones	Mr Peter Jones	
Mr Bridge	Mr Hassell	

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ACTS AMENDMENT (CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 21 August.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [4.00 p.m.]: This Bill perpetrates the Government's mismanagement of land in this State. We totally and completely reject the legislation.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	Noes
Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mrs Beggs	Mr Tom Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr Pearce
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Read
Mr Brian Burke	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Carr	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Troy
Mr Evans	Mrs Watkins
Mr Grill	Mr Wilson
Mrs Henderson	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hodge	
Mr Blaikie	Mr Mensaros
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr Stephens
Mr Court	Mr Trethowan
Mr Cowan	Mr Tubby
Mr Coyne	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr McNee	

(Teller)

(Teller)

Ayes	Pairs	Noes
Mr Tonkin	Mr Thompson	
Mr Bertram	Mr Grayden	
Mr Parker	Mr Laurance	
Mr McIver	Mr Crane	
Mr Burkett	Mr Peter Jones	
Mr Bridge	Mr Hassell	

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mrs Henderson) in the Chair: Mr Brian Burke (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 24 put and passed.

New clauses 18 and 19—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I move—

Page 5—Insert after clause 17 the following new clauses to stand as clauses 18 and 19—

Section 31A inserted

18. After section 31 of the principal Act, the following section is inserted—

Restriction on abolition of national parks

31A. Land that, after the commencement of the Acts Amendment (Conservation and Land Management) Act 1984, is reserved under section 29 for the purpose of a national park shall, by force of this section, remain a national park until, by an Act in which the land is specified, it is otherwise enacted.

Section 37 amended.

19. Section 37 of the principal Act is amended by deleting "section thirty-one" and substituting the following—

" sections 31 and 31A "

Mr Blaikie: Would you explain why you are doing it?

Mr Williams: He doesn't know!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This amendment is consequential upon our amendment in the main Bill and it refers to national parks of "A"-class status. I have been right through that. If the member for Vasse wants to go through it again and repeat the things that he said at that time, I suppose we could do so, but all of those arguments that go to the preservation of areas that set themselves aside as being of supreme natural attraction are covered by these new clauses.

I do not really think there is much point in going through all of those arguments again. I heard what the member had to say before and I think he covered his ground fairly well. If he wants to argue a little bit more, I suppose we could do so.

New clauses put and passed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mrs Henderson): As a procedural matter, I in fact made a mistake when I put the first 24 clauses. I should have moved clauses 1 to 17 before we took the new clauses. We have now passed the new clauses moved by the Premier and now I shall put clause 18.

Point of Order

Mr CLARKO: I may be well out of date now, but I understood that in the old days we used to insert new clauses after the clauses in the Bill had been dealt with. I understood it to be the standard practice to put them in in the way you did. I regret that you have suggested to me that you are wrong.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was also under that impression but I have been corrected. That is

why I am now doing it the way I am informed is the correct way to do it. I refer the member to Standing Order No. 272.

Mr Barnett: You live in the past all the time.

Mr Clarko: I thought that was the way you did it too.

Committee Resumed

Clauses 18 to 24 put and passed.

New part VII and clause 25—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I move—

Page 8—Add after clause 24 the following part to stand as part VII—

PART VII—PUBLIC WORKS ACT 1902

Section 2 amended.
Reprinted as amended, approved 13 June 1978; of "Crown land", by inserting after amended by "Land Act, 1933" the following—
Act No. 67 of 1979.

" or any national park referred to in section 6(3)(b) of the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 "

New part and clause put and passed.

Title—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I move—

Page 1—Delete the words "and the Fisheries Act 1905" and substitute the passage "the Fisheries Act 1905, and the Public Works Act 1902".

Mr Blaikie: Will you explain this?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not want to be rude to the member, but we have just passed an amendment that added a new part to the Bill that refers to the Public Works Act 1902. Having passed that new part of the Bill, we are now adding to the long title the title of the Act that we have included: that is, the Public Works Act 1902. Had we not passed the new part to include this Bill, we would not have had to amend the title.

Mr Blaikie: I am ensuring that there is a record of it, and that is fair enough.

Amendment put and passed.

Title, as amended, put and passed.

Bill reported, with amendments, and an amendment to the title.

ACTS AMENDMENT (INSOLVENT ESTATES) BILL

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr I. F. Taylor) in the Chair; Mr Grill (Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Mr GRILL: Yesterday evening the member for Floreat asked a question in relation to the operation of this Bill. That question had been put in another place and not answered. He asked by what procedure this particular Bill extinguished the Crown's priority in relation to debt in an insolvent estate.

I was not able to answer the member last night, but he surmised the way in which the Crown priority was extinguished, and he was correct: By adopting the Bankruptcy Act, which does not contain within it any priority to the Crown, and indicates that the Crown, in respect of the Commonwealth and the State, is bound by that Act and the normal common law position which would have given the Crown priority is extinguished. The Crown has priority under common law by virtue of its Crown prerogative. The member for Floreat was correct in what he surmised.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 11 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Grill (Minister for Transport), and passed.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from 23 October.

MR OLD (Katanning-Roc) [4.18 p.m.]: The Budget which was presented by the Treasurer some weeks ago was, as he said, a balanced Budget. It is balanced inasmuch as the expenditure is designed to coincide with the revenue. Certainly, it is not balanced in other ways, and I refer of course to the allocation to agriculture and the Agriculture Protection Board.

I find it a little disturbing that the amount of money allocated to agriculture and the APB this year is not what we expected. The agriculture vote, plus the APB vote has improved 8.8 per cent, which is not very much higher than the rate of inflation.

I know that it will be claimed that inflation is running at about six per cent, or somewhere thereabouts. The last figure I saw was 5.6 per cent.

which was forecast for this year. That is a false figure, because there is no provision in the CPI index today for Medicare.

I have not yet found out what justification there is for excluding Medicare from the CPI. How the Government can differentiate between contributions for health insurance which were taken into the CPI in the past and an income tax levy for contribution to Medicare, is something which is beyond my comprehension. Perhaps one of the better economists on the Government side can explain to me the theory on which this concept is based.

Mr Mensaros: To please the Government.

Mr OLD: I think that is probably right. It certainly does not please the constituents.

Mr Clarko: It means you cannot use it as a statistic to compare with past inflation rates.

Mr OLD: I guess that is right. I am really more interested in the amount of money allocated to agriculture.

In 1983-84 the amount allocated represented a 10.2 per cent rise on the previous year. This year the increase is 8.8 per cent. In the final year of the O'Connor Government the increase on the previous year was 18.5 per cent. I was hopeful we would be on the way to getting a better allocation of revenue to the agriculture industry but it is obviously not happening.

The APB vote is up by 6.2 per cent, a mere 2.1 per cent rise on last year, and I do not care what set of figures is used for the CPI, that item certainly does not match the inflation rate. The 9.2 per cent rise in the agriculture vote, excluding the APB vote, was good in some areas—one was land and soil conservation—but it was not much good in others such as marketing and economics which were up 7.9 per cent, entomology up 8.3 per cent and total divisional research and services up 5.8 per cent. Although the agriculture vote was up 9.2 per cent—it is not quite so good if APB is included—and the figure was \$4.64 million, it appears from the Estimates that \$1.64 million of that rise was due to an increase in contributions from the Commonwealth and industry.

I take note of the fact that after last year's criticism of the method of accounting—and I make no apology for the fact that we all use the same method which is designed to confuse—the Government this year has shown clearly the amount of money being contributed by the Commonwealth under various trust funds and grants. I commend the Government for that although one of the more senior Ministers still wanted it disguised this year. Unfortunately for him the

Treasurer said he had had enough of that type of accounting, and I am grateful that has been done.

The rise in contributions from the Commonwealth and industry from \$4.5 million to \$6.41 million is mentioned on page 113 so we get a fair idea of the contribution industry is making to its own revenue section in the Budget. That is fair enough because it has always been an established practice that the industry generally—and agriculture is not the only industry—does come to arrangements with the Government to make a contribution to various programmes, and Governments invariably agree to some extent to match those funds. It has done a lot to foster research in the agriculture industry and I am not at all critical of the fact that industry is called upon to contribute: it is a well accepted practice.

Despite all that it was disappointing to note that the actual mention of agriculture in the Treasurer's speech took up six lines, and that is being very charitable because there were only two words on one line. It is an infinite improvement on last year's performance when agriculture did not rate a mention at all. I found that to be most disturbing because, when all is said and done, agriculture contributes a tremendous amount to the economy of the State.

The 1984-85 expenditure on agriculture and the APB as a percentage of total Government outlays is 2.1 per cent for agriculture and 2.49 per cent for the combined total. That is still less than the 1982-83 figure as a percentage of the Budget, very marginally, I admit, but it is a step backwards. I know that getting funds for various programmes is very competitive, and I feel sure the Minister would have promoted the case for agriculture. I feel agriculture is being short changed and I hope it will not receive the same treatment in future.

The Treasurer at best ignores the rural sector and takes it for granted. I suppose it would be drawing a long bow to say he is antagonistic towards farming, but I think the attitude of the Government towards rural people is pretty well demonstrated by the Deputy Premier today when he was talking about people in my electorate whom he does not know because he has never had the grace to go there. He shows good sense in not going, but he also shows his contempt for country people and people in a very productive area of the State.

Despite all this and the apparent lack of interest in the country I guess it is singing the old song to say that agriculture in Western Australia has an annual output of more than \$2 billion. It produces one-third of Australia's wheat and carries one-quarter of the nation's sheep. I know the Minister

is aware of the figures because I have heard him quote them before, but it is a good idea to remind the Government of the importance of agriculture to the economy of the State, especially when we are discussing Budget allocations.

Agriculture produces exports worth \$1.7 billion a year and accounts for one-third of Western Australia's total export income earnings. It is responsible for the employment of more than 20 per cent—one in every five—of Western Australians in employment.

The increased allocation for soil conservation and the soil conservation staff appointments are very welcome. The fact that the Minister is making one or two appointments to the Jerramungup area is gratifying because that area has some of our greater problems. The amount of money allocated is largely due to Commonwealth grants and although I noticed in the paper a day or two ago the Minister was talking about \$120 000 or \$140 000 being allocated from the State—

Mr Evans: About \$140 000 and back-up personnel.

Mr OLD: That is fine. The amount allocated to Western Australia by the Commonwealth deserves some mention because the figure, \$620 000 or thereabouts represents about 13 per cent or 14 per cent of the total amount of money allocated by the Commonwealth to the States. I do not know what formula is used to allocate this money. It cannot be on a population basis as I originally thought, because it does not equate, and it certainly is not on a needs basis, but I believe there must be a better formula. While I agree with the Minister when he said he was grateful that the Commonwealth had allocated \$620 000, I point out that we have the largest land mass of any State and probably the biggest problem areas of any State.

I say that with a fair amount of certainty, but perhaps with the exception of South Australia, which could only come up to Western Australia on a percentage basis. The more established States do not appear to have the same degree of problem in that area as does Western Australia. I believe that the Agricultural Council should discuss this matter and I am sure the Minister could produce the figures to convince the Minister for Primary Industry that there should be a greater allocation in the future. It is fine to be able to get the money and to take this step of employing more staff to undertake what is a very important programme in the agricultural industry.

We talk about a balanced Budget but I point out that the balance is purely on a monetary basis and not on the allocation of money. To demon-

strate this I would like to quote to the House some of the percentages that have gone to various sectors of the Government service. The real engines of the economy have virtually been denied their proper recognition.

We have the primary industries—the agricultural industry and the mining industry—which had their allocations increased by 9.2 per cent and 18.7 per cent respectively. That is quite deplorable when one considers the rises that have been given to other Government sectors. For example the increase to the Technology Development Authority is 2 403.6 per cent. I must admit that that is a fairly frightening figure, but one on which one cannot place much importance because the actual basis on which it was worked was pretty low. However, there has been, and very much so, a wooing of technology. I believe the Government has become very starry eyed about technology and tourism and believes that they are the main earning parts of the economy.

The allocation to technology has increased by 299 per cent. The increase to tourism is 80.9 per cent and that is not a new department by any means. The allocation to the Library Board has increased by 66.8 per cent and the increase to Treasury is 41.8 per cent. One would be entitled to ask, "Why is the Treasury up 41.8 per cent and what is it going to do? Is it going to employ a tremendous number of staff?" It would be interesting to hear the Treasurer give the House some indication why that rise was necessary. The allocation for the Legal Aid Commission has increased by 37.3 per cent, for the Public Service Board by 36.6 per cent, and for the Department of Premier and Cabinet by 33 per cent. Goodness knows, the Department of Premier and Cabinet had a colossal rise in the first year of the Burke Government and now we find that on last year's figures it has increased by 33.3 per cent. Is it more jobs for the boys, the dads or whoever?

Mr Williams: No. It is more booze for the Cabinet and their mates!

Mr OLD: I am sure it may be, but the Government will tell us more about it.

The allocation to the Department of Administrative Services has increased by 26.9 per cent and the allocation to the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation has increased by 22.2 per cent. If one were to go through the Budget carefully one would find that the Government sectors which have the greatest increases come under the portfolios of the Premier and the Deputy Premier. It is not only jobs for the boys, but dough for the boys, and God help the rest of the Government sectors.

The Treasurer, under his rapidly dulling halo, says that he has practised restraint, but that is not shown in the figures I have quoted. On page 2 of the Treasurer's Budget speech he points out the constraints that are being practised. Constraints are being carried out by other departments, not his department.

Mr Read: There has been an 80 per cent increase in employment and training.

Mr OLD: I will come to that, but I think the member for Mandurah should check the figures on it.

If there has been an increase of 80 per cent it has been offset by unemployment. This Treasurer has reigned over the highest rate of unemployment of any Treasurer in the history of this State.

Mr Gordon Hill: That is nonsense. The rate of unemployment is steady and there has been an increase in jobs.

Mr OLD: The member for Helena is quite wrong. What are the figures? There is no answer.

We are certainly experiencing a honeymoon with technology and tourism. I wanted to make that point so that the people of Western Australia will know where their money is being spent. Unfortunately, not enough publicity is given to the splitting up of money. It is all very well to balance a Budget and say that the Government has a \$2.8 billion Budget, but it comes down to who gets the money. I can assure the House that one does not eat computers and that machinery is indigestible.

Another example of the lack of the Government's performance, despite the Treasurer's blustering attitudes, is that it has made no significant progress in unemployment. The Treasurer has presided over the highest rate of unemployment in this State. I remember Bob Hawke, in his backbench days predicting five per cent unemployment. It is a fact of life that it is very hard to restrain unemployment because of the increase in technology and because of the ease with which people today can be paid for doing nothing. I am not being critical in that regard, but I noted today that an American lecturer who is in Perth said that part of our problem is due to the fact that children are encouraged to leave school by being able to receive the dole. It is a tremendous tragedy that children are leaving school today and are unable to secure employment of any sort. I have a great empathy for those people, but I do not think we should be encouraging them to leave school and to go on the dole.

I know that efforts have been made to encourage students to stay at school for their eleventh year and I congratulate the Government for what it has done. However, it is bringing problems with

it because by keeping children at school the hostels and the classrooms are becoming overcrowded. It is better to spend money on providing classrooms than to spend it on providing the dole for children, which is totally unproductive. I am sure that students, by staying an extra year at school, will gain the benefit of that in their future life.

Before I go on to a few general points about matters in the electorate generally, I would like to mention an interesting point and to record in *Hansard* some interesting statistics; that is, the percentage of the Budget that has gone to agriculture and to the APB over the last three years. The percentages are as follows—

1982-83—2.54%

1983-84—2.46%

1984-85—2.49%

This year's figure represents a marginal increase on last year's figure, but it has not yet hit the 1982-83 level.

With the time available to me I will move on to some of the matters concerning my electorate, and I take this opportunity to bring forward a matter which is causing some concern; that is, the matter of a water supply in the township of Munglinup.

Unfortunately the Minister for Transport is not here, but he shares with me the town of Munglinup because the boundary of our electorates is about 200 yards east of the town. It is a very nice little settlement; it consists of about 12 residences and 6 commercial ventures—such things as machinery repair shops and welding shops, because the town serves a large agricultural area. A hall has been there for a long time and an ambulance centre is now being built. Munglinup has a good sports ground, a golf course, an equestrian centre—which is notable because a lot of time and money has been put into it and there is a large number of horsemen there; they hold regular equestrian events—and a tennis club.

There are 27 points for a potential water supply at Munglinup. That is not very many, but these people have been on what is called the five-year plan for about 15 years. Each year the plan looks like coming up they slip back. Unfortunately Munglinup has now fallen off the plan, which is very distressing, especially to the progress association which was very active.

Mr Ken Cadee wrote a letter referring to the five-year plan. He indicated that the Munglinup water supply should be in place by 1987; that is three years' time. We were then horrified to find that the five-year programme has fallen by the wayside, so even if the plan is replaced next year it could be 1989 before anything is done.

I ask the Government, and especially the Minister, to give some consideration to these people, because they deserve a water supply. Some of them have been there for a long period.

The member for Floreat recently made the point that the PWD seems to be catering for gold plated installations. There is currently a dam and an engine, a pump—and some reticulation, most of which residents have put in themselves. But the water supply is anything but reliable, because it needs to be enlarged. The plans, which are very elaborate, envisage a 32 000 cubic metre dam and reticulation. The plan shows six-inch mains, which seem quite excessive. In one letter I noted that Hon. Des O'Neil, when he was Minister, thought that the number of connections would flatten out at about 40. On that basis one would think a four-inch main would be ample, and probably an inch or an inch-and-a-quarter reticulation conduit would be sufficient. With plastic piping of the quality made today, a great reduction could be made in the amount of capital necessary to put in a satisfactory water supply for the next 25 years. There is no indication that any great influx of people will occur.

I might add there is a possibility of some mining activity, because there is a graphite deposit within a few miles of the town, and that could bring the number of potential connections up to 40, which is the number mentioned by Hon. Sir Des O'Neil.

I think most members would agree that one could never put in a water supply more cheaply than it could be done today, irrespective of cost. The last costing was done in 1982, when the sum mentioned was \$557 000. I would have to agree with any Minister who said that was far too much to spend on a water supply with so few connections. I suggest to the Minister concerned that he go back to his water supply department and ask the officers to bring forward a plan more fitting for the requirements of Munglinup.

The Minister for Transport, who shares half the Munglinup district with me, in a recent Press release advised that some \$600 000 will be spent on a water supply this year for the Esperance region. Of that some \$461 000 will be spent in Esperance, \$94 000 at Grass Patch, and \$45 000 at Gibson.

I feel sure if \$100 000 is spent at Munglinup, the people would be eternally grateful, provided the water supply was on a reasonable basis to cover the needs of Munglinup for some time to come.

Incidentally, that \$557 000 included \$162 000 for a bitumen catchment. Perhaps it could be a roaded catchment with a chlorinator or some type of settlement system incorporated, but these

things could be solved by the engineers concerned, provided they get away from their penchant for over-design. If one were an engineer in a Government department the temptation would be to over design, because one would want to make a name for oneself and make a good showing.

The next thing to talk about—I am sorry the Minister for Health is not here—is the Katanning Hospital. The maternity wing has had to close because of lack of staff. I am also informed, although it is not in my electorate, that the maternity section at Dumbleyung has had to close. The position at Katanning is not as serious as it might have been, as part of the general ward has been converted into a maternity section and the labour section of the maternity ward is still being used: patients are transported to the general wards. This is not terribly satisfactory as far as doctors are concerned, but they agree that with lack of staff it is probably the best that can be done in the circumstances.

Mr Davies: How do they deal with patients? Is there a big demand?

Mr OLD: The hospital had six midwifery patients last week, so the demand is fair. It must have been the season, because it has come up a bit. As the Minister who has just interjected would know, as an ex-Minister for Health, it is desirable to have the midwifery section away from the general section from the point of view of cross infection—colds, flu, and that sort of thing being transmitted to small babies.

I hope something can be done about the staff. I know the Government has embarked on a series of courses to encourage ex-nurses back into the profession. I hope this will alleviate the position somewhat.

Not only did I want to speak about the maternity ward, but there is also the matter of the permanent care section of the Katanning Hospital. I am sorry the Minister is not here because I am sure he would probably be able to answer my query right away.

I can find nothing in the Budget which indicates an allowance for the work on the permanent care section of the hospital which has been promised. I understand from the administrator that tenders are to be called in the near future. I only hope that some funding is provided, because it is a matter which is beginning to assume urgency, bearing in mind the number of patients needing that sort of permanent care. I hope the Minister will be able to give me an indication later in the debate as to what is happening in that regard.

One other point I bring up on behalf of my ex-nursing friends is the idea of training all nurses

academically in the future. I understand the Western Australian Institute of Technology is to be the venue for training nurses. I have no grouch with academic training for nurses: it is essential. However, the old-fashioned training of nurses which was a mixture of academia and practical nursing work certainly produced some wonderful nursing sisters who had great compassion for their patients. They did not come out of their training schools without a knowledge of how to empty a bedpan and take a temperature. That was part of their training. I would venture to say that some of those nurses are the best trained in the world. In fact Australian nurses are world renowned and a nurse with Australian registration does not encounter much difficulty getting jobs overseas, because she has been so well trained.

Now nurses will be trained academically. They will go out into the hospital situation never having had actual hospital experience. I guess we shall be relying on nursing aides or assistants—whatever they are called today—to teach the nursing sisters how to become nurses, and that is quite ridiculous.

Mr Davies: I thought there was a very small amount of practical work; however, there is some.

Mr OLD: There is a small amount of practical nursing, but it is not the amount that the curriculum provided for in the past, as the Minister would be well aware.

Mr Davies: It has been an ongoing argument for 12 years.

Mr OLD: We had a mixture of training. Some nursing sisters were trained at WAIT and we still had the teaching hospitals. We had a mix and I guess one was able to help the other. However, this is a step in the wrong direction. I will not dwell on it, but I do not agree with it.

I seem to be giving the Minister for Health more to do than anyone else, but while I am dealing with hospitals, I refer to the fact that the provision of a hospital at Jerramungup is of concern. We have a nursing post at Jerramungup at the moment with a resident doctor, Doctor Hesketh. He is ageing and would like to hang up his scalpel in the not too distant future, but he has a responsibility to the residents of the Jerramungup area. He is very highly respected not only for his medical ability, but also for the fact that he is there and intends to stay there to help the people.

Jerramungup is an isolated area despite the fact that we have such things as bitumen roads today. We still have the problem of getting people from Jerramungup to Albany, or to Gnowangerup or Katanning.

A deputation waited on the Minister and unfortunately, to say the least, it received short shrift. I was disappointed about that, and I believe the Minister would have given us a far better hearing had we been able to discuss the matter at length.

It was stated by a senior officer of the Health Department who was present that the number of people at Jerramungup as claimed by the hospital committee which had brought forward the proposition for a nine-bed hospital was wrong and in fact there were fewer people. However, the figure used by the authorities was taken from Australia Post which showed X number of residents in the area. That figure would have been arrived at by the computer and I venture to say—I would happily stand corrected—that it was derived by means of postcodes. In other words, the Jerramungup postcode would be punched into the computer which would indicate how many people had that address.

Many people in the Jerramungup area have the postcodes of Bremer Bay, Ravensthorpe, and Ongerup. The Needilup people have always had an Ongerup address, even though they are in the Jerramungup area and utilise it as their centre. Therefore, if a proper census were taken of the residents and farmers in the Jerramungup area it would give the lie to the figure produced by Australia Post.

I ask that this matter be considered again and that this time it be looked at more seriously and in greater depth, because these people have a problem.

Indeed, the very big problem experienced in this regard in the Jerramungup area was demonstrated recently when the senior assistant of the Shire of Jerramungup—a lady who had her small child with her at the time—was involved in a motor vehicle accident near Jerramungup. She was transported to Albany, because a patient cannot even be kept overnight at the Jerramungup nursing post.

The nursing post is a very good building. Great care was taken in its design and with little work it could be converted to a small, nine-bed hospital. I am informed there is plenty of potential staff in the Jerramungup area—married nursing sisters and the like—who would be prepared to staff such a hospital.

Unfortunately, the lady to whom I referred had to be transported to Albany and, as a result of the delay in getting her to hospital, she was very ill. That is a very good case to be considered by the Minister.

I ask that as soon as possible the Minister take the opportunity to come down to Jerramungup and have a look, at first hand, at the lack of facilities there and the size of the district. I am quite sure he would get a different idea as to the importance or otherwise of a hospital in the area.

I am fast running out of time; however, there is one matter I want to bring to the attention of the House before I sit down. I refer to the Australian flag and the treatment it is receiving at the hands of the Federal Government and a number of people who feel that it is something of which we should not be proud—something which should be changed to a boxing kangaroo or some such motif.

I was horrified when I was sent a copy of an examination paper from the New South Wales Department of Education. It was the school certificate reference test, 1984, for English and the time allowed for completion was two hours. To say the least, some of the remarks about our flag were distasteful; indeed, they were disgraceful.

Anyone with any allegiance to the flag or to the monarchy would share my concern at the way in which this matter is being handled. We are teaching kids to be ashamed of the fact that the Union Jack is part of our flag. We are telling them that we do not much like the colour of the flag.

To give an indication of the position, I refer to page 3 of this English paper set by the Department of Education in NSW. It sets out a range of comments in relation to somebody's opinion of the Australian flag.

Mr Davies: We do not have any jurisdiction in NSW.

Mr OLD: I realise that, but I do not want to see it happen here.

One of the references is—

Flag-waving seems to be a popular pastime at the moment.

It probably is; to continue—

Should we or shouldn't we change the flag we've got? Just about everybody has an opinion.

I have one: I think we should change it—and do so for the 1988 Bicentennial celebrations because that would be a neat and tidy time and way to do it.

Our flag is simply not recognisable and therefore fails the basic test of a flag's effectiveness.

The author wonders if it is New Zealand's flag or that of another pacific nation, or the Royal Navy's ensign splattered on by seagulls. That is the respect that this lady or gentleman has for the

Australian flag. Of course, it all comes back to the contempt with which the people of the left treat our monarchy. The article continues as follows—

Let's have a stylised kangaroo, like the Qantas symbol.

The kangaroo is the one symbol which is instant-Aussie, worldwide. I suppose we could use Alan Bond's boxing kangaroo on the Australian national flag. What a load of baloney! What an insult to people who have fought under the flag, and what an insult to the Crown. Of course, that does not matter to the people opposite because they have no allegiance whatsoever to the Crown.

Mr Evans: Some of us did our bit of fighting.

Mr OLD: I agree. That view is not shared by the majority of Australian people and I think members will find a rising revulsion against the efforts of people to denigrate the Crown and the flag.

I am grateful for the opportunity this afternoon to be able to make a contribution to the debate.

MR EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [5.03 p.m.]: I seek to use a portion of my time in the Budget debate as I was unable to speak on the Conservation and Land Management Bill which was finally debated earlier today. I seek to do that because I was obstructed to some extent. I cannot ever remember an Opposition—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Henderson): Order! I draw the Minister's attention to Standing Orders which indicate that reference is not to be made to a debate of this session.

Mr EVANS: I shall not refer to the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Henderson): Or the Bill.

Mr EVANS: There are some matters in connection with my electorate to which I would like to make strong reference. In this regard I point out that I have been most disturbed with some of the aspects of the Warren electorate which have been purported by the Opposition.

The measure which proposes to make some changes to the Forests Department and the national parks and wildlife sections, will cause a new department to be created. I have heard it said that this would set up a mega department. To say such a thing is an utter stupidity. A quick look at the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of this year will show that the new department to which I have referred will total something of the order of 814 officers; 612 from the Forests Department, about 100 from national parks, and about the same number from the wildlife section of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, making a total complement of 814 officers.

If members have regard to the Department of Agriculture which has a staff including the APB, of 1 579, that is about double that figure. Members must have regard to the range of sections within the Department of Agriculture, the dozens of disciplines which are involved and the application of those disciplines right throughout the State, whether it be agronomy, the control of disease in plants and animals, or whatever, the work is carried out from Kimberley to Esperance. That work is done in probably double the number of regional offices and research stations that would pertain to a new department.

For that reason, I wonder what constitutes a mega department. Is the Department of Agriculture classified in this way? Still looking at the Estimates, it can readily be seen that the Prisons Department has 1 307 officers, the Police Department has 4 268, the Health Department has 634 and the Education Department has 20 764. What arrant nonsense has the Opposition been peddling? What constitutes a mega department? To say that the proposed department to which I have referred will be a mega department with mega problems is arrant nonsense, and I would like to make that point very clearly.

Mr Davies: It gets a good headline though.

Mr EVANS: The working party carrying out research to the establishment of a new department brought down conclusively in the finding that there could be a range of savings in resources, and these are identified positively. I refer to this working party as it has access to other documents going back to the CTRC System 6 and every other piece of legislation that has been formulated in the past.

The working party recommended savings in areas such as fire control. I draw attention to an occurrence of 12 months ago last February when a wildlife reserve was set alight by a lightning strike. There will continue to be lightning strikes: of the 60-odd wildfires of last year, approximately 13 were caused by lightning strikes and this will be an ongoing problem. Protection must be inbuilt into the fire control system that we have evolved. By the time the fire unit from Perth had arrived at the Lake Muir area about six hours had elapsed, with the result that a major bushfire was out of control and it was only then that the Forests Department could become involved. In the meantime the fire had become quite a crematorium. The local farmers, I might add, were highly incensed and more seriously disadvantaged.

A unit within the wildlife section carries out research into *Phytophthora cinnamoni* which is vitally important to the Fitzroy River reserve and also to Two People Bay where there is a signifi-

cant outbreak. The basic research into *Phytophthora cinnamoni* has been carried out by the Forests Department and there is no liaison in regard to this most important aspect of research in the forests of WA.

I point out also that in the fields of flora and fauna the Forests Department has played a leading role. When it came to looking at the environmental impact statement for the wood chip industry it was found that there was no research except where the Forests Department became initially involved. I also point out for those members who are not aware of it and cannot readily recognise it, that while we have Forests Department officers at Kununurra, Kimberley, Kalgoorlie, Broome, and Narrogin, they are spread very widely and the benefits that could be derived from incorporating them with the wildlife system of this State under a single department could be enormous. It has been said that it is not possible to mix production and conservation management in forests, and this is again a statement of complete and utter nonsense. Officers of the Forests Department are doing this now, they have been doing it for years and will continue to do it with distinction.

It is apposite to draw attention to the fact that Forests Department officers are probably the best trained of all professionals in any department in this State because they have a broad academic base in their initial training. It starts with a first year of science studies at the University of Western Australia and is completed in Canberra. The breadth of subjects taken there equips them well for future roles in land management. Their post-graduate training involves administration and planning of a very high order, and they are left to a fairly independent role, much more so than most other departments. As a consequence, they are better equipped than professionals who become involved in a single discipline. For that reason the capacity of officers of the Forests Department is probably way above that of others in handling land management on a practical, academic, and theoretical basis.

There has been some misunderstanding by critics in other places and on the other side of the situation that will arise with the creation of a single department of land management of the sort to which I have referred. The lack of understanding is most alarming because this Bill ensures that the status of road and stream reserves and management priority areas is secure. This is done very thoroughly and more effectively than is the case at present under the existing pieces of legislation which control land management. I also point out that as far as State forests are concerned there is

no way the general working plan can be ignored or that the status of State forests can be disregarded.

In the first instance one becomes an ongoing management programme, and in the second instance there can be no change to State forests by reservation or revocation to allow any alteration without such proposal coming before both Houses of this Parliament. I do not want to dwell too much on that aspect. I want to point out that which has been disregarded so frequently in relation to the forests of Western Australia.

The basic problem facing the timber industry and the State forests of Western Australia is one of over-cutting. I will touch on the position regarding the karri forest which lends itself to a single entity and is more readily absorbable. Karri was first cut in this State in 1914 because of the requirement for sleepers for the transline. At the rate of cutting no karri forest would have been left by the end of the century; that is, in a matter of three-quarters of a century the entire karri forest would have been cut and no further cutting would be possible for 50 years. I also point out that the general working plan has, because of the restrictions it has imposed, allowed that period of cutting time to expand roughly to the year 2015. It gave another 15 years' grace.

The planners within the Forests Department have shown that the general working plan levels which they have set and which are ongoing to the year 2015 can be maintained with the Shannon River basin resource withdrawn under the replanning. Even with that assurance, the position of the timber industry in the lower south-west remains unchanged.

The karri intake of the timber industry in 1984 will be 190 000 cubic metres. That figure will reduce by 1992 to a level of 160 000 cubic metres, and by the turn of the century it will decline to 134 000 cubic metres. It will reach a base by 2015 of 100 000 cubic metres a year and will stay at that figure until the middle of the next century. That is what the planning scene is all about—a reduction is as inevitable as a Greek drama; it will come about, but it brings with it the economic consequences which have been conveniently disregarded by members opposite and others.

If we are talking of almost halving the hardwood cut in 30 years' time, representing as it does 60 per cent of the economy of the Warren area which I represent—

Mr Brian Burke: Very ably.

Mr EVANS: —we are talking of a net cutback of 40 per cent of the economy—30 per cent in timber and at least 10 per cent in the facilities and service industries which attend upon the timber

industry. To see that situation arising and do nothing about it would be criminal negligence. It could not be described in any other way as it is the area of greatest dislocation and that is the reason the Government has put resources into ensuring it does not occur.

Leave to Continue Speech

I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage of the sitting.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE) FUND BILL

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [7.15 p.m.]: Before question time this afternoon I took the opportunity of outlining some aspects in connection with the timber industry that do not seem to be appreciated by some members of this House and, I would suggest, by people outside this House.

The significant point is that because of overcutting inevitably there has to be a reduction in the hardwood cut, to the extent that between 1984 and 2015 the level of karri cut will reduce by almost one-half, from 190 000 cubic metres a year to 100 000 cubic metres a year. That brings with it, of course, an economic dislocation which is not very hard to figure out. If we are halving the industry that supplies 60 per cent of the economic base of a district we are cutting back that economic base by 30 per cent net, and if we take along all those ancillary industries that would be affected, we are talking in terms of reducing the economic base of the area in question, the Manjimup Shire, by in the order of 40 per cent. A dislocation of that kind just is not acceptable.

The Government has taken action by commencing to establish a softwood industry, which when built up to a level of about 300 000 cubic metres of timber per annum, will represent somewhere between 600 and 700 jobs in Western Australia—not necessarily all in that region of course. However, when the transportation, nursery and management aspects of plantations, as well as the milling and processing operations are taken into account, somewhere in the order of 600 to 700

jobs can be expected to be created. That is a positive step and it is about the only step which can be taken with the Manjimup region. It is the only compensatory step that is possible and I applaud the Government for its initiative. With the decrease in the hardwood industry, it has the overtones of jobs, land values, and everything else that goes with it—things that people are only just beginning to realise.

The corollary to that is the commitment by this Government to refurbish 2 000 hectares per annum of hardwood region that is debilitated but which has the potential to produce timber in the future. Those two aspects together will go a long way towards meeting the future timber needs of the State. It is the first time, under this Government, that a serious attempt has been made to increase hardwood resources by rehabilitation of the hardwood forests, accompanied by a massive injection into the utilisation and market research of the resources that are available.

I have indicated the attitude of members opposite who do not understand the timber industry. They have shown by their attitude over the last nine years that they do not care about the people in this industry. As far as they were concerned, the lower south-west could just languish and wither. I appreciate the approach taken by the Treasurer—

Mr MacKinnon: The only languishing and withering in the south-west is being done by the Minister.

Mr EVANS:—in regard to the investment that has been made in this area with a view to minimising the dislocation in the area where it otherwise would occur, to the extent of 40 per cent of the economic base of that region.

Mr Blaikie: What are you doing in the sunlands?

Mr EVANS: Members opposite can just dwell on the lack of initiative and care that they showed when they had the chance.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.20 p.m.]: I wish to make my contribution to the Budget debate in two ways: Firstly, by addressing some general comments to the state of the nation's economic position, particularly as it relates to taxation; and, secondly, by making some comments relating to what could broadly be termed as efficiency in Government. Members would understand that as an accountant, I have an interest in this matter.

In *The Weekend Australian* of 16 and 17 June there appeared a particularly good article written by Des Keegan entitled, "Following in the footsteps of the Ancient Romans". Keegan gave an expose of how he believes Australia was perhaps

following the road to destruction that was followed so long ago by the Roman Empire. In that regard he referred to the manner of Government expansion in Australia. I will quote from that speech so members will have an understanding of the drift of the article. He said—

A South Australian reader yesterday posed a couple of interesting questions related to this proposition. Assume money is taken in progressively higher amounts from productive enterprise and given increasingly to support the non productive, including government bureaucracy and loafers.

"Is there a 'crunch point', or can governments continue to borrow, or print or inflate out of it all?"

"In what form will this 'crunch point' manifest itself? What are its forewarnings?"

"When is this 'crunch point' likely to come in Australia—not necessarily in time, but as a function of what trigger conditions?"

Those were the South Australian reader's comments. Des Keegan then said—

Looking deeply into my crystal ball it seems there are warnings that the crunch point is on the horizon and likely to arrive during the next term of a Federal Labor Government compounded by socialist excesses at State and local levels.

I know it might not be fashionable at this time in our nation's and State's history to be talking about poor economic times, or proposing that the future looks bleak in Australia, but if we continue on the present path there is a distinct possibility that the crunch point talked about by Des Keegan may arrive much sooner than people thought.

I will refer to the State and Federal Budgets to give an indication of what I think Des Keegan was talking about, and what concerns me about the future of this country.

On 9 October the Treasurer said in his Budget speech, "The Budget I introduce today continues that pattern of restraint. There are no increases in taxes and some significant tax cuts". If we look at the facts, not the rhetoric of the Treasurer which often does mislead and bears no relationship to the facts, we will note the Treasurer's income source. I have a table which summarises that income source in recent times. I will seek leave at the end of my speech to incorporate the table in *Hansard*. It compares the revenue collections of the State Government in the years 1982-83 and 1983-84, and those proposed for 1985-86. It gives a comparison between each of the revenues and the percentage changes. The total increase in Govern-

ment revenue during its time in office in two Budgets is \$517 million or 22.3 per cent.

The figures that were included in the Government's financial statement, also tabled when the Treasurer introduced his Budget this year, show that inflation for the year 1983-84, which was the first year of the Government's term of office, was 6.9 per cent. For 1984-85 it is estimated to be 5½ per cent. That is about 12 and a bit per cent inflation over those two years, whereas the Government's revenue and expenditure, which are expected to balance in these times, are increasing at the rate of 22 per cent, almost double the rate of inflation.

If we look at the Federal Government's Budget estimates on page 10 of the Budget paper No.1, we note that in the same time period, the Commonwealth Government—that is the Hawke Labor Government—has had an increase in Budget receipts in 1983-84 of 9.3 per cent and in 1984-85—the expenses as we know at the Commonwealth level are greater because it works on a Budget deficit—it had an increase of 17 per cent. In round terms that is a 27 per cent increase in total receipts in the two years of the Hawke Labor Government.

For the State Labor Government we see a 22 per cent increase when at the same time inflation is running at about 12 per cent. So, in this country, in real terms, we have seen Government receipts increase at twice the rate of inflation in the last 12 months. Many other people in this country believe that unless something is done to match the Treasurer's rhetoric in his Budget speech or a pattern of restraint is introduced into Government the crunch point that Des Keegan talks about as was mentioned in the article in *The Weekend Australian* of 16 and 17 June, could be on us much sooner than people think. The Treasurer who so often comes here to gloat about the economic performance of this State will find those comments will come back to slap him harshly in the face in the near future.

Following the Treasurer's Budget speech last year, the editorial of the *Sunday Independent* stated—

Only the eradication of Government intervention and control over our productive industries, not its increase, accompanied by lower taxation can return the State to economic prosperity, development, and high employment.

That is true. We see no indication of that occurring with this Government: in fact, we see the opposite. We are seeing increased Government intervention: increased control over our productive

industries, and increased and higher taxation. While in the short term we may be seeing a short-lived economic prosperity, I think the current policy pursued by the State and Federal Governments will see this nation and State fail to achieve any level of economic prosperity and development, or increase employment in any real terms of magnitude.

I come to the second part of the comments I would like to make which relate to Government efficiency. Members will recall that in June last year the Treasurer, amid a blaze of publicity, entered into what I would call a media week. During that week he announced a massive increase in Government charges, and then the very next day announced a whole series of Government initiatives designed "to improve efficiency and impose tighter financial control over Government activity".

The increases were announced in a Press statement of 22 June. The grandstanding announcement of savings occurred on 22 June and indicated that savings of \$29 million would be made.

The Treasurer made a 10-step commitment. We have seen over the last 12 months a very patchy performance in relation to that commitment. I would like to run through each one of those areas now and relate them to the Government's performance. Let me remind members of the few comments of the Treasurer, prior to the election and in the papers of the two Budgets he has presented to the Parliament.

I can only say at the beginning of these quotations that the Treasurer, if nothing else—I give him credit here—is consistent in his rhetoric though inconsistent in his performance. On 10 June 1982 he said—

The only sure way of holding down Government taxes and charges is to strictly control the costs of Government. This means ensuring that all Government agencies are operated at peak efficiency.

In his support of the Budget on 13 October last year, the Treasurer said—

Our first steps were to review all existing expenditures and to seek ways of enhancing government efficiency.

As I said before, he is consistent. He continued—

Those responsible for every government function will have to justify its continuance to the functional review committee established for this purpose.

Further on he said—

In addition, the Government has:

...imposed a selective non-replacement policy for departmental staff,

tightened up on the use of government vehicles,

begun efficiency audits for government departments and agencies,

reviewed the government purchasing system with the view to introducing efficiencies, and

brought in more effective capital budgeting procedures and moved towards the introduction of performance and programme budgeting.

He was right up front in last year's speech. What did we see in this year's Budget speech? On the penultimate page, before the "Budget Overview" section there was a section headed by the words "Government Efficiency". It seems that all of those items that were referred to in the Budget speech which appeared in *Hansard* at page 3062 of 13 October last year were completely ignored. The Treasurer, however, acting as he normally does, is consistent in his rhetoric. He said—

The first is to seek new sources of revenue which do not impinge directly on businesses or families. I have already touched on the steps we are taking to this end.

Further, he goes on—

We have established the functional review committee to carry out this task and the fruits of its work are already to be seen.

There, he is referring to maximum efficiency. He went on further to make a comment about the Government Stores Department and what was happening in that area. Strangely, no comment was made about the selective non-replacement policy for departmental staff, or efficiency audits for Government departments and agencies and nothing about effective capital budgeting procedures.

We can see exactly what happens to those from answers to parliamentary questions provided by the Treasurer.

In a Press release of 22 June 1983, he said—

Announcing the measures, the Premier and Treasurer, Mr Brian Burke, said the initial savings from the measures in 1983-84 would be about \$29 million, but the greatest impact would be on government financial management in the medium and long-term.

That is what the third paragraph of that release states. As I recall, that statement got fairly wide coverage in the media. It amounted to a \$29 million saving.

Recently, I thought it was time that we followed up the Press statement and had a look at the performance. I asked a question of the Treasurer as recently as 26 September in relation to that Press statement. I asked how much those cost saving measures actually saved. We then heard more rhetoric in relation to that \$29 million. It sounded pretty good. It got good Press coverage: people believed it. The answer stated—

Compiling this information would tie up considerable resources in the Treasury at a time when the department is heavily involved in preparing Budget papers.

That is despite the massive increase in the Budget and Treasury staff about which I will talk in a moment. He went on—

I will give consideration to arranging for the Treasury to supply the member with the detailed information in due course.

The Treasurer appears to be still giving that consideration.

Mr Hassell: How many months ago was that one?

Mr MacKINNON: That was asked on 26 September. It is nowhere near as long ago as the Leader of the Opposition asked his question. He asked it in August.

In June last year, when I assume that the Treasury was flat out preparing the Budget papers, it quite quickly arrived at a \$29 million estimate of cost saving and yet, this year, when we are trying to match the performance with the rhetoric of the Treasurer, the answer is that the Treasury is too busy. It is too busy despite the fact that it had over two years and almost a 100 per cent increase in its Budget allocation. I am not sure what the staffing figures are. I do not have those figures in front of me. However, I can assure members that there has been an increase in staff. Yet, it was too busy to ascertain whether the Treasurer was telling the truth at that time. I think he was straying far from the truth.

On the very first page of the Press statement, the Treasurer went on to say—

The new financial management and control measures are:

expanding the role of the Auditor-General to enable him to check the efficiency of government departments and agencies.

He then went on to say—

At present, his role is restricted to reporting to Parliament on whether money was spent according to law.

Further he said—

A new Financial Management and Audit Act will be brought down to enable the Auditor-General to report also on whether money was spent efficiently and economically and in accordance with performance standards set by the legislation. The new Act and associated regulations will come into effect in 1984-85.

What happened in relation to the Auditor General? What happened about this great Government efficiency that should have been led, if it was to be led by anybody, by the Auditor General in Western Australia? Page 4 of the Auditor General's report, tabled only recently, states—

Audit Act—No progress was made during the year on redrafting the Act, because of a lack of staff resources in Treasury. The issue has been recently taken up and there are prospects of progress being made in 1984-85.

All this yet the Treasury Department had an almost 100 per cent increase in its Budget allocation.

Almost 18 months ago, in June last year, the Treasurer said that the new financial management and control measures were expanding the role of the Auditor General. A new Act and associated regulations would come into effect. The Auditor General quite clearly indicated what this Government did in that area.

Let us refer to the Budget estimates and see how fairly the Auditor General was treated. Was he given the resources to actually carry out that expanded role? In 1982-83, his department was granted an allocation of \$2.9 million; in 1983-84 it was granted \$3.1 million; in 1984-85 it has been granted \$3.3 million. Over those years there has been an increase of 5.6 per cent and 7.1 per cent respectively. What do we see with Treasury? There was an increase of 47.7 per cent in 1983-84 as compared with 1982-83 and a 41.8 per cent increase in 1984-85 as compared with the figures for 1983-84. In real terms, in 1982-83 to 1984-85 there has been a 100 per cent increase. Yet, the Auditor General had his budget pegged. In fact, if one looks at the figures, one sees that staff levels were reduced over those periods. The figures between 1983-84 to 1984-85 were maintained.

Let us have a look at the figures of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. There was a massive increase in funding from \$5.4 million in 1982-83 to \$7.5 million in 1984-85. Yet, the Auditor General's role was to be expanded to enable him to check on the efficiency of Government departments.

It seems that the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Treasury Department, in particular, have expanded beyond all realms. The officer of the department who was supposed to be checking on the efficiency of the Government departments and whom the Treasurer lauded loudly in his Press release has had his resources cut. If members share concern, as I do, about what might happen as these funds are restricted, then I refer them to the statement attributed to the Commonwealth Auditor General. The following was reported in *The West Australian* of 5 October—

The Auditor-General, Mr K. Brigden, has warned that the independence of his office will be seriously impaired unless he gets more staff and funds.

I would say that the Auditor General in this State must be independent and his ability to carry out the roles referred to by the Treasurer in his statement of 22 June is being seriously impaired by the lack of resources allocated to his department.

Let us look at another area of the Auditor General's office that interests me, and it has been touched on often by the Treasurer in his Press statements, and in his articles and notes in *The West Australian*: that is, efficiency audits. The Treasurer in his Budget speech last year, made great play about the fact that efficiency audits would be introduced at a Government level. He said—

In addition the Government has begun efficiency audits for Government departments and agencies.

Mr Speaker, would you believe that Government efficiency audits have been undertaken in only one authority—the Artificial Breeding Board? I asked a question of the Treasurer on 2 August, and I have not followed it up in recent days, but there may have been one or two other departments involved. However, when I asked him who would carry out these efficiency audits and whether other departments would be involved, he replied as follows—

The position has not changed since the reply given on 5 April.

On 5 April I asked the Treasurer whether the Government had carried out any efficiency audits other than in the Artificial Breeding Board, and his answer was, "Not as such".

If efficiency audits in Government, and efficiency in Government have anything to do with the Auditor General's office, the answer of the Premier and Treasurer given in this Parliament was, "No".

Mr Brian Burke: More haste less speed—my mother says that.

Mr MacKINNON: Any haste would make some speed.

The first plank of the Treasurer's statement was this area of Government efficiency. No. I was the Auditor General's efficiency audits—and we see no performance to date. The second point was the introduction of programme and performance budgeting, and as an accountant I can assure the House that I have an interest in this area. I would support the introduction of programme performance budgeting in Government. It is the right way to go. I understand it has been introduced in other States. Perhaps the member for Kalgoorlie, as a former Treasury officer, would be able to advise us about that.

What was the answer that I received to a question I asked of the Treasurer about programme performance budgeting?

Programme and performance budgeting is one of the key things that will give us Government efficiency. The Treasurer said that it would give us improved efficiency and tighter financial control of Government.

On 26 September this year the Treasurer was asked the following question—

Has the Government yet introduced a programme of performance budgeting?

The answer was as follows—

The matter is under consideration.

That was on 26 September, more than 12 months after the Treasurer said that the Government would introduce programme and performance budgeting. As members will recall, it was one of his major statements in that great stage-managed week to take away the glare of publicity from the massive increase in Government charges.

Mr Brian Burke: That was the week before the last Budget.

Mr MacKINNON: That is correct. I am referring to last year. I am trying to relate the Treasurer's performance with the rhetoric included in that statement. I am relating last year's statement to what has happened, and the action has been fairly minimal.

Mr Brian Burke: You are a very hard taskmaster. You want everything done overnight.

Mr MacKINNON: I would not have thought that 15 months was overnight. I would have thought that 15 months after the Treasurer said he would introduce a programme of performance budgeting he would have been able to give me a

better answer than, "The matter is under consideration".

Mr Brian Burke: You did not do it in nine years.

Mr MacKINNON: I do not believe that is any answer to his Government's performance. How much longer do we have to listen to, "You did not do it in nine years"? The Premier and Treasurer now leads the Government and it is his task to get on with the job of doing what he promised he would.

I did not say that we would introduce a programme of performance budgeting, but I can give an assurance that if we are returned to Government, we will, and we will certainly do it quicker than 15 months from the time we make the decision to do it.

The third area in which the Treasurer made a commitment was in relation to a new computer-based system for capital works budgeting. I give credit where it is due and in this area it seems that the Government lived up to its commitment, because on 26 September the Treasurer said the following in answer to a question I raised about that matter—

(1) (a) Yes:

(b) the system was introduced in time to accommodate the preparation of the 1984-85 capital works Programme estimates.

(2) The new system initially applies to those projects which are grouped under the public buildings programme.

Obviously it has been introduced to a limited extent. One out of three is not too bad.

Mr Brian Burke: One and a bit out of three—the Artificial Breeding Board is a bit.

Mr MacKINNON: What is the budget of the Artificial Breeding Board? I could probably look that up, but I would estimate that it is a 0.1 per cent of the Government's Budget. The Treasurer's response shows how seriously he treats efficiency in Government.

Point number four relates to new organisational operations and procedures for Government Stores. The quotation reads as follows—

Subsequently, new management and control measures were expected to lead to a one-off saving of \$3 million and further annual savings later.

Once again I asked a question of the Treasurer on 26 September and the answer to the question was that these procedures had not yet been introduced. However, in the Treasurer's Budget speech, under "Government efficiency" on page 17, he indicated

that the Government, has, in fact, made an allocation this year to the Government Stores Department for the development of a computerised stores management system. I commend him for that because I would think it is progress. It is a move that we would applaud.

However, the Treasurer on 22 June last year gave an indication that this move would save \$29 million and he specifically indicated an amount of \$3 million would be made available in this area.

As we see, that again has yet to be implemented. Almost 16 months after the statement was made, it is yet to be introduced.

An allocation in this year's Budget could well mean it would be in excess of two years before it is implemented. Again, we have a strike out—three out of four not achieved.

I refer to the fifth commitment which was an expansion of the responsibilities of the Public Accounts Committee. I will read this in full because it is important, and as a previous chairman of that committee I take a close interest in its activities. It reads as follows—

Its name is to be changed to the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee. The government will ask the committee to quickly commence an analysis of major agencies, such as the State Energy Commission and the Metropolitan Water Authority, and major government expenditure areas, such as health, education and welfare.

That is a clear and concise statement. The Government will ask the committee to quickly commence an analysis of major agencies. What is the performance to match that rhetoric?

In question 930 on 27 September I asked the Premier whether the Government at any time since 20 February 1983, the day after the Government's election,—just to give it the benefit of the doubt—had requested the Public Accounts Committee to examine any Government agencies or statutory authorities. The answer was as follows—

Consideration is currently being given to appropriate alterations to the Powers of the Public Accounts Committee to enable it to more effectively examine Government agencies and statutory authorities. The Government will not request the Public Accounts Committee to examine Government agencies or statutory authorities until its powers are clarified.

I then asked, "If so, would he list the requests made and the dates on which they were made?" Of course, he appropriately answered, "Not appli-

cable". Can I remind you, Mr Speaker, about what the Treasurer said on 22 June 1983. He said—

The government will ask the committee to quickly commence an analysis of major agencies . . .

He also said that there would be an expansion of the responsibilities of the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.

Mr Brian Burke: This was before the last Budget.

Mr MacKINNON: The question was asked in September 1984. The question that one must now ask is this: Why was the statement made by the Treasurer on 22 June 1983 that the Government would ask the committee to quickly commence an analysis of major Government agencies, when 16 months later we find that no such request has been made? Why make a statement in the first place?

Mr Brian Burke: Which committee was that?

Mr MacKINNON: The Public Accounts Committee. It seems very strange to me. We have reached number five. This is in one area.

Mr Brian Burke: Functional review.

Mr MacKINNON: We will come on to that later.

Mr Brian Burke: That is working well.

Mr MacKINNON: I will give the Treasurer credit for a little: one and a little out of five is not too good.

Mr Brian Burke: The functional review committee is still together.

Mr MacKINNON: We come on to point six, which is the establishment of a priorities and planning committee to review existing Government activities within the context of the 1983-84 Budget.

Mr Brian Burke: That committee is a subcommittee which was meeting prior to the Budget for many weeks and months.

Mr MacKINNON: Two and a bit out of six. I have yet to see any statements or results from that committee's work.

Mr Brian Burke: You will not see them.

Mr MacKINNON: Once I have received an answer from the Treasurer I hope to see some statements about what it is achieving. After all, it was a major part of his statement, a major part of the nonsense about Government's savings.

Mr Brian Burke: Mr Tonkin, Mr Bryce and myself make up the committee. It is a confidential subcommittee of Cabinet. You never published those things.

Mr MacKINNON: Obviously it is establishing very little. What has it achieved?

Mr Brian Burke: Ask the Minister for Health. We have really chopped back on some of his proposals.

Mr MacKINNON: We will be pleased to examine the Minister for Health's budget.

Mr Peter Jones: He must have asked for the moon, then.

Mr Brian Burke: Give credit where credit is due.

Mr MacKINNON: All I have seen is the establishment of a priority and planning committee without any performance.

We then go on to the most effective and accurate part of the statement made by the Treasurer on June 22 1983, which referred to pay cuts. Those cuts, as the Treasurer and I are patently aware, were very effective, and they did lead to significant savings to the Government.

Mr Brian Burke: What is the score now?

Mr MacKINNON: That is three and a bit out of seven.

Then we come to number eight—a reduction of 50 per cent in the rate at which Government employees are replaced when they retire or resign. The expected savings are \$15 million. On May 30 Cabinet suspended all new or additional staff appointments until further notice. A small staff monitoring unit has been established within the Department of Premier and Cabinet to deal with requests to the Treasurer by Ministers for exemptions from that decision.

Let us go on to see what were the results. I asked a question about the suspension of those new or additional staff appointments.

I asked: "Did the Government, on 30 May, suspend all new or additional staff appointments?" The Treasurer said, "On 30 May Cabinet suspended all new or additional staff appointments". I then asked, "If so, when was that lifted?" The answer was, "Measures were introduced to assist with difficult financial circumstances in which the State was left by our predecessors. Subsequently procedures were introduced to give greater flexibility to staff appointments".

Perhaps the Treasurer can tell us when the suspension of new or additional staff appointments was lifted by Cabinet? How long after 30 May was it?

Mr Brian Burke: When we introduced the 50 per cent rule, but I am not sure of the exact date.

Mr MacKINNON: The 50 per cent rule is not mentioned in this statement, but it was introduced subsequently.

Let us have a look at the performance. Let us go back to September 1983. This statement was made in June 1983 in answer to the member for Dale. The Premier indicated that staff levels of the Government on 30 September 1983 were 91 099. That is certainly nowhere near those at today's date. It is now 92 269; that is an increase of over 1 200.

Mr Brian Burke: Keep going. There are other figures there.

Mr MacKINNON: I have not had time to read all the answer. I apologise if I have misrepresented the Treasurer's position, but can he say that the level of Government employment has not increased over that period of time?

Mr Brian Burke: It is 2.8 per cent as compared with your 8 per cent normal. It is not true to say it has not increased, but the retention rate of potential school leavers has meant we have had to increase teachers by several hundred.

Mr MacKINNON: How does that happen with the 50 per cent replacement policy?

Mr Brian Burke: As was explained at the time, it did not apply to policemen, for example, or to teachers where ratios were maintained.

Mr MacKINNON: The 50 per cent replacement policy which the Treasurer was talking about was included in this statement. The Treasurer is talking about new and additional staff appointments in the same statement. He is talking about the 50 per cent replacement policy. I quote—

Mr Burke said a continuing total freeze on staff and non replacement of those who leave would lead to some breakdown in non essential services. The Government's advice for a cut of 50 per cent in replacement rate was practical.

The cut of 50 per cent has certainly not achieved the desired result if we consider the large increase in employment I have just quoted.

Mr Brian Burke: It has been very effective.

Mr MacKINNON: I do not think it has been all that effective with the large increase in the rate of employment. I shall analyse those figures in detail later.

Mr Brian Burke: You should have done that before you made your speech.

Mr MacKINNON: We would have done so had we had the answers to the questions. The member for Dale's question was submitted on 26 September, and we received the answer today.

almost a month later. Unfortunately we did not have the information.

Mr Brian Burke: There is a lot of work in that answer.

Mr MacKINNON: It is strange that last year we had the answer to that question within days. This year we cannot, despite a massive increase in staff in the Treasury and in the Treasurer's own department.

Mr Brian Burke: The 50 per cent replacement rule means everyone is working harder.

Mr MacKINNON: Not in the department which compiled the answer.

Mr Brian Burke: I will tell you the absolute truth. It took us 19 days to work out what the question meant, because the member for Dale is very difficult to follow.

Mr MacKINNON: I doubt that very much.

We go on to point nine—a reduction of 20 per cent in sitting fees for members of Government boards to save \$170 000. I guess that was achieved. That is a saving of \$170 000 in \$29 million. What is that as a percentage of the total? Very little.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKINNON: The next point concerns a new management system for Government motor vehicles. I am pleased to see once again that the Premier answered a question on 18 October about that, giving a qualified, detailed answer as to how those cost measures were arrived at. The answer to that question was that the containment and pooling measures resulted in an estimated saving of \$2.1 million.

Mr Brian Burke: What is the score now?

Mr MacKINNON: I think it is five and a bit out of 10.

Mr Brian Burke: It is a pass!

Mr MacKINNON: A very poor pass, in my estimation. When I was at school I always tried to achieve A's.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKINNON: I did not always succeed, but I tried. I thought that the Premier would take seriously the questions that I have raised this evening; let me repeat some of them.

Take the role of the Auditor General and efficiency audits. I take efficiency audits very seriously, as I do internal audits. I do not think they can be receiving very good treatment if the staff of the Auditor General is to be reduced in actual terms, and his budget has been reduced in real terms. I take very seriously the introduction of programme and performance budgeting, as I guess

the Treasurer did in June last year when he made a statement. Perhaps he has changed his mind since then.

I take very seriously the question of Government Stores, as I guess the Treasurer does, because he has made an allocation to that area.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKINNON: To be fair, Mr Treasurer, give credit where credit is due. I have quoted quite factual statements. I am quoting the Treasurer's answers. Nothing has been pulled out of the air.

Mr Brian Burke: You are being very political.

Mr MacKINNON: How can the Treasurer call this being political? Perhaps it is the statement from which I am quoting. Perhaps it is the statement which says it is an expansion of responsibilities of the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee because the Treasurer said the Government will ask the committee to commence an analysis of major agencies.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKINNON: Nothing happened at all.

Why did the Treasurer make that statement? I went through that statement to outline clearly where the Treasurer made statements last year which he really did not believe. Had he believed them, he would have ensured what they promised was carried out. After all, he is the Treasurer. Most of those matters fall directly under his responsibility. The reason I said that is that, in his Budget speech this year, the Treasurer again made comments about Budget efficiency.

Mr Brian Burke: What about payroll tax?

Mr MacKINNON: We have supported the Government's cut in payroll tax. However, at the same time we criticise the Treasurer. He was not here earlier when I spoke about the level of Government taxes and charges, but I can repeat the figures I gave then. In fact, I have the table here which I should like to incorporate later in *Hansard* so that the Treasurer can read it at his leisure. However, I repeat that Government taxes and charges have increased by 22 per cent at a time when inflation in Western Australia has gone up by 13 per cent. Therefore, the cut in payroll tax can be seen as a very selective political exercise.

Mr Brian Burke: Do you know what you have forgotten?

Mr MacKINNON: What have I forgotten?

Mr Brian Burke: The looming deficit you left us.

Mr MacKINNON: Let me take out those figures. The \$40 million deficit which the Treasurer claimed was left by the previous Government

would reduce that figure by 0.01 per cent or maybe 0.02 per cent. Therefore, we come back to an increase in revenue of 22.1 per cent over the period of this Government rather than 22.3 per cent. That would be the case if, as the Treasurer claims—I do not agree with him—when we were in Government we left a deficit of the level of approximately \$40 million. Therefore, one can see the Treasurer's statements do not hold water.

The Treasurer's statement of 2 June 1983 did not hold water as you, Sir, saw today at a Press conference in relation to employment funding. It was clear the Treasurer's statement in last year's Budget in respect of that matter did not hold water either. Therefore, we must question very closely any statement made by this Government in relation to Government efficiency.

Let me conclude by referring to the Government's latest statements in relation to Government efficiency. Of course, I refer to the statement issued on 15 October by the Treasurer. It refers to sunset clauses—a system which enables a clause to be introduced into legislation to ensure that Government bodies are reviewed properly or extinguished after a certain period.

As you, Sir, know I have been a proponent of such clauses for quite a time. The Treasurer made a Press statement on 15 October. I will not go through the whole statement, but the first sentence reads as follows—

New statutory bodies established by the State Government will have a fixed life.

Being a person interested in Government efficiency, on 15 October I asked the Premier a question and he made a comment which in fact is made also later in this Press statement. That comment was—

Cabinet decided that sunset or review clauses will be included in the legislation establishing new statutory bodies and that the clauses should be put into the legislation governing existing bodies when amendments are made to it.

Two aspects may be mentioned about that. Why did the Treasurer say, in the very first line of his Press statement, that statutory bodies established by the Government would have fixed lives when, in his own statement and in answer to questions in Parliament, he has indicated he knows that not to be true?

In nearly all cases when legislation has come before Parliament and it has been appropriate, we have moved relevant amendments, and we shall continue to do so to hold the Treasurer true to his word. In respect of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Bill which is before us at the

present time, I give notice to the member for Kalgoorlie, or whoever is handling the legislation on behalf of the Government, that we will move an amendment to that effect.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Which amendment?

Mr MacKINNON: To insert an appropriate sunset clause in that legislation. It is easy to see where I stand, but while the Government's statements in relation to efficiency in government are laudable in their aims and objectives—and I support those aims and objectives—in reality, in almost every case, the performance of this Government in achieving those objectives has been very scant indeed.

If one wants to mark the Government out of 10, as I have endeavoured to do tonight in an objective way, the mark would be 50.02 per cent. In my terms, that is a very poor performance on the part of a Treasurer who claims to be so great, effective, and efficient in the running of the Government. Clearly that is not true.

By leave of the House, the following table was incorporated—

BURKE GOVERNMENT'S INCOME SOURCE:

	REVENUE COLLECTIONS—\$ MILLION *				
	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1982/83 — 1984/85	
				INCREASE	%
Taxation	475	585	662	187	39.4
Territorial	136	152	176	40	29.4
Law Courts	17	19	22	5	29.4
Departmental**	296	** 390	370	74	25.0
Public Utilities	258	248	267	29	11.2
Commonwealth	1 142	1 266	1 324	182	15.9
TOTAL	2 324	2 661	2 841	517	22.3

* Rounded

** Department estimates for 1983/84 inflated by one-off \$50 Million contribution by forward royalties from Argyle Diamond venture.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [8.06 p.m.]: I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments during the Budget debate on some of the subjects covered by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and others. I express sentiments similar to those expressed by our deputy leader at the beginning of his speech in respect of the direction in which Australia is heading under Labor Governments.

Mr Brian Burke: I hope you aren't going to carry on in the same political fashion as the previous speaker.

Mr COURT: This Budget is the culmination of an amazing year with Labor Governments, both State and Federal, bombarding the Australian people with the best organised propaganda machine that this country has ever seen. The media has fallen neatly into line with the Government's plan and, combined with excessive use of taxpayers' funds, with large-scale advertising in all forms through the media both State and Federal—

Mr Brian Burke: This is pure politics.

Mr COURT: —and massive direct mailing campaigns, this has had an effect on the Australian population. That effect is that the Australian people have become confused and many Australians have become disorientated within their own country. That is a matter of great concern.

In the last 18 months we have seen a number of these publicity stunts. We have seen the economic summit in the Federal sphere and locally we had a State employment summit. We remember that at the time the Minister and his adviser (Mr Woods) promised the world and it has turned out only a couple of months later that these people are non-performers in the whole field of employment. We had tripartite committees and all sorts of gimmicky things which have been established as part of the Government's machine.

Mr Gordon Hill: Are you saying the economic summit was a gimmick, too?

Mr COURT: The member can speak in this debate.

Australians expect all people to be frank with them and they want to be told the truth. However, under both these Labor Governments there has been considerable confusion and much uncertainty. We can look at the questions of land rights; lump sum superannuation; the assets test; Medicare; the uncertainty in respect of defence and visits by nuclear-powered and USA ships; the position in regard to the national anthem, immigration, and the flag; and the cosy arrangements members of the Government have with their advisers. We also have the casino. Where will it go? Will it be sited on the foreshore? When will the Government come good on that decision?

We also had the position in respect of industrial relations and the whole problem of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, where we have a generation of Australians whose children are coming into the workplace and facing terrible uncertainty. Members of my generation were fortunate when they came into the workplace, because they did so at a time of full employment.

However, that is not the case now and there is tremendous uncertainty.

We have seen this Government attack the Public Service and it has many other problems which have created this confusion and, as I mentioned, has made Australians disorientated within their own country. At the top of the list must be the land rights issue. The Treasurer has talked around and around that subject, but he will not say in honest, simple terms just what he intends to do in respect of land rights. Without doubt his policies are scaring people and Australians are wondering whether they will be unwelcome in their own country.

Never in the history of this country—

Mr I. F. Taylor: Are not Aborigines Australians?

Mr COURT: —has a Government ever taken such a racist stand on an issue. Look at industrial relations. We now have a Government which appears to be encouraging standover tactics in the workplace. We have example after example where the Government has stood back and taken no action against these sorts of tactics in the workplace. If one approaches a Minister and explains that certain union people are standing over a person and threatening his survival in a business, one is guaranteed of one thing, and that is that nothing will be done about it.

Mr Gordon Hill interjected.

Mr COURT: That is a typical sort of interjection which the Minister for Housing would usually make, not the member for Helena.

Mr Wilson: I think it is very true too.

Mr COURT: I hope the member does not resort to that sort of childish interjection, but if it makes him feel better—

Mr Wilson: You are the child.

Mr COURT: —every time he says it, let him continue to do so.

Mr Wilson: It seems to get under your skin, little boy.

Mr Terry Burke: Learn a bit off dad and then come back.

Mr COURT: After nearly three years of the same interjections I would be very disappointed if those interjections were not made. I am very pleased to see the member is back with us again.

We are guaranteed of one thing if we approach this Government to obtain assistance when

standover tactics are taking place in the workplace: Nothing will be done about it!

Mr I. F. Taylor: A rambling speech!

Mr COURT: We know of a case where a person went to see three Ministers and still got no action on the case. The whole country can be brought to a standstill because of the inactivity of those Ministers.

Mr Wilson: That is what you are hoping for.

Mr COURT: I cite another example which is taking place right now. I asked some questions of the Treasurer during question time today. He was not familiar with the case which I brought up. I would like to take this opportunity to tell the Treasurer just what is happening out there today, right now, and the lack of action which his Government is taking on this issue.

A builder, a Mr Minniti and Son, is building 13 units on Beechboro Road, Morley. What is the first thing he did when he got the order to build these units? He advertised in the newspaper for bricklayers—quite a normal procedure. He received many replies, from people wanting the job, and he went through the different people who applied and chose one. He agreed with this bricklayer that work would be done at certain rates because the bricklayer had a number of brickies working for him who would be capable of carrying out this work. They agreed on a price: there was nothing forced about it. It is the marketplace at work. There were different prices and a number of people wanting to take on this work. But they agreed to a price and the builder and the bricklayer signed a contract.

That contract stated that the subcontractor would lay face bricks for \$210 per thousand, fast wall for \$250, long ridge for \$200, and the firewall for \$200. The bricklayer started work. He gets his first payment of \$1 600 for 8 000 bricks, less the three per cent withholding tax, and the bricklayer and Mr Minniti, the builder, agreed for a second subcontractor bricklayer to work on the site. He had been there only a few days when Mr Ethell from the BWIU rolled onto the site.

Mr Old: Oh, Bill!

Mr COURT: This is a small builder. Mr Ethell told the builder that everybody working on the job would be on wages—that is, day labour—and they would be working for the bricklayer subcontractor.

Mr Peter Jones: Wait a minute. You said there was a contract.

Mr COURT: Yes, there was a contract, but that seemed to be irrelevant in this case. He said if they were not working on wages for the subbie

they would be working on wages for the builder himself.

Here is a builder who has a legal contract with a bricklayer to do the work and all of a sudden Mr Ethell walks on site saying, "I am sorry. You now have to put these people on wages". What happened then? Mr Ethell sent everybody home. Mr Ethell told the brickies that Mr Minniti, the builder, would pay their wages while this dispute was being resolved. What dispute? It is a created dispute. The bricklayers were on the job happily doing the work for a voluntarily agreed upon contract price, and all of a sudden Mr Ethell came on site and everyone was sent home.

On the Thursday Mr Ethell had a meeting on site with the brickies from which Mr Minniti, the builder, was excluded. The builder was in a helpless situation. He contacted the member for Perth, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Cabinet, the Premier's brother, and explained the situation. The member for Perth contacted Tom Butler, the Premier's adviser on industrial relations. Mr Butler went onto the site and met with Mr Ethell and the subcontractor and they began quoting high figures for laying the bricks, \$400 a thousand instead of the \$250 agreed upon, and they started discussing site allowances and other issues. At lunchtime Mr Minniti went to the Premier's office and picked up Mr Butler from the CML Building. He took Mr Butler across to the BWIU office in Beaufort Street. I am giving members all the details so they understand what a small businessman has to go through when he is put under pressure from the BWIU.

Mr Wilson: From whom did you get these details?

Mr COURT: From the builder, Mr Minniti. He has been to the Press. He is in a helpless situation in this case. He cannot win.

Mr MacKinnon: He has nothing to lose.

Mr COURT: They went to the BWIU office at 1.30 p.m. on Thursday and had a meeting with Mr Ethell and Mr Butler. Mr Minniti did not say a great deal and he was asked to leave for 10 minutes while private discussions between Mr Butler and the union ensued. Mr Butler said, "All is fixed". Mr Minniti took him back to the Premier's office. That was the understatement of the day. That was last week.

What happened this week? On Monday the brickies were on site, playing tennis. On Tuesday they were on site playing soccer. Mr Ethell was still saying that the builder would pay their wages. Members can imagine how the wages bill for all these people would be building up.

Mr Peter Jones: For their tennis and soccer.

Mr COURT: That is right. Now the heavies are on the site, as has been reported, and it has become a very upsetting situation. This poor builder has been building homes here for many years and previously he has never had to work under this sort of pressure or under these threats. How would any of us like it if we had to endure the experience which he is going through now? He is very concerned and he is certainly very upset about his family because he, of course, has to work to provide for them. I am sure everyone in this House would agree that that sort of threat hanging over one's head is very serious.

Mr Coyne: Is his wife under any pressure yet?

Mr COURT: His wife is not under pressure from the unionists, but is under indirect pressure. She is very upset about the matter, as is the builder himself, and that is understandable. The builder has tried to contact the Premier. He rang him at home but he was not available, which is quite understandable. He rang up the office and he was told to write to him and the Premier would arrange an appointment with him. That is fair enough, but this matter is quite urgent. The Premier's adviser, Mr Butler, is heavily involved in the case anyway and, as we know, there has not been much effect.

To me this is a classic case of what we are reading about in the newspapers every day in regard to the kind of tactics being used in the building industry.

Mr Gordon Hill: We don't read about them every day.

Mr COURT: Look, in recent weeks a number of cases have been in the courts actually resulting in convictions for similar types of tactics being used on building sites.

Mr Brian Burke: You are just being political.

Mr COURT: The sad thing about this case is that the Government has been fully informed. I do not expect the Premier to be fully informed about everything that has taken place, but his adviser on industrial relations is heavily involved in this case. It surprises me that quicker action has not been taken to try to bring a resolution of this matter. It has been dragging on for some time now. The pressure under which this builder is working is immense and of course this action costs everyone money. In no way will the builder pay the Federal award for these people when they are not working. He has a contract with a certain subcontractor bricklayer to lay the bricks.

This is a very concerning matter. Tomorrow the shadow Minister and myself will visit this site to view the situation at first hand and to see what this builder has to put up with. That is one

example that I have collected of a builder; the member for Helena might interject and say that it is not happening all the time, but it is. It is not happening just in the building industry, but that is the one we hear the most of. The people concerned in that industry seem to be the most bold about carrying out these activities. However, this is happening across the board in a number of industries. We can name any industry in which subcontractors are working and there is a push for the subcontractors to be wiped out.

This is being done with the help of the Government. To give one example, the clothing industry is where the next push to wipe out the subcontractors will take place. When the Government introduced its industrial relations legislation at the end of last year it was determined to get through the provision to classify subcontractors as employees and bring them under the control of the legislation. That Bill was defeated and the Government is now using other means to achieve the same thing.

We must all agree that the subcontract system in any industry is the basis of an efficient free enterprise operation. I repeat the comment that the Government in this State is determined to work with militant unionists to wipe out the subcontracting system in a number of industries. If a small businessman approaches a Government Minister, that small businessman can be assured of one thing; that is, he will not be given assistance in a case where these standover tactics are used. There is no protection for the employers and little protection for some of the employees under this Government.

While on the subject of industrial relations, I refer to the concept of voluntary employment contracts introduced by the Opposition in the other House. This was automatically rejected by the Government and the TLC although small businesses and many of their employees fully support that concept. It is a concept which they have developed and they would very much like to see it incorporated within the existing arbitration system. However, instead of discussing the matter rationally, it has been thrown out.

Mr Brian Burke: The Confederation of Western Australian Industry does not support the concept.

Mr COURT: It does support the concept of factory employment contracts. We will have a lot more to say about that when we are debating the industrial relations legislation in this House.

Returning to the Budget, I would like to make more detailed comments on the areas of small business and technology. When going through the Budget estimates I suppose one of my main con-

cerns is in the field of technology. The Minister has been very effective in establishing a very ineffective technology bureaucracy and I will be asking many questions of him to obtain his explanation of what he is trying to achieve in that particular area.

Mr Brian Burke: Will you be constructive?

Mr Bryce: What a cheek you have! You do not know what you are talking about, you wimp.

Mr COURT: I would also like to thank the Government for a couple of things it has provided which are certainly of great assistance to my electorate.

The first is the funding to be spent on the Hollywood Senior High School. This is one of the older and more established high schools in Western Australia and in recent years some of its facilities have become a little antiquated for the projects carried out, particularly in the field of computer studies and also in relation to arts, dramas, music and dance. For some years the school has had temporary classrooms in many cases and the Government this year has agreed to a spending programme which will see the development of this school by getting rid of the demountable rooms and putting in new facilities to enable the arts and dance and music classes to have better facilities. Funds have also been provided for the computer studies facilities to be upgraded.

One of the big problems for a school like Hollywood is that it is located on a very small site and it is very difficult to put in many new facilities. As far as sporting facilities are concerned, the school must rely on facilities nearby.

I was very interested to find that some funding has been given to the Subiaco City Council for the senior citizens' centre in Osborne Park. I am not too sure whether the Government has assured the Subiaco City Council of the money it was asking for. The Minister for Health might be able to interject there. He answered a question last week about funding for the Shenton Park senior citizens' home. I understand it received that funding and that is appreciated. The Subiaco City Council spent the money and built a facility and again I must say that I appreciate the fact that it is to be given that money.

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that this Government is seen by many people and certainly seen by the small business people in this State, as being a very extravagant Government. It is extravagant from the top down. It is a Government which likes flash offices, flash cars, advisers and campus creeps, or whatever Mr Coates called them. It spends money on wasteful propaganda, and in many cases it should be setting a far better

example. It seems to have the impression that there are plenty of dollars coming in from the taxpayers and does not realise that things are still very tough in the private sector. The private sector is going through difficult times, as is the agricultural sector. The Government should set examples instead of showing massive increases in expenditure in the Department of Premier and Cabinet! This does not go down very well with the business community. Even in the Deputy Premier's area, lobbying groups in the private sector in this community are conscious of how much the Government is spending on the Small Business Development Corporation. There is a group of small business people who watch the department to make sure that it does not spend too much money and expand the bureaucracy. I will comment further on that when we debate the Small Business Guarantees Bill.

Mr Bryce: I think you are becoming a nark. I do not think you like to see things happen for the good—

Mr COURT: I made a simple statement about not wanting to see waste coming out of the Government. The Minister would have to agree with that.

Mr Bryce: Nobody likes waste of any sort.

Mr COURT: In business, when one starts seeing bit of extravagance at the top one finds it flows through the whole operation. I think it is called "organisational slack".

The Labor Governments, as I mentioned at the beginning of my talk, are confusing Australians. Their propaganda machine, which is in full flight, is confusing Australians and making Australians disorientated within their own country. Members cannot deny that.

Mr Wilson: You don't have a very high opinion of Australians.

Mr COURT: I have a very high opinion of Australians and I am sure that Government members are being told in their travels that people are concerned about what the Government is doing. The Government cannot tell me that the land rights policy it advocates, is being understood by the public. They are scared stiff.

Mrs Buchanan: That is scaremongering.

Mr COURT: It is not scaremongering.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Nedlands.

Mr COURT: I quite enjoy it when the Minister for Welshpool—

Mr I. F. Taylor: The Minister for Welshpool! You mean the member for Welshpool.

Mr COURT: I mean the member for Welshpool.

Mr Jamieson: I have a ministry at last!

Mr COURT: With a little practice the member for Welshpool will get there.

Several members interjected.

Mrs Buchanan: I enjoy the member for Welshpool's interjections because they make some sense of the speeches that are made.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: I know that many people are becoming fearful in many ways because they believe there is a possibility that they will lose control over their own country and that they will lose some of their much-valued freedom. Members of the Government may laugh about that.

Mr Gordon Hill: I am laughing at it, it is absolute garbage.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: I explained tonight how a simple businessman is being stood over and the Government is standing back doing nothing; it is saying that the man is not being deprived of his freedom. How can Government members sit there and say that that is right? How would they like to be told when they arrive at Parliament House tomorrow that they cannot enter the building?

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: When I said that Australians—

Mr Bryce: You should have heard some of the tactics used by the former member for Nedlands when he rigged the electoral boundaries of his State. He said, "Cop this sweet!"

Several members interjected.

Mr Bryce: That is exactly what he said, "Cop this sweet". He was like a big standover bully.

Mr Blaikie: You talk about standover tactics. You need a soap box.

Mr COURT: Australians are concerned about losing their much-valued freedom. There are some serious concerns in the community that the Government should not ignore. With regard to the way in which the Deputy Premier has performed over the past few years, I know how he performs. He would have to go down as the greatest and least successful mud thrower of all times.

Mr Bryce: Is that so? You are not doing too well yourself as a statesman in the making, are you?

Mr COURT: Does the Deputy Premier call it mud throwing when I bring up a simple case of a

small businessman who is not getting any support from this Government?

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: I will bring up one of these cases every day and the Government will have to start doing something about them.

Mr Bryce interjected.

Mr COURT: I have been at the receiving end of the Deputy Premier's pretty weak attempts, as have members of the public.

I get back to the point I was making.

Several members interjected.

Mr Trethowan: Standover tactics are being used in the building industry.

Mr COURT: Not only in the building industry, but also in many industries. The unions have been able to move in and push for membership.

Mr Bryce: The words are the same, but the music is about the 1930s.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: The big problem with Labor Governments is that they always end up scaring the pants off the Australian public and the current Labor Governments, both in this State and Federally, are doing just that.

Several members interjected.

Mr Bryce: Is that the end?

MRS BUCHANAN (Pilbara) [8.36 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to make a contribution to the Budget debate, and I would hope it is rather less gloomy than the pictures painted by some of the Opposition members in their contributions.

The State Labor Government is showing that it has the capability to maintain the State's contribution towards the recovery from the recessionary influences that were apparent in the early part of this decade and that it also has the capability to come up with a balanced Budget. Part of the overall strategy of the Government is to lessen the burden placed on businesses and also families by holding down the rate of growth of taxes and charges. It has not been easy and it has meant that some strict financial disciplines have been necessary.

Several members interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: Nevertheless, the Government has taken this initiative which is seen as a most significant and practical means by which it can fulfil the commitment to the national prices and income accord and thereby help to foster the continued economic recovery.

Mr Blaikie: Will it help to bring prices down in the Pilbara?

Mrs BUCHANAN: I will tell the member for Vasse about that later.

Mr Blaikie: Good.

Mrs BUCHANAN: The trade union demonstration of discipline in respect of the accord is also a matter that has contributed towards that recovery and is to be highly commended.

The Pilbara has fared extremely well under this Budget.

Mr Old: Especially in prices in the supermarket.

Mrs BUCHANAN: Is that all the member for Katanning-Roe can talk about?

With the upsurge of development in the north it is pleasing to see that the Government has considered the associated needs of people in my electorate. The reduction in the rate of payroll tax is one of the most significant things that small business, in particular, has welcomed in the Pilbara.

Several members interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: Members opposite can snigger—

Mr Old: What is the gross take of payroll tax?

Mrs BUCHANAN: —and carry on, but as a matter of fact I attended a Pilbara regional development meeting in Onslow and that meeting passed a motion of congratulations to the Government for reducing a somewhat iniquitous tax.

Several members interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: It certainly raised the Government's credibility in that area.

Mr Old: I bet it did!

Mrs BUCHANAN: I am trying to compete with a lot of braying donkeys. I sat in silence and listened to some of the ridiculous comments of members opposite. However, I hope that I can stop the braying of members opposite long enough in order that I may contribute to the Budget debate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Several members interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: The Pilbara regional development committee has recognised that while it is only a moderate reduction in payroll tax it is an important step and it is an indication of the sincerity of the Government's effort towards an eventual significant real reduction in that tax, given that this is not a State election year.

Mr Old: Does there have to be more in an election year?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Pilbara is probably the only member in the House

who never interjects on speeches made by other members at the rate demonstrated here tonight. As a matter of courtesy the members should respond accordingly when the member for Pilbara is making her speech.

Mrs BUCHANAN: Thank you for your remarks and your protection. Mr Speaker. I was about to say before I was so rudely interrupted that in the Budget, expenditure applicable to the Pilbara energy related developments continues to dominate the spending with a massive allocation of \$262.1 million on further works on the gas pipeline. That is the largest item in the State Energy Commission's works programme.

Mr Rushton: Who put it there?

Mrs BUCHANAN: A great deal of money must still be allocated to continue the work. I am glad that the member recognises that it should be there.

Mr Burkett: The member for Dale should show the member for Pilbara the compassion that he showed in local government.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mrs BUCHANAN: The State Energy Commission programme also includes the construction of gas laterals at various locations, including one to the Hamersley Iron operation and also completion of the Cape Lambert lateral which will greatly reduce the Pilbara's dependence on fuel oil for generating electricity. Power supplies to Karratha, Roebourne, Dampier, Point Samson, and Wickham, will now be generated by gas fired appliances.

Work will continue on the overall power grid in the area. The system is expected to be completed in the next 12 months. It includes the Cape Lambert to Port Hedland transmission line and also the new terminal at Port Hedland.

Mr Peter Jones: All works that I started.

Mrs BUCHANAN: Yes, they are continuing. Other major items in the capital works programme in the Pilbara include a large allocation for continuing work on the Harding River Dam. An amount of \$13.8 million has been approved. This has become necessary to provide extra capacity to meet additional demands from industrial and domestic areas in the adjacent towns, which at the moment depend on the Millstream supply.

The demand for water is a matter for some concern and I know that the Minister for Water Resources is looking very closely at water consumption in some of the Pilbara towns. He is also concerned at the need to conserve this precious commodity and I know he has some extremely good plans for the area in this respect. I commend

his work and I also commend the Public Works Department for its efforts to promote water conservation in the Pilbara. The Public Works Department has mounted exhibits at various festivals throughout the area and its water conservation float was successful in taking the first prize in the recent FeNaCl Festival competition.

Mr Mensaros: Almost two years ago your colleague was 100 per cent against this development.

Mrs BUCHANAN: There was good reason for that opposition, but as the dam had already commenced when this Government took office, it has proceeded accordingly.

I refer now to water conservation in the Pilbara.

Mr Spriggs interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: How could the Government oppose something that was constructed and in place?

Mr Spriggs interjected.

Mrs BUCHANAN: That would be ridiculous when thousands of dollars have been spent on the dam. It would be irresponsible for any member to oppose it in the Budget. I would have expected better from the member for Darling Range.

To get back to water conservation in my area, I have to say that my home town of Wickham has a very poor record. In fact, we are guilty of using a great deal of water. People in that town are keen gardeners and it is difficult to produce green lawns and shrubbery in that arid area without using quantities of water. The results were evident following the passage of cyclone "Chloe" earlier this year. Trees in the town toppled over like ninepins because they had surface root systems rather than deep tap roots which help to anchor trees when there is such a storm. I was pleased to see the reaction of the Cliffs Robe River company in recognising the overuse of water in the town. It has produced an extremely informative pamphlet which has been distributed in the area. Among other things it advocates the installation of low water-use gardens. The Department of Conservation and Environment Officer, Mr Chas Nicholson, has also put in some excellent work in this regard in promoting the installation of low water-use gardens and encouraging the residents in the area to conserve water. I commend his efforts.

In the area of education, facilities in the Pilbara continue to be treated as a very high priority. The main allocation this year has been for extensions and additions to both independent colleges at Karratha and Port Hedland. I am particularly pleased that both colleges will be provided with student residences which are much needed. They

will provide better access to the colleges from students in inland towns. Therefore, the colleges will be better able to serve much wider areas once the residences are constructed. Karratha College will also get a new administration and technology building, an auditorium and student amenity buildings, which are long overdue.

Improvements to the Roebourne Primary School will cost \$87 000, and for the Wickham High School \$49 000. That was welcome news on the education side in my electorate. Most of the Pilbara communities still need to stabilise their populations. The Government's commitment in respect of education facilities is a major factor in encouraging people to stay in the north. We have far better facilities now than ever before.

The other improved area with regard to stabilising the district is in the provision of housing. The large injection of funds into the construction of new housing in my area fulfils our pre-election promise. The allocation of \$186.9 million from this Budget has given the highest ever priority to the housing needs of low and moderate income earners in the State. Of the 740 new homes to be constructed for State housing in country and northern areas, I am pleased that a total of 135 units will be constructed in my area. I am extremely delighted with that.

One of the most innovative initiatives which has come to light in this Budget is the proposed establishment of seven regional community houses. This is a totally new concept and one of those facilities will be placed in South Hedland in my electorate. This is much needed and will fill a gap in the provision of child care services in the area.

The community houses are being planned as multi-purpose buildings, and they will be put to a wide variety of uses by a number of community groups. I am pleased to have one of the community houses in my electorate.

I am also pleased to see a further allocation towards the upgrading of the Hardie House hostel in South Hedland. I had the opportunity recently of visiting that establishment, and the new dormitory furniture which has been put into place so far has made a world of difference to the amenities provided for the students. Members may recall a concern expressed by me and the member for Kimberley last year when the future of the Hardie House hostel was in doubt following the withdrawal of funding by Goldsworthy Mining Ltd. I am pleased that the Government has taken over the responsibility for the running of that facility, and has given an assurance that the hostel will keep running for as long as it is needed. The Government is continuing a programme of

upgrading the facility. I take the opportunity to thank the Minister for Education, although he is not present in the House, for his great assistance on this issue.

For some time, I have been concerned about the Government office space in Karratha. In particular, I have been concerned about the offices of the Department of Conservation and Environment, the National Parks Authority, and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, which have been housed together. The staff have been trying to operate under extremely cramped and difficult conditions. They are a dedicated group of people, and they have a very large responsibility in looking after a very large piece of country, which includes ecologically sensitive areas such as the Millstream reserve, the Hamersley Range, and the magnificent Dampier Archipelago. Therefore, I am very happy to find that the required \$2 million for new offices in Karratha has been allocated in this Budget, and this will greatly relieve the situation and enable the officers to work far more comfortably.

I am privileged indeed to represent an area which produces much of the State's wealth. I feel very much a part of the tremendous development that is taking place and will take place in my electorate. As well as Government efforts to turn the economy around, prospects in the Pilbara are bright, with the second stage of the North-West Shelf gas project just around the corner; a feasibility study to be jointly undertaken by Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. and Chinese interests, with the possible outcome being an expansion of Hamersley's operations; the deepening of the harbour at Port Hedland to permit the entry of large ore carriers; and the announcement recently by Mt. Newman Mining Co. Ltd. that it has secured a long-term contract to sell 150 000 tonnes of iron ore a year to Malaysia.

While that may sound a comparatively small tonnage, it is an indication that the companies are starting to diversify and tap into new markets. That augurs well for the future.

At the same time, in recent months we have seen the formation of the Pilbara Iron Ore Consultative Council, which is a tripartite council. I understand that, following the Minister's recent visit to Karratha, the wheels are now in motion to establish a secretariat in the Pilbara to get the council under way. While I do not expect this will provide an overnight solution to the industrial problems of the past, it certainly represents a major step forward in industrial relations in the iron ore industry. That move is very welcome.

In the mail today I received a very welcome invitation to attend the official launching of the East-West Airlines services in the north of Western Australia. No doubt other members have also received invitations. I will be very pleased to see the commencement of a second airline in my area. This follows another initiative by the Government in breaking the one-airline monopoly on northern runs. The people in my electorate are looking forward with great enthusiasm to having alternative flight schedules and to seeing competition which, undoubtedly, will have great benefits for the residents.

Mr Blaikie: That is a very important comment. East-West Airlines will make an important contribution to the north. There is no doubt that competition is the key to good government.

Mrs BUCHANAN: I thank the member for his comment.

Mr Peter Jones: Has a timetable been published yet?

Mrs BUCHANAN: Not as far as I am aware. The launching in Perth takes place on 31 October, and there will be a function in the Pilbara on 1 November. I understand the inaugural flight will take place on 28 or 29 November.

Mr Blaikie: We have had a fair bit of association with the company in the south-west. It is an excellent company.

Mr Peter Jones: They will be flying a link through Yulara, near Ayers Rock. That is how it will be done.

Mrs BUCHANAN: I am optimistic about the future of the Pilbara. It is an important area of the State, and it is gratifying to know that the Government is keeping abreast of the all-important developments in terms of Government services and assistance provided.

This is not an election year for the Burke Government, and therefore this Budget cannot be said to be aimed at vote catching. It is a determined and carefully thought out Budget. Despite the introduction of tax cuts and the holding down of charges, the accounts are in balance. Therefore, the Government's commitment to responsible financial management is maintained.

The State is poised for a new surge of economic growth in the last half of this decade, and the Pilbara will certainly be right up in the front, continuing to play a major role in development. The confidence of the people in the Australian Labor Party was shown when they elected this Government; and that confidence has been vindicated by sound management, by responsible

policies, and by the associated economic recovery now evident in the State and Australia as a whole.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [8.58 p.m.]: Like most similar documents or sets of papers, the Budget papers hide the warts and bring out the shiny bits. However, they reveal the state of finances in Western Australia, and they contain more than the matters on which comments have been made tonight by various members regarding the funds to be expended in their own electorates for different purposes.

I will spend a few moments talking about the deficits currently being experienced in transport, and within Westrail in particular. I will not go into the matter in great detail, because we will do that in due course when we deal with the Estimates in Committee. However, the largest public deficit in the present Budget relates to Westrail, and the situation should be explained clearly by the Government. It should tell us how it sees the future of Westrail.

Despite the document put out by Westrail regarding its future, and despite the answers to various questions and the comments made by the Minister from time to time, we still do not have a very detailed assessment of how the Government sees the future of Westrail, and not just in the financial terms which flow from the operational role of Westrail.

When I pursued this with the Minister, particularly the ambitions Westrail has detailed within the document published last May, he made it clear that that did not represent a Government decision. That is the way I understood it to be. It simply represents an assessment by Westrail of the various options it has before it, the various investments and pursuits which it can follow and which in its view will lead to a more efficient and more economically viable transport system.

I am saying "transport system" as distinct from "railway system" because the document makes it clear that in Westrail's opinion it will need to move into other areas of transport operations in order to become economically viable.

The Minister has made it clear—which is fair enough—that the document does not represent the result of any Government decision or any concrete initiative taken by the Government to be pursued by Westrail in the coming years. I accept that the Minister has made it clear that that is the Government's view. However, within Westrail at a divisional level we have a situation where officers are writing letters which make it clear that Westrail is going to pursue certain initiatives. In other words, at the operational level statements are being made which are quite contrary to what the Minister has

said in this Parliament and quite contrary to what the general understanding is of Westrail's intentions and the status of its so-called corporate plan.

I wonder when the Minister will decide that he cannot have it both ways. As a member representing a country electorate, I received a letter from the regional traffic manager covering my electorate, and he made it clear that Westrail was intending to move into road transport and other transport modes in order to become a complete transport operator and, in his terms, to become more commercially viable. In other words, Westrail was planning to move contrary to the information provided by the Minister.

It is no secret that this is Westrail's ambition. It is an ambition that the Opposition completely opposes.

But how can we have a situation where almost by stealth Westrail should be seeking to impose its ambitions upon the WA community in a way which is not supported—according to the Minister—by the Government and which is not the result of any Government decision?

Mr Grill: We said that we had not made a decision.

Mr PETER JONES: I am not being critical of the Government or the Minister: I am simply saying that the community accepts and I accept that the Government has not made a decision, although Westrail has sent out letters indicating its intention to become a road transport operator. This letter is dated last June.

Mr Rushton: Legislation is coming forward.

Mr PETER JONES: Yes, legislation has been foreshadowed. I accept what the Minister told me in Parliament in answer to a question when I asked him specifically whether this represented Government policy or Government decision-making. He made it clear—and I accepted—that the Government had made no decision. The simple question that arises out of all this is: Is the transport system in this State controlled by the Government or by Westrail? Does the Government—that is, the Minister—really know what Westrail is doing or saying or planning or introducing?

Mr Grill: I have to make something clear: I said about the document "Commercialisation of Westrail" and about the document "A Five Year Corporate Plan" that the Government had made no decision on the overall policy. However, in respect of the question of Westrail's moving into other forms of transport, I have indicated that the Government would not object to Westrail's moving into conveyor belts, pipelines and road

transport where we considered it appropriate. I have said that publicly.

Mr PETER JONES: We now have the authoritative statement from the Minister that the Government's intention is to support Westrail's move into road transport where, in the Minister's words, it is considered appropriate.

Mr Grill: In the past your Government has thought it appropriate.

Mr PETER JONES: To do what?

Mr Grill: To allow Westrail to move into road transport.

Mr PETER JONES: I accept that. Is the Minister referring to Total West?

Mr Grill: Yes, and also to the cartage of ilmenite sand.

Mr PETER JONES: But that is a specific operation; it is like the operation in the Minister's electorate where Westrail had the contract to carry gypsum. These are specific, single purpose, dedicated transport situations; but I am talking about the entitlement Westrail wants to pursue, when now it seems that if the Government considers it appropriate it will permit Westrail to tender for a whole range of road operations. We know it wants to go into trucks, and the Minister has said that it has trucks in mothballs and that those trucks can be brought out to assist in Westrail's operations.

Mr Grill: They can now be sold off.

Mr PETER JONES: I hope the Minister is not agreeing to sell them off because they are last year's models and he is wanting new ones.

Mr Rushton: The Government is saying that Westrail can go into the trucking business.

Mr Grill: It is already into the trucking business.

Mr PETER JONES: It seems that Westrail is in the trucking business on the basis that the Government is seeking to expand Westrail's operations "where appropriate", or at least where Westrail is seeking to go into those operations and the Government supports it.

I make it clear that the Opposition completely opposes any move by Westrail to expand into road operations, especially where this intrusion by Westrail will jeopardise the operations of existing private sector operators who are conducting businesses in this area.

To the Minister's credit he has partially helped resolve a situation in the southern grain transport area this year; but he put off the evil day only to some degree, because he cannot avoid the fact that considerable private sector money has been put

into trucks, men, equipment, and facilities, to build up services which have now been placed in jeopardy by Westrail.

In this Chamber I asked the Minister: Would he control Westrail's advertising and blackmailing, especially in relation to the lakes district transport, particularly the grain freight transport, and the so-called southern transport area? The Minister said, "No, Westrail is handling that and it is a commercial operation. I do not want to buy into it. I want to remain at arm's length".

He was really saying that the Government was prepared to shut its eyes and allow a Government instrumentality to place in jeopardy the funds, the jobs, and the investment of private operators who have provided a service, in the case of the southern transport free zone, for something like 20 years.

Mr Watt: For 27 years.

Mr PETER JONES: The services which have been provided for 27 years have been placed in jeopardy by a Government instrumentality.

Mr Grill: You have to be fair. I said that I would not interfere unless it jeopardised these sorts of operations, and as it turned out I instituted the Taplin inquiry, which came down with recommendations acceptable to most people. But I did make that exception.

Mr PETER JONES: I am not disputing that the Minister did not do those things in the end, but how much pressure had to be put on the Minister before he did? How many people in Albany had to wait to see whether their jobs would be saved? Southern Transport Pty. Ltd. is interested in buying additional equipment for the harvest which will be 25 to 30 per cent more this year in the area it serves. It could not make a commitment until the answer was given. Meanwhile, the henchmen from Westrail were still placing advertisements in the Press to ensure that what they were seeking was applied.

No-one is criticising the cost saving exercise: the Minister will be well aware that I have not criticised it in anyway. Indeed, I supported it when the member for Dale was exercising considerable effort to reduce employment in Westrail, to effect cost savings. No-one on this side is disputing the need to make Westrail into an efficient, economic, and viable railway operator. That is what it is now.

The member for Dale refers to it as a "specialist bulk freight railway carrier". It was the ambition of the previous Government that it specialise in the handling of bulk products such as fertilisers, grain, coal, and some minerals under various agreement Acts, as well as other goods. It is a specialist bulk freight railway operator today.

The Opposition does not criticise in any way the movement towards that, as the Minister would be well aware, but it has meant that, over a period Westrail will be reducing staffing in the town I represent by some 118 jobs. My criticism of that is not that it is seeking to be more efficient, by easing out that number of jobs, but the way it has gone about it.

Members of Westrail staff were not told what their employment position would be. The public relations of Westrail were abysmal. Indeed, they were so bad that we reached the stage where the Minister agreed in this House that something had to be done about it.

Mr Burkett: Was that when you were in Government?

Mr PETER JONES: Will I repeat that? It was just a few weeks ago.

The point is that with the exercise of a diminution of staffing in the great southern, some local people in Westrail, despite the hindrance and frustration they have had to experience, even at the very top level, have gone to no end of trouble to anticipate the situation to ensure that employees faced with relocation, job loss, or whatever else applied to their branch or division in Westrail, could be moved into other areas of Westrail. Mr McClure and his staff in the great southern region have done a tremendous job at a local level, despite the fact they have at some times worked with one hand tied behind their back.

Mr Grill: On that particular move: I think you probably can see that Westrail came down with a very attractive package of incentives for people who have had to move out.

Mr PETER JONES: Absolutely! They were spreading our money around as though it was going out of fashion!

Mr Grill: Men have been treated fairly, haven't they?

Mr Old: People in Katanning have gone out with nothing. Guys who have been there for 20 years are going away with nothing but the dole.

Mr Grill: Have you seen the relocation package? The purchase of properties package?

Mr Old: You show me where these people have gone.

Mr PETER JONES: I assumed the Minister was referring to that package where they attempted to buy people.

Mr Grill: Yes.

Mr PETER JONES: That one certainly was attractive for those who qualified. One or two people in Narrogin received considerable amounts,

but as the member for Katanning-Roe has said, some people received very little. They were forced to accept relocation rather than take what was a considerably lower offer than could otherwise have been the case.

Mr Grill: All I am saying is that men down there were treated very fairly. It was a generous package.

Mr PETER JONES: The point I was making about the men and the job was this: The public relations of Westrail was abysmal and the Minister acknowledged that. Secondly, if it were not for the great work done at a local level by Westrail officers, there would have been far more public criticism than there was. They have done a considerable job.

Members who have Westrail operations in their electorates receive letters, from time to time, stating that sidings will be closed. For the most part, members have accepted the fact that when the figures are looked at in the long term those sidings are often not operational. Unfortunately there has been a reduction in the operation of sidings and we have the situation again where Westrail does not seem to let its left hand know what its right hand is doing.

Such a letter was received in my electorate the other day, asking the normal questions and giving tonnages for the last few years. The local shire was asked to make some comments, because it was proposed to close the siding. I asked the local shire to make some comments about it also, only to be told that Westrail had just spent a considerable amount of money on that siding to put in new points. I was told by the local engineer that it was done at a considerable expense. Within a few weeks of the works being finished it was decided to close the siding and the process of notifying people was commenced.

Surely an organisation which is trying to be more efficient and more economically viable should operate its organisation better than that.

Mr Grill: If you give me the details—

Mr PETER JONES: It has all been taken care of. That was the situation which took place, even to the point of hurrying up the works, where overtime was paid. I am making the point that that is an example where there has to be some improvement in the organisational structure and liaison between various parts of Westrail.

No-one is criticising the effort to be more efficient. However, money was spent on a siding and within a few weeks it was decided to close it. I am told by the people in the division that these points will be taken out again and relocated somewhere else.

Mr Grill: They do swap equipment around a bit.

Mr PETER JONES: Yes, but this does not happen for nothing.

We have a situation at the operational level where works are undertaken and somehow or other there does not seem to be much liaison. One of the other initiatives that the Government indicated that Westrail would pursue in the future for economic viability are new business ventures, and, specifically, joint ventures. Some months ago there was a nice little note in the Press regarding a joint venture with Quarry Industries which involved the use of rolling stock iron ore wagons—those wagons that were no longer needed for the iron ore coming to Kwinana from Koolyanobbing—and also the utilisation of some land at Kewdale. In pursuing that and in discussing it with some of those involved, it became quite clear that Westrail had not done its sums and that it seemed to be the kind of joint venture in which anybody with an eye for business would not really become involved.

However, time went by. In keeping in touch with what was going on, certain facts became obvious. It began to emerge that it was not, by any manner of means, the attractive proposition that we were all led to believe, so much so that we now have information from the Minister that Westrail has entered a joint venture on a 50-50 basis with Quarry Industries and has formed a company called Western Quarries Pty. Ltd. We were advised that Westrail is putting \$3.68 million into that joint venture. It put in a little bit in the last financial year and the bulk of the allocation is being made from this Budget.

The return to Westrail over the next five years, according to the Minister, will amount to \$2.75 million. What sort of deal is that to base the economic future of Westrail on? If that is an example of its economic efficiency in forward planning, there are problems ahead. How can one spend \$3.6 million and get back only \$2.75 million over the next five years?

The joint venture also includes work to be undertaken in the Midland Workshops. I have asked the Minister some questions relative to that because, far from utilising rolling stock that was no longer required on the Koolyanobbing-Kwinana railroad, considerable fabricating work has to take place to alter the wagons and to redesign them so that they are bottom-discharge.

The Minister refuses to give us the cost of that exercise. However, he has said that that work will be carried out at the Midland Workshops. He has told us that other fabricating works related to the joint venture will be done at the Midland Work-

shops. He mentioned also that it is being done at the workshops because the Government is under pressure from the unions. The Minister made that clear yesterday in answer to a question without notice.

When I asked whether the general fabricating work associated with the joint venture could go to the private sector or whether he would at least allow the private sector to tender for that work, he said also that none of the parties concerned had asked the Government to take that work away from Midland Workshops. Of course they have not asked for it. The answer is simple: The requirement is that that work not go out to tender. The Minister admitted yesterday that it is required that that work be done by the Midland Workshops.

Mr Grill: Because the joint venturers want it done in the workshops.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister said that the Government is under a fair deal of criticism from the employees at the Midland Workshops. I do not find anything wrong with that if there is some arrangement whereby one can find out how much that work costs. The Minister has admitted that he does not know. I have no complaint either if there is permitted to be involved in the arrangement a competitive situation as we talked about earlier in relation to the State Engineering Works.

I believe that certain specialist activities relating to rolling stock and wagons where designs are involved exist at the workshops and that, quite clearly, that work should be carried out by the Midland Workshops at which there is a capacity to do that work. However, I feel that general fabricating work that can be done by private fabricators who are, at the moment, experiencing a severe shortage of work, should be tendered out to those firms.

Why are they not allowed to tender for the general fabricating work? I repeat the Minister's words: The Government is already under a fair deal of criticism from the Midland Workshops employees in respect of the amount of work they are doing. He said that the Government did not want to inflame those employees any further.

The Minister is saying, on behalf of the Government, that regardless of whether it costs more—we do not know whether it does cost more—

Mr Grill: Westrail has always done its own fabricating work.

Mr PETER JONES: I am talking about the general fabricating work associated with the joint venture.

Mr Grill: That is 50 per cent owned by Westrail and Westrail has always done its own fabrication work. That is nothing new.

Mr PETER JONES: The Deputy Premier has been talking about how much work the Government would tender out to assist the fabricating industry. He made it clear that he understands that the private fabricators in this State are under considerable pressure. It was the subject of discussion here some three or four weeks ago. This is an opportunity for the Government to at least allow some work to go to tender and to allow some opportunity for the private sector to compete. Here I am talking of the general fabricating work associated with the joint venture. The Minister has said that that will not happen in this case. He will not even allow us to assess whether the joint venture could have gone anywhere else more cheaply because the Government is under pressure from the employees at the workshops and he does not want to inflame those employees any further.

Is it not also legitimate for others to tender, particularly for a joint venture? No wonder, when one knows neither of the partners, Quarry Industries nor Westrail, had asked for it. It was a marvellous deal.

A sum of \$3.6 million will be invested in order to return \$2.75 million over the next five years.

Mr Grill: In that \$3.6 million a lot of facilities would not be utilised otherwise.

Mr PETER JONES: Get rid of them!

Mr Grill: At least we are setting up a joint venture which will make money.

Mr PETER JONES: How much money will it make?

Mr Rushton: Westrail got \$6 million out of that joint venture.

Several members interjected.

Mr Grill: That is not substantiated.

Mr PETER JONES: May I make the point that in this joint venture, Government figures show it is putting up \$3.6 million in one go in order to get back \$2.7 million.

Mr Grill: It is not all new expenditure.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister will say it is not new expenditure because some work will be done in the Midland Workshops. That is to be included in the \$3.6 million.

Mr Grill: It will be a profitable venture.

Mr PETER JONES: The Government will be losing \$900 000; these are the Government's figures.

Mr Grill: That is a direct assessment of the way to work out the profitability of an operation.

Mr PETER JONES: Perhaps the Minister would care to provide more figures to show how profitable it is. Everything here shows it is not profitable. I know where the profit is and so does the Minister. The profit for Westrail is in providing work for employees in the Midland Workshops, because the Minister has admitted that. They are being provided with something to do because they cannot be got rid of.

Part of that work is in converting wagons to bottom-discharge, utilising some land in Kewdale, and other bits and pieces. What the taxpayer is asked to do, as well as supporting the Westrail deficit this year, was revealed in answer to another question.

Mr Grill: It is a substantial decrease on last year.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister is taking credit for the good harvest, the rain—tremendous!

The benefit for Westrail is providing something for people to do—people Westrail cannot get rid of. Secondly, it is marvellous for Quarry Industries, because it helps it with its business operations, not only in relation to this State, but also as it is part of the arrangement, and it naturally suits the company with the other deals it has done on the side. But the situation remains where this is a ridiculous lot of nonsense. If Westrail is to embark upon a 50 per cent joint venture on the one hand to help a private company which is having difficulty breaking its way into the local market—

Mr Grill: You have spoken to other operators.

Mr PETER JONES: I have not personally spoken to any other operator. I have spoken with the Quarry Industries people.

Secondly, it provides work for Westrail people whom the Government does not want to get rid of because, on the Minister's own admission, it is under pressure and it does not want to inflame the work force any further.

On that same theme—and we will have a further opportunity to talk about this when we come to the Committee debate—we have a similar situation, but a little more unsatisfactory, affecting the State Energy Commission. A situation exists there where the Government, without the approval of the commission—that is to say the commissioners—has permitted the SEC to do deals with unions regarding the amount of work to be done by day-labour gangs, the amount of work to be done within maintenance and workshop areas, and the amount which the unions will allow to go out to the private sector. I will have more to say about that later.

The Government has made deals without the approval of the commission. By the commission, I am referring not to the officers, but the commissioners, those who, under the SEC Act are responsible to the public of this State for the conduct of the SEC, and the major decisions that the SEC makes. The Government has said quite clearly this was an administrative matter and it was not necessary to get the support of the commissioners.

The Government has allowed the unions—and the unions are listed in answer to questions which have been asked—to extract from the SEC undertakings regarding the work that they will do; the work that they demand and the work that they say will, in fact, not go out to the private sector. So when the Government criticises the Opposition for seeking to ensure that the maximum involvement of the private sector in certain Government operations will occur, it makes a joke of the Premier's statement about trying to maximise the efficiency within Government departments and instrumentalities—when a situation like that in Westrail and in the SEC can exist and the unions can say work will not be sent out to the private sector, but that they will do it.

There was a gradual diminishing of that day-labour work in the State Energy Commission. The situation had been reached where something like 50 per cent of the additional transmission lines in the south-east were done by private contractors. They were done very well and efficiently. A whole range of other activities was catered for. The supply of goods and services and maintenance, for example, such as painting, was done in the north and the north-west by the private sector. Now that is done by day-labour within the SEC because the union wanted to do it and that was part of the deal, regardless of cost, regardless of how much additional funding will have to be found by the consumers of energy in this State.

I want to refer to one other comment regarding the Department of Conservation and Environment. Again I will have something more to say about that when we get round to that department's estimates. I drew the attention of the House to the report that that department prepared on Farrington Road. Notwithstanding the Minister's comments that I confused the role of the EPA with the department, the situation stands. That report reveals the attitude of the department—a very selective and malicious attitude against the Main Roads Department. It produced a document which was full of half-truths and insinuations.

The Main Roads Department certainly had an obligation to do more than it did to ensure that the correct approvals had been processed. For the De-

partment of Conservation and Environment and the officers concerned to suggest that they were not aware of the need for the Main Roads Department to build Farrington Road is a lie. The report revealed it as such.

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the need for consideration about the future of the Department of Conservation and Environment and the need to get it under control, rather than rampaging around. It is in fact becoming a roadblock.

Any member who has had anything to do with works associated with that department and getting approvals will be well aware of the attitude of some officers and of the way in which there is an internal struggle between certain officers. There is a private war between the director of the department and the EPA in relation to some matters. There are wars between some of the officers within the department concerning the way things ought to be done. The actions of some of those officers, their hates and dislikes, are being borne and have to be suffered by people who want something done.

Yesterday I had a meeting with a businessman in this town who has been trying for two years to get some assistance from that department but to no avail. The project with which he was associated as a consultant has now had to be shelved simply because of the time it has taken and the fact that this department has frustrated him every time he has tried to get anything done.

The Government cannot put off for ever the need to get the Department of Conservation and Environment back to what it once was; that is, a helpful group of people who assisted others. The department comprised a very competent group of people until ambition crept in and they decided they wanted to play God. The Government has signalled that it intends to make the Department of Conservation and Environment a managing department in relation to effluent disposal. It wishes to change the Act to ensure that that department can become the licensing department for effluent disposal. That will be strongly opposed because the Department of Conservation and Environment is not a managing department. It is an advisory department; it is a department that exists to help, guide, and assist people. It was not designed to reflect the negative attitude that it does at the moment and certainly it was not established to duplicate managerial control, especially as it relates to effluent disposal, because work of that nature is capable of being carried out by the Health Department and other bodies.

It is ridiculous for the department and the Government to suggest they can introduce legislation of that nature and obtain support for it. However, before one reaches that stage, the key element is that that department must stop being at war with other Government departments. It is not entitled to bring into this House a document which is very selective and misleading and which in fact identified certain weaknesses in other departments while hiding the fact that it was the key element in this matter, because it was not more helpful to the City of Cockburn, the City of Melville, and the Main Roads Department, whatever imperfections existed in their cases.

Very soon, some of the selective documents which that department produced in the report will be added to so that this House will be able to judge a little more easily the wisdom, honesty, and integrity of the Department of Conservation and Environment.

MR CRANE (Moore) [9.42 p.m.]: I would like to make my small contribution to the Budget debate and I open my remarks by saying to the Minister for Transport that, contrary to the views just espoused by the member for Narrogin, I think the joint venture between Westrail and Quarry Industries is a good one. It is in my electorate. Some time ago I supported this move when the persons concerned came over from South Australia and talked to me about it.

My colleague made some points tonight and I wish he had discussed them with me before he made them, because I believe we should be entering into this type of joint venture. I give it my support. While there may be some concern about the work done at the Midland Workshops, I well remember the standard of workmanship which has come out of those workshops and while I know it may be claimed its work is very expensive sometimes, because the workers do not work as hard as they ought, I have not been there and watched them, so I am not in a position to say that this is the case.

Mr Grill: You are right when you say they do some very good work.

Mr CRANE: I am going back to a time before some of the people here were born. I served in the Navy during the war and one of the ships on which I served had three-cylinder, reciprocating steam engines, HP—that is, high pressure—IP—that is, intermediate pressure—and LP—that is, low pressure. The ship was an Australian corvette T. The numbers of the engines were 11 and 12 and they were made in the Midland Workshops in Western Australia. A lot of people did not know that the Midland Workshops

were capable of manufacturing these steam engines which powered many of our ships during World War II. However, I served on one and those engines never let us down. They steamed hundreds of thousands of miles in hazardous and at times frightening conditions. I was always very proud that they were manufactured in the Midland Workshops in Western Australia.

I felt I must put in that plug for the people whose work has probably not been recognised previously. I did not intend to say this, but it just came to mind and I felt it was appropriate.

I was very happy that the Government eased the pressure of payroll tax. It is an iniquitous tax which should not have been introduced in the first place. It affects business greatly and it taxes the wrong people. At a time that we need employment, we have a tax on the people who employ men and women, and that seems wrong. We should be encouraging businesses to employ workers and, therefore, small as it may be, the reduction in payroll tax is a step in the right direction and one which I am sure is appreciated by all of us on this side of the House. The reduction should have been larger and, indeed, payroll tax should never have been introduced in the first place.

I have not changed my views in respect of the financial institutions duty. When this tax was introduced I spoke against it. The ex-member for Mt. Lawley, who was the then Leader of the Opposition, and I were, if I remember correctly, the only two people who actually said that, when we were back in power, we would rescind that legislation.

Many people have since agreed with us, but we actually said it at the time. It is one thing to intimate that, but it is quite another thing to say it.

FID should never have been introduced. To some extent I suppose the fact that it has been reduced appeases some people and we must be grateful for small mercies, but at the same time the tax is wrong and I would hope that it will not be long before it is dispensed with altogether.

I turn now to education. There is some concern in this area, particularly in relation to country high school hostels. I have been on the board of one of these hostels since its inception. We have had many problems meeting our budgetary requirements and in fact the first year that the St. James Hostel operated it was in debt to the extent of \$7 000 and the Shire of Moora picked up the tab. The Country High Schools Hostels Authority was not agreeable to refunding this money to the shire so the Government of Western Australia

should be eternally grateful to the shire, as should those people who were educated at Moora and who resided at the hostel there.

Those difficult days are over and it could quite reasonably be claimed that the St. James Hostel at Moora is one of the most efficient, if not the most efficient, hostel in Western Australia from a budgetary point of view. The Deputy Premier would probably have some information on this, because his sister serves on the board of that hostel and he would be well aware of the position.

However, the aspect which concerns me and the other board members is that the Country High Schools Hostels Authority has suggested that we should increase the fees paid by the students who stay at the hostel in order to bring those fees into line with those charged in other hostels which evidently are not as efficient as the St. James Hostel for some reason or other.

I believe that would be wrong. Education is very costly for country people and it is difficult enough for those people to pay the fees we charge now without those fees being increased when it is not necessary.

One of the points I make about the St. James Hostel is that the board is very careful about the way in which it spends money. The students are able to do a little of the cleaning and tidying that is required around the hostel and, of course, this reduces costs and at the same time teaches the students to be self-sufficient and tidy in themselves. Perhaps an examination should be made as to why the St. James Hostel is so efficient compared with some other hostels.

My electorate is reasonably well placed in respect of education. I was disappointed this year that we were not able to carry on and improve and upgrade the Carnamah District High School. The Minister has agreed that the work will be started early in the coming year and I understand \$50 000 has been set aside for planning purposes and that an amount of \$300 000 will be allocated for work to begin in the new year.

The Carnamah District High School has put up with many difficulties, as did the Toodyay District High School before it, in waiting for this work to be done. I just bring the matter to the attention of the Government because it seems to be a case of country schools and some district high schools having to wait a little longer than one would think was necessary for this work to be done. The fact that schools in the country may not have the great numbers of students that some schools in the metropolitan area have, does not detract from the importance of their being upgraded and having all the facilities to which those children are entitled. I

am hopeful that the planning will be done within the next few months and that the upgrading will be carried out early next year.

While I criticise the Budget in some areas, I must give my thanks in others. I was very pleased with the continuity of a programme established by the previous Government to build a boat harbour at Jurien Bay.

Mr Grill: We are doing well tonight.

Mr CRANE: Yes, the project is in excess of \$4 million, and I know it is urgently needed up there. I never fail to make the point that I believe Esperance jumped ahead of Jurien Bay in the provision of a boat harbour when one looks at the need for it.

Mr Blaikie: Esperance jumped ahead of Busselton.

Mr CRANE: The Minister was probably very pleased that it did. I have always maintained that when one considers the tuna fishing fleet at Esperance and the rock lobster fishing fleet at Jurien Bay and the natural surrounds for mooring facilities, something seemed to be a little wrong. However, at last Jurien Bay has the go-ahead. I thank the Government for carrying on with the job. It will be a tremendous improvement to the west coast and to the fishing industry. It is much appreciated by the people of Jurien Bay who were concerned only a few months ago that perhaps with the awe of the America's Cup and the way that money was being handed out to the America's Cup challenge preparation by the Government like a man with six arms, Jurien may miss out in the dish-up. However, it did not miss out. I told the people there I was sure they would be all right and my confidence in the Government was well placed.

Mr Grill: Has work actually started up there yet or not?

Mr CRANE: The preparatory work started some time ago and it was to continue. I have not been to Jurien Bay for several weeks, so I cannot really answer that question as to whether the excavations have actually commenced, but I know everything is well in hand for it to go ahead and I am thankful for this.

Another matter concerning the fishing industry was the need for the Lancelin jetty which we when in Government promised to provide. While the building is not proceeding, I was pleased to notice in the Budget that a sum of about \$200 000 has been set aside for the purchase of land on the shore and for planning for this jetty. I am not sure whether the figure was \$200 000, but it was a generous sum of money and I am thankful that the planning is going ahead. The land will be purchased and I am sure that the jetty will be built.

This jetty is needed by the fishing industry. I thank not only our own people when we were in Government for putting this in train; I also thank the present Minister who has carried on and who will proceed and build that jetty, both for the harbour and for the jetty that will be built on behalf of the fishermen.

We cannot have it our own way all the time, and I am not really being other than constructively critical of the Government now—I am not being critical of the Minister personally—when I mention a matter which I brought to his attention today. I asked a question concerning the 150 per cent increase in freight for wildflowers which are being brought down from our lovely Western Wildflower Farm at Coomberdale, which is run by Mrs Rhonda Tonkin. Any members who have been fortunate enough to travel to Coomberdale and to see what Mrs Tonkin is doing there would appreciate that she and others like her need all the help they can get. I saw her on Sunday because it was the “Back to Coomberdale” day, celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the school’s establishment. It was interesting to note that the apology for the Leader of the Opposition was recorded there. He went to school at Coomberdale at one stage so he has also a little stake in that place. On Sunday Mrs Tonkin was quite distressed and told me that she had been advised by Westrail that it had increased the price of transporting her boxes of wildflowers from \$2 a box to \$5 a box.

Mr Grill: Westrail?

Mr CRANE: I am sorry. Total West, the company which we brought into being as a joint venture with Westrail and which the current Government has carried on with. An increase of 150 per cent overnight is quite a substantial one and is one which many other country businesses just could not stand. While the Minister did say in reply to my question that he was not aware of what had happened, he said that he thought, while the increase seemed exorbitant, that probably the \$2 a box which she had been paying was considerably less than she should have been paying.

Mr Rushton: Has she got any alternative? Is any other company going there?

Mr CRANE: There are alternatives which she is looking at. I understand she has made alternative arrangements. I spoke to her on the telephone tonight. She was disappointed in having to make alternative arrangements because Total West was very conveniently placed and provided a service five days a week.

The point I would like to make to the Minister—it is a constructively critical one—is that while the charge was \$2 a box for her 40 boxes of

flowers—in other words, \$80 a trip—it would pay for the distillate of the vehicle doing the trip, and the fact that Total West has increased the charge to \$5 means it has lost the business altogether. Total West, being a competitive company, hopefully, will reconsider this matter and will realise that perhaps half a sheep is better than no sheep at all and previously it was getting \$80 a day to offset its costs. It must be remembered that Total West was backloading these flowers to Perth; on the way up it was taking the mail, which it had to do anyway, so the backloading trip with the flowers would be a bonus as the vehicles had to return to Perth in any event.

Mr Grill: Your proper approach on this subject is not to me. You should properly approach the management of Total West because I do not interfere at all with any of the commercial proceedings of Total West, and nor did the previous Government. It is operated strictly on that basis.

Mr Rushton: It is an independent corporation.

Mr CRANE: Yes, I understand that, and the Minister mentioned it. I am raising the matter here because this is the place where I can raise problems which affect country people. It is not a criticism of the Minister. I am only pointing out that Total West has lost \$80 a day, or the cost of its fuel, in returning its vehicle to Perth. I will take the matter up with the company and will point these things out to it.

Mr Grill: The other thing is that Mrs Tonkin might be able to negotiate a special rate.

Mr CRANE: Yes, that is right. I told Mrs Tonkin this when I had a good talk to her on the telephone tonight. The Government to a certain extent is involved because it is involved in a joint venture with Total West.

It seems to be my day for troubles and I would like to raise another matter. I am sorry the Premier and Minister for Tourism is not in the House, but I am sure the Deputy Premier will take note of my comments. The matter I raise came to my notice only tonight when I arrived back here and received an urgent telephone message from a Mr Rod Abel from Melbourne, who established the Atlantis Marine Park. I imagine all members have seen the Atlantis Marine Park and know how it operates and the attraction it is to tourism in this State.

Mr Abel went to Victoria to establish a marine park there and made an application to the Federal Minister for Home Affairs (Mr Barry Cohen) and only today received a reply stating that his application to catch cetacea was refused. He wanted to catch whales and porpoises. Cetacea is the proper

name, I understand, although the Minister did call them "cetaceans".

The disappointing fact is that in the Minister's answer to Mr Abel he said the reason for his refusal to allow the capture of these animals was the extent and nature of the opposition which had come from people belonging to the Greenpeace and Operation Jonah organisations. They did not want the cetacea to be caught.

Mr Blaikie: If the Minister has his way Atlantis Marine Park will be Operation Jonah.

Mr CRANE: This is serious because as a result Atlantis Marine Park will be eventually forced to close. I am not trying to be emotional about this, but I am sure the Premier would agree that we have to act quickly to ensure that this does not happen. The extent and nature of this objection was the result of 260 to 270 letters protesting about the capture of these animals. I would suggest that 260 to 270 objections, in a population of 13 million, is even less than a speck in the ocean, yet the Minister has seen fit to take notice of this objection and refuse licence to Mr Abel, after Mr Abel has expended a great deal of money in the preparation for a marine park. Mr Abel had also made application to the Victorian Government for a licence for the marine park. The Victorian Government had appointed three responsible independent persons to examine the application.

Now, the whole operation is in jeopardy. The point I make is that the Government should act quickly. I hope I can speak to the Premier tomorrow—who is also the Minister for Tourism—in an attempt to initiate quick action to stop any move which will be made to close Atlantis Marine Park.

Atlantis Marine Park has had almost 1 million people through its gates since it opened and has made a tremendous contribution to tourism in Western Australia. I had lunch yesterday with Mr Hata the Manager of Yanchep Sun City Pty. Ltd. He explained to me what they had done there and was quite excited about all that work. He was a little disappointed that he was going back to Japan; however another man will replace him as manager here.

If Atlantis is forced to close, it will be a severe blow to Western Australia. It will be forced to close if we do not take some positive action immediately. I am sure the Opposition and Government will work together on this matter. We should work together on matters of concern to this State. We should not be opposing each other just because we sit on opposite sides of the House. We should co-operate with each other. We should get

together and support this project, which is of tremendous value to Western Australia.

Mr Blaikie: Will this mean that people will be denied the opportunity of taking these animals?

Mr CRANE: Yes, they will be denied this opportunity. This will affect projects in Queensland and America if this movement is allowed to proceed. It will affect all marine parks throughout the world. Those animals will not be allowed to be used for tourism or entertainment purposes. Research on the animals will not be carried out, because we will not be able to capture them. These animals are looked after properly and research is done into their health and many other factors.

I am pleased to note, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you and your family visited Atlantis Marine Park recently. I am sure you enjoyed the visit and got a great deal from it. It is a place for the family, and I recommend it as a place to go for the day. People are well received and the training of the dolphins and seals there is something one has to see to believe.

Mr Blaikie: It is world-class.

Mr CRANE: I understand it is one of the highest rated oceanariums in the world.

It is our responsibility to work together to prevent the Greenpeace movement and Operation Jonah—which have nothing better to do than to stop these worthwhile projects—from causing Atlantis to close. Nothing is done to upset or hurt the animals there, and not one animal has died in captivity at Atlantis. Members are welcome to go there and see the training methods they use. I hope we will get the support of the whole Parliament in this instance.

It could be said I was losing my touch if I did not refer once more to, and ask that we do not lose sight of, the water project which we have propagated for many many years—the Agaton water scheme. This proposed scheme is to provide water taken from Agaton basin, west of Watheroo, to serve the wheatbelt which extends from Moora east through Miling, Bindi Bindi and Dalwallinu and to the east, and north-east.

I am sure the Minister for Minerals and Energy would be interested in the point I am about to make, but this scheme would take the pressure off Mundaring Weir and more water would be available for the mining industry. I understand that the mining industry is concerned that its long term future is in jeopardy, because water supplies may be restricted.

The present Government and the previous Government made promises to build this scheme. I hope the Premier will take on board the comments

I made when speaking last year about obtaining an assessment from some companies in Perth which could provide the raw materials for this project. If this scheme were proceeded with, Humes Ltd. and Hardies could provide many of the pipes, and the labour force which would need to be employed. If the materials and people from this State could be employed on this project it would be important to the depressed economy of this time, when so many people are out of work. We are looking for opportunities to gainfully employ people.

While I appreciate the fact that people who are out of work must be given money so they can live in dignity, I do believe that much of this money is channelled in the wrong direction. It would be far better to use it in a scheme devised in co-operation with the Federal Government where this social security money could be channelled into projects of this type. I do not like calling this money "dole" money. It is not a nice word. It is certainly not a word which is applicable to many people who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed today.

At the end of it all not only would we have given those people the money they are now receiving and more besides, but also we would have a worthwhile project of long-term benefit to the State. I hope the Government will carry out a study into the financial advantages of the Agaton project. It certainly is needed in the wheatbelt. When the previous studies were made they clearly showed the Agaton scheme, relative to the other comprehensive water schemes in money terms, was no more expensive today than the other schemes were in their day. With inflation and the fact that we have gone from pounds to dollars we seem to use twice as many of them. When we changed to this system my farm halved in size and my income doubled, although not in purchasing power. It came about only because we changed to the metric and decimal systems.

I hope the Government will take my comments on board and carry out a private investigation which will show the Agaton project, if allowed to proceed even at a decelerated pace so that we did what we could each year and worked towards a long-term objective would be of great advantage to Western Australia.

It would be remiss of me to conclude my remarks tonight without saying a few words about the rural situation. You, Mr Acting Speaker, chaired the inquiry of which we were both members. I was not in the House when you tabled the report to say how much I supported the remarks you made on that occasion. It was a privilege to serve on a committee as one of five members who

came from different political persuasions. We all worked with one object in mind—to look most searchingly at the problems besetting the industry with an open mind and to come up with recommendations which we felt could be implemented.

Not one of the members of the committee failed to be impressed with the evidence we received or was not concerned with the tragic circumstances facing many people associated with the rural industry today. It was so often said, as you will recall, Mr Acting Speaker, by witnesses before the committee, "We need a good season or a couple of seasons to put the industry on its feet". You and I and the other members of the committee know that all a good season will do—and thank God we have one this year—is to enable a number of farmers to pay some of their bills. The serious situation will be retarded for only a little while before we return to not so good seasons throughout the State. Unless the cost-price squeeze—whether it comes from oil, rail freights, taxes, excise on fuel or whatever—is alleviated, the rural industry is definitely on the way out.

If it does go and Federal and State parliamentarians are stupid enough to allow us to lose the one industry which has really built Australia—certainly with help from some of the others, but it has been the backbone of Australia for many years—or allow it to become completely destitute or destroyed, Australia will be in a very serious plight.

I am concerned that, to the best of my knowledge, there has never been a Federal rural policy. A lot of promises have been made at election times—they always are—mostly by people who unfortunately know they will not be able to honour many of them. Nevertheless, the promises are made. It must fairly be said that we cannot blame any one Government, but some Governments have been in office longer than others, and the rural decline has been going on for a long time. Therefore, I believe, conservative Governments are more to blame for the problems facing farmers than anyone else.

As a member of a former conservative Government and one who has supported them for a long time, it gives me no pleasure to say it, but it is time we stood up and recognised our responsibilities. It is time we admitted we have fallen short in that which we should have done, and we have fallen short in many ways. As I said in relation to doing something for our tourist industry, we must deal with this problem as a Parliament not as an Opposition requesting a Government to do something or ridiculing a Government in its attempts to deal with the situation.

I know it was not a recommendation, but an offer was made that because the five members took the evidence on the committee we would be prepared to take the report directly to the persons most concerned: that is, the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer, and the Federal Minister for Primary Industry. It is important that the State Government should ask us to take our report to them. It is not sufficient for the report to be mailed to a few Government advisers for them to study because we know the fate of all reports: They end up in a pigeonhole gathering dust and nothing becomes of them. This report is so important to the economy of Western Australia and Australia that I do not believe it should stay where it is, but should be taken directly to the Prime Minister—by us.

Having known the Minister for Agriculture for as long as I have and his concern for the industry, I am confident he will take note of the plea I am making to take this report further and have it thoroughly examined by the people who will make the final decisions about it. I cannot speak too strongly on this matter, and I believe I am entitled to support from the whole Parliament in the remarks I have just made. I know the committee itself felt very strongly about this, and I thank the other four members who took part and listened so attentively to farmers' pleas and took the time and trouble to write the report.

Three members of the committee were from the Government, and I know they were impressed and concerned. That concern was expressed to me the other day by one of the *Hansard* typists who was typing up the evidence that came in from these people. She said she had not realised how serious the problem was in the country.

Three years ago I said the rural industry had five years left. I still say that we must take some positive action now. I know we cannot in the next week or two because an election is in the offing and all members are busy, but I hope that as soon as the Federal election is over we may take up this matter with the Prime Minister and the two Federal Ministers I mentioned. We will then be able to explain to them the problems besetting this industry and I feel confident that when they are explained by the people who gathered the information they will take heed and take some positive steps to relieve the serious plight of farmers and country businesses.

It does not refer only to farmers but also to country businesses.

Many of these country businesses have their headquarters in Perth. They do the business in the country because that is where their clients are, but

their offices are in the metropolitan area. By doing what I suggest, therefore, we shall be helping all businesses in Western Australia.

With those remarks I thank the Government for the assistance we have received in certain areas. I hope it will take my comments on board with regard to the areas in which I have not agreed with it. I hope that we may continue with the rural hardship investigation by taking it to the hub of the problems where the decisions can be made which will solve them.

MR BRADSHAW (Murray-Wellington) [10.21 p.m.]: The Treasurer's Budget speech takes credit for the turnaround in the economy which has occurred in the last year or so. I do not want to dwell on this point because I believe it is a load of rubbish.

Mr Terry Burke: You don't really mean that.

Mr BRADSHAW: Yes I do. I will not dwell on that point. The only credit I am prepared to give the Government with regard to helping the economy is the assistance given to the building industry through the first home owners grant. The State Housing Commission activity has also given the economy a lift. The first home owners grant scheme is a credit to the Government; the scheme has stimulated the building industry and given it a much needed boost. This has added to the turnaround in the economy. It is sensible of the Government to encourage people to buy their own homes. When the State provides homes it has the ongoing costs of maintenance and repairs which are a burden on the State. People who own their homes are more interested in maintaining them to a higher standard and also in establishing and caring for their gardens. These factors are a benefit to the State.

The Budget speech did not highlight the fact that our unemployment figure has increased. It is a pity that the unemployment rate has risen in Western Australia and with the policies and legislation of the State and Federal Governments I cannot envisage a change in that field. It is a pity that the Government has supported the redundancy claims made by the unions. Also some of the legislation brought forward will not decrease the number of unemployed. Unfortunately those hit hardest are in the 16 to 20-year age group; they form the largest percentage of unemployed in this State. If they are unemployed for any length of time they become unemployable. Therefore, it is essential to get these young people into the work force.

On a recent visit to Singapore it was pointed out that there is no unemployment in Singapore. In fact, they import workers.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Swap their standard of living for ours.

Mr BRADSHAW: I do not think it is all that bad.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Tell some of the workers that.

Mr BRADSHAW: It is all relative. One cannot compare them on the basis of wages. Of course the wages are different but also their cost structures are different.

Mr Tom Jones interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: The policy of the Singapore Government is to set certain wage levels and conditions but it is up to the businesses and the workers to come to a mutual agreement on what the business can afford to pay.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You would hardly call that Government democratic.

Mr BRADSHAW: It was voted into office.

Mr I. F. Taylor: With one member of the Opposition. On second thoughts that might not be too bad but it would be difficult for us to choose one member. You are all equally bad.

Mr BRADSHAW: It has worked successfully in Singapore and in that country they do not have an unemployment problem. Perhaps if we considered a system whereby businesses paid what they could afford and came to a mutual agreement with employees, more of the unemployed people would be in the work force. The Government's present policies will not increase the number of people employed.

On the surface the Budget appears to be sweet. In fact, it is relatively sweet and it resembles a pre-election Budget. We shall wait and see if that is the case.

The Government can afford to look generous this year after the rip-offs forced on the taxpayers of Western Australia last year. There was a massive increase of about 20 per cent on service charges; the introduction of the financial institutions duty; the doubling of stamp duty charges; the ceiling being taken off motor vehicle costs; the punters being ripped off by another one per cent of TAB turnover which went into the Government coffers; and the tobacco tax being increased. It is easy to see why the Government can afford to be generous this year with its so-called modest increases. The Treasurer is proud that he has managed to come up with a \$1 million surplus in the Budget from the previous year.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Especially when we started with a \$30 million deficit.

Mr BRADSHAW: Even the Treasurer does not say it was \$30 million.

Mr I. F. Taylor: We will agree on \$21 million.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: What about all the increases I have previously referred to? Even if there was a \$30 million deficit the Government has picked that up from the tobacco tax. Every time the Government increased taxes it said it did so because of the deficit it inherited.

It was interesting to hear the Treasurer's reference in his Budget speech to the State's participation in the Argyle diamond venture as innovative. It was that all right. We finished up buying a pup and had to become innovative to get rid of it. The Treasurer was on his knees last year pleading for the poor people of Western Australia to be able to take part in this diamond venture. The fact that they could have gone to the Stock Exchange and bought shares had nothing to do with it. The Treasurer came out with the shonky tax rearrangement. Normally the Government will give tax rearrangements where there is a high risk in the resource business. However, in this case there was no huge risk because he had offered a minimum return on the trust shares they bought.

It is interesting to note that a few years earlier the then Opposition members were squealing like stuck pigs about tax avoidance schemes, yet the Treasurer took these actions and not a thing was said. It was also very interesting to note that the Treasurer said that the man in the street would buy these shares and take part in the development of Western Australia. However, he sent personal letters to the people he thought would buy the trust shares and they were millionaires. I saw one of those personal letters which was written to a fellow who certainly was not what I would call the average man in the street.

Mr Read: Could the average man in the street buy the shares?

Mr BRADSHAW: Of course, he could, but the Treasurer wrote to multi-millionaires.

Mr Read: Did they have access to the shares, yes or no?

Mr BRADSHAW: Of course they did.

Mr I. F. Taylor: The Malaysian Government has an interest so what is wrong with the Australian people having an interest in it?

Mr BRADSHAW: They could go to the Stock Exchange and buy the shares. When the shares were launched the total cost was \$65 million, but they were later valued at \$17 million by *The West Australian*.

A couple of weeks ago it was reported in the newspaper that diamond dealers were having trouble selling Argyle diamonds and had to sell

them at a discount rate. Apparently the cutters are experiencing difficulty in cutting them.

Mr I. F. Taylor: The diamond cutters are impressed with them.

Mr BRADSHAW: The bulk of the diamonds are being sold for jewellery and the diamond cutters are experiencing trouble cutting them. As a result, the diamonds are being sold at discounted prices. It was also reported that there may not be a profit in the diamond venture or that profits will be drastically reduced. Who is going to meet the bill for the Treasurer's guarantee that the venture would be successful? The taxpayer will have to face those costs because of the "innovative" ideas of the Treasurer.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You will have to eat those words.

Mr BRADSHAW: I hope I do, because I do not want the public having to meet the cost of these boo-boos.

It was interesting to note in the Treasurer's Budget speech that he is attempting to improve the efficiency of the Government. I think it is strange that he wants to improve efficiency in the Government. He should look at the blow-out in his department last year: we are now faced with a 33 1/3 per cent increase in his department. It is extravagance personified. Unless there is a reduction in the costs of the Department of Premier and Cabinet how can it be expected that other departments should reduce their costs?

It was interesting to note that there will be an increase in the staff of the Education Department. An extra 485 people will be employed. It is probably a good thing because it was a pre-election promise by the Labor Party to increase the staff of the Education Department. However, the interesting point is that 98 of those 485 people will not be employed as teachers. Of course, that means that we will have 98 more bureaucrats who will put out various bits of information and sit around working out ways of growing in their departments. I believe that that ratio is a little out of place; it would have been much better had more teachers been included in the increase of the Education Department staff by 485 persons.

The Education Department building is not large enough even for the people who are working there at the moment, yet the Government is going to employ 98 extra staff. It probably means that premises will have to be rented and again that places the burden of non-productive people on the taxpayer.

Mr Read: You are knocking teachers.

Mr BRADSHAW: I am not knocking teachers.

Mr Read: I must read this in *Hansard*.

Mr BRADSHAW: The allocation to tourism has increased by 80 per cent. Obviously a large percentage of that money will be spent on the America's Cup promotion. I know that the tourist industry is a vital one and creates employment and I believe that not only should more be spent on the America's Cup, but also it should be spent on promoting Western Australia generally.

The region I represent, and also the region the member for Mandurah represents, could certainly do with an officer to promote the area. It is an area which could be developed for one or two-day trips because there are plenty of sights which would be of interest to tourists. For example we have the Hotham Valley railway and the recently renovated Coopers Mill at Furnisdale. These attractions should be promoted more strongly.

I was also interested to note that the Government is attempting to reduce payroll tax. I congratulate the Government on taking this stand, even though it is a minor drop of 0.25 per cent.

Mr Gordon Hill: It is the first drop ever.

Mr BRADSHAW: I suppose Government members could say that it is interesting that the previous Government did not increase payroll tax by six per cent like the other States.

Mr Gordon Hill: Nor did it attempt to lower payroll tax.

Mr BRADSHAW: As I said, the Government is still to collect more money than it did last year and it is probably in line with the inflation rate. As long as we see a drop of some description each year I will certainly congratulate the Government for it. The sooner this iniquitous tax is dropped completely the better off everyone in Western Australia will be. It is a tax which certainly should not have been introduced and I congratulate the Government on its efforts to reduce it.

The grouping of payroll tax is a worry. I have been confronted by a couple of people in my area who have been caught in regard to this matter. They were in a situation where they should not have been grouped and it is hard to get that point through to the State Taxation Department. I see the reason that we should have grouping, but innocent people will get caught. It is impossible to get that point through to the State Taxation Department in order to overcome the problem.

With regard to the financial institutions duty the Treasurer is taking another pat on the back. I guess that is why he still has a sore back: He keeps patting himself so often that it has become very sore. The reduction in FID did certainly not go far enough, as far as I am concerned. The sooner that

tax is abolished the better off Western Australians will be.

Mention was made in the Budget of the recommencement of work on the north block of Royal Perth Hospital.

Mr Gordon Hill: It mentioned a lot of positive things and it is a credit to you that you recognise what your colleagues have failed to recognise.

Mr BRADSHAW: With regard to the recommencement of the north block of the Royal Perth Hospital, I refer to the metropolitan region scheme report of 1962 in which it stated as follows—

The Stephenson-Hepburn Report included recommendations for six major general Hospitals.

Further on it stated—

(a) Limited extensions be made at Royal Perth Hospital.

I understand that a similar recommendation was made in 1950. I tend to believe that the north block should be turned into a car park. There is an acute shortage of car parking facilities at Royal Perth Hospital.

Mr Burkett: Did your predecessors start it so that it would become a car park?

Mr BRADSHAW: No, it was built with the intention that it be a hospital. However, that does not mean that I have to agree with that.

Several members interjected.

Mr Blaikie: Are you allowed to disagree with your leader?

Mr Burkett: Yes, we are, but none of us wants his job.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burkett: What is your position with the leadership challenge?

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: I believe the place should be turned into a car park. We should upgrade hospitals such as the Wanneroo and Bentley Hospitals. Hospitals such as that should become more decentralised for people living in those areas so that they do not have to come into the city to visit their relatives.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: What about the statements made before the election that the Government was going to open a floor at the Wanneroo Hospital?

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: Suddenly it is changed—as soon as it is needed. Before the election the Government made a great song and dance about

how it would open up the floor that the Liberal Government had closed. The Liberal Party did not close it down; it never opened it. It did not need to be opened. That is another broken promise.

Several members interjected.

Mrs Beggs: The money is there.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Your brother must have slipped that bit into your speech without your knowing it. It is a long way from Murray-Wellington.

Mr BRADSHAW: I read the papers; it was well publicised.

Mrs Beggs: They do not do hair transplants, do they?

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: My brother does not practice at the Wanneroo Hospital. As I was saying, I believe that north block should be turned into a car park to provide more reasonable parking for those who wish to visit Royal Perth Hospital, and that Wanneroo and Bentley Hospitals be upgraded so that people from those areas can get there more easily to visit their friends and relations in hospital.

The "Bunbury 2000" concept rates a mention. The Treasurer says it is proceeding at a great rate and things are going well. Unfortunately it does not seem to be going as we would wish. I would like to see it go ahead, because a concert hall would be provided in the region sooner, and more people would mean a greater chance of having such a venue for entertainment.

It will also bring other amenities. The Treasurer says the concept is going at a great rate. In the *South Western Times* there appeared a report that "Bunbury 2000" is losing momentum.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: I cannot remember what was in it.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: Even though it is said that "Bunbury 2000" is a regional concept, the Government's idea of decentralisation seems to be to decentralise all the areas around Bunbury into Bunbury. An example of this is moving the Agriculture Protection Board from Harvey to Bunbury. The Minister could say that is for economic reasons, and it is.

Mr Evans: What about the last balance sheet?

Mr BRADSHAW: I have not finished yet. It would have been possible to move the Herd Improvement Centre out to the Agricultural Protection Board rather than bring the APB into Bunbury.

Mr Evans: Your thinking is wrong. Where is your backup, your laboratory and everything else?

Mr BRADSHAW: It could be set up in Harvey rather than in Bunbury.

Mr Evans: Come off it!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: It was interesting to see, in "Letters to the Editor" the other day, that a Collic fellow had written that he was not very impressed with the concept of "Bunbury 2000". He thought Collic was missing out.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: He said he was a Labor supporter. I would not have a clue who he was.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: It is also interesting that I asked the Minister for Transport last year to have a look at financing the road between Worsley and Harvey to try to encourage people to live in the Harvey-Waroona area. His reply was that he wanted a count taken on that road. The road is in such poor condition that people will not travel on it until it is upgraded. With the development in this area it is important that road be upgraded and bituminised. It would be beneficial to do that, even though it is a bit late for the Worsley refinery.

If the smelter were built near Worsley it would be important to have that road upgraded, otherwise it would become a death trap. When the Worsley refinery was built, accidents occurred there every week. They have tended to decline now because traffic has lessened as workers do not return that way. There used to be at least one accident a week.

Another area of concern is in respect of irrigation rates. They have increased at the same rate for the last 10 years, averaging 20 per cent. Coming down to a more moderate increase would certainly be beneficial. I am pleased about this year's increase, which is the lowest in years, because the farmers are up to their ears after being hit by a 20 per cent increase every year.

A Government member: I cannot understand why they vote Liberal.

Several members interjected.

Mr Blaikie: They have not had an increase in the price of milk to compensate.

Mr BRADSHAW: Another area of concern is drainage rates. These have been of concern to some people in my area.

A Government member: How much is the increase?

Mr BRADSHAW: The increases go up to 40 per cent until they catch up with whatever it is.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: People who have never had drainage rates before suddenly become burdened with them. It is interesting that there has been a change in drainage rating in places where there are blocks with several shops on them. Last year or the year before one person paid \$10.80 or something like that for a whole block with 13 shops. This year he was charged for each of the 13 shops, \$13, an increase of something like 1 400 per cent in one year.

Mr Blaikie: I wonder what that person thought of the Government's action in wiping out the Bunbury drainage system altogether!

Mr BRADSHAW: This fellow used to be the secretary of the Labor Party in Bunbury. He was very impressed.

Mr Blaikie: I wonder whether he was impressed when the member for Mitchell was able to get back rates waived as well by a political stunt!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: Another area needing an increase in funds is the country dental assistance scheme. For the last 12 months or so the scheme has been lacking funds, and that has resulted in many underprivileged people being forced onto waiting lists until funds become available to have their dental work done. I have not been able to determine whether the allocation has been increased in the Budget this year, but certainly it should be increased fairly substantially so that people with dental problems do not have to wait. The longer they wait, the worse they become, so it is imperative that country dental assistance scheme funding be increased dramatically.

Also it would not hurt if the country racing and pacing industries received an increase in funds. The racecourse development fund is distributed to help the clubs provide facilities; and the industry is under pressure from falling patronage in some cases, and falling Totalisator Agency Board turn-overs. Therefore, the returns are less than they used to be, or they are not keeping up with the rate of inflation. This is putting a few of the country racing and pacing clubs under considerable pressure, and in fact some of them are close to folding.

The industry provides many jobs. People with horses have to go to speed merchants—veterinary surgeons—and farriers to shoe the horses. The more clubs are in existence, obviously the more people will benefit from the industry.

Mr Burkett: And it is an industry which your colleagues ignored for nine years. You have only to ask your brother.

Mr BRADSHAW: What has the Australian Labor Party done about it? It ripped another one per cent out of the TAB.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRADSHAW: It is time that the industry received more money from the racecourse development fund. I am sure that money could be found without any hardship. There is a TAB fund which is used—

Mr I. F. Taylor: It is also time that the industry lifted its own game. You do not just sit back and wait for the money to fall. You do something about it. That is what the racing industry should do.

Mr BRADSHAW: The clubs are hamstrung by the setup. They have voluntary workers who put in a lot of time. Certainly they are trying their hardest to keep the industry on its feet. That is to the credit of those people.

Mr I. F. Taylor: They should try a bit harder.

Mr BRADSHAW: They need some assistance at this stage with an increase in the racecourse development fund. The fund is established from unclaimed dividends. It does not represent the total amount of unclaimed dividends because the rest goes into Government revenue. An easy way to increase the money in the fund is to divert some of the money which is used for TAB facilities. At this stage, most of the TAB agencies are built or kept to a quite acceptable standard. I am sure that much of the money is either being stored or used for the sake of using it.

Mr Burkett: But they have increased the prize money right across the board. You would have to agree with that.

Mr BRADSHAW: Who has?

Mr Burkett: The TAB—the money they have injected back into the clubs.

Mr BRADSHAW: The clubs are under pressure to increase their race dividends. If they do not increase their dividends, the TAB turnover falls, and so does the return to the club. I do not know if the member for Scarborough knows how the TAB works.

Mr Burkett: Yes. I do.

Mr BRADSHAW: Unless the racecourses raise dividends, they do not receive increases in their TAB returns. Many of the clubs are in a catch 22 situation. If they make capital improvements, they have trouble paying them off. If they try to pay them with TAB returns, they then receive lower

returns from the TAB. They are under quite an amount of pressure, and I see the need to increase the racecourse development fund to help them to meet their building costs.

Recently, the Minister for Transport came to my electorate in relation to the jetty licence fees. That was in relation to whether the Government would charge licence fees for the so-called jetties on the Yunderup canals. In fact, there are no jetties there, although the Marine and Harbour Department has said that they are jetties when in fact they are driveways going to the edges of the canals. They do not protrude into the canals, yet the department has suddenly sent application forms for them to be registered as jetties, although the Yunderup canals have been in existence for some time.

The odd fact is that if people have not put toppings on the driveways and left them sandy, they have not received application forms to register them as jetties. If they have concreted them, they must register them.

Mr Grill: This is legislation that your Government passed. Do you not think we should abide by the law?

Mr BRADSHAW: I cannot believe that anyone in his right mind could say that these things were jetties. There is nothing there. I have not noticed the Minister rushing in to unravel the problem.

Mr MacKinnon: The Minister is rushing in to impose the licences.

Mr Grill: That is not true. I intervened, and no one has been forced to pay a licence.

Mr BRADSHAW: The department is still trying to get them to pay.

Mr Grill: A lesser fee.

Mr BRADSHAW: There should not be any fee. There is nothing there. Why is the Government suddenly so keen to register these things?

Mr Grill: Because we abide by the law.

Mr BRADSHAW: But there is nothing there to register. Can the Minister not understand that?

Mr Grill: The legal interpretation is that they are jetties and that they must be licensed. I said to your people that we will have a look at the situation, and the present situation is that they will pay a reduced licence fee.

Mr BRADSHAW: As far as I am concerned, they should not have to pay anything.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am having extraordinary difficulty hearing the member for Murray-Wellington. The reason is the far too audible conversations, particularly on my left behind

the Chair, and the level of conversation throughout the Chamber. It should now cease.

Mr BRADSHAW: As far as I am concerned, no fees should be paid. I find it difficult to believe that anyone in his right mind could interpret as a jettty something that is not there. Certainly I am not in favour of any fees being imposed.

Another matter of concern is the imposition by the Australian dairy industry of a milk levy on the milk producers of Western Australia. States like Victoria and Tasmania have overproduced and created an excess of milk products, and the people of Western Australia who have done the right thing now must pay a levy to overcome the problems. Certainly that imposition is not right. It will

take much money out of the dairy industry in the south-west. The amount taken from each farmer could range from \$4 000 up, depending on how much milk he produces. It is imposed at a rate of between 1.4c and 2c a litre. This will not do the economy of the south-west towns any good. In fact, one dairy farmer reckons it will take all his net profit and put him in an embarrassing situation as he has just bought half of the farm from his brother. I have received representations from other people who are worried that they will be put in embarrassing situations.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tubby.

House adjourned at 11.00 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRANSPORT: PASSENGERS

Perth-Fremantle: Survey

1297. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will he table and let me have a copy of the latest survey on passengers travelling between Perth and Fremantle?
- (2) Who carried out the survey?
- (3) Will he table any report upon the passengers using public transport to and from the Perth-Fremantle corridor—
 - (a) prior to reopening Perth-Fremantle rail service on 29 July 1983;
 - (b) recently?
- (4) (a) What were the total number of passenger journeys estimated to be made by bus (including line bus), prior to reopening of rail service, from within the Perth-Fremantle corridor;
 - (b) what are the total number being carried by the combined rail and bus to and from the same area now?
- (5) When comparing the results of the present train service with the previous bus service in the Perth-Fremantle corridor does he relate it to the line bus service only?
- (6) What is the estimated total subsidy per passenger (including social service in deficit) for the last financial year for—
 - (a) rail passengers;
 - (b) bus passengers?
- (7) What progress is being made towards introducing a light rail passenger vehicle?
- (8) When will the first of the 10 new rail cars on order come into service?
- (9) Which of the present ancient rail carriages will be taken off service and how are they to be sold or scrapped?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The last survey conducted for the Perth-Fremantle rail service was a cordon count of passengers arriving and departing on Fremantle line trains at City Station. This was conducted Monday to Friday, September 17 to 21 1984, inclusive, from 0700 to 1800 hours. A copy of the survey summary is

tabled and will be supplied to the member.

- (2) Westrail at the direction of the MTT.

- (3) Reports are tabled—

- (a) Perth-Fremantle line bus service, travel intention and passenger count, June 1983;

- (b) Perth-Fremantle rail study—total passengers carried boardings and alightings, November 1983.

- (4) (a) and (b) Statistics on the total number of passengers using public transport in the Fremantle-Perth corridor are not specifically recorded by the MTT owing to the high cost involved. However, cordon counts of passengers arriving and departing the Perth CBD are made for a week in November and March each year. These figures show that during the week commencing 21 March 1983 the average weekday passengers on buses at the cordon point in the Perth-Fremantle corridor, north of the river, was 18 610, including 6 021 on the line buses.

For the week commencing 19 March 1984 the similar figure was 11 030 on buses and 6 812 on Perth-Fremantle passenger trains which replaced the line buses.

The passenger trains in 1984 carried 791 more passengers on an average weekday than the Perth-Fremantle line buses that they replaced.

While the cordon survey indicates a decline in public transport usage in the corridor of four per cent between the two years, the MTT considers this a marginal variation in view of the differences that could arise from the nature of the cordon counts.

- (5) My observations on rail performance have been based on the conclusions that can be drawn from the information in answer to (4) (a) and (b) above.
- (6) (a) MTT suburban rail 218.78c per passenger;
- (b) MTT bus and ferry 79.73c per passenger.
- (7) Registration of interest and preliminary technical proposals have been invited world-wide for a new generation of diesel rail cars, of lightweight design offering

minimal overall cost, to replace the existing overage urban diesel rail car fleet.

- (8) When pre-delivery trials currently being undertaken have been satisfactorily completed.
- (9) Three ADX and three ADA railcars will be written off and disposed of under Westrail's normal salvage procedures.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 239).

TRANSPORT

Australian Bicentennial Road Development Trust Fund

1301. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) (a) Will he table a copy of the State's programme submitted for public transport from the Australian bicentennial road development trust fund;
- (b) when is approval expected?
- (2) If "No" to (1) (a), why does he refuse?
- (3) (a) Is a rail/bus transfer station to be built at Armadale this year;
- (b) if "Yes", will he table a copy of the plan?
- (4) How many XW and XF wagons are to be built at Midland workshops in this financial year?
- (5) (a) Is the \$3.416 for quarry joint venture made up of cash contributions, or rolling stock and other Westrail assets;
- (b) will he please list the assets?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) (a) Western Australia's rolling programme for urban public transport works to 1988-89 under the Australian bicentennial road development trust fund is being developed and revised as research and evaluations conducted by the MTT proceeds. As such, Western Australia's current ABRD urban public transport programme is not at present contained in one document.

Details of the projects for which Commonwealth approval has been obtained are as follows—

Item	\$ Mill.	Status with Commonwealth approved
High speed priority bus services: 8 additional buses; New park'n ride facilities extended at Rockingham and Innaloo; Park'n ride facilities at Hilton Park and Marmion Reserve; Kwinana bus station improvements	1.7	approved Dec. 1983
High speed priority bus services	2.6	approved Aug. 1984
North-west services: 8 additional buses and more parking at Warwick bus station; Gosnells service: 6 additional buses and extensions to bus depot		

Page 8 of the "supplement to loan estimates speech", in the section dealing with Westrail, lists some specific bus/rail and rail urban public transport projects. It is also stated that application has been made to the Commonwealth for Australian bicentennial road development trust funds of \$2.4 million for these works. This information is incorrect and any inconvenience which it may have caused to members is regretted. The correct position is that a number of bus and rail projects are currently the subject of evaluation and discussion prior to an application being made for further ABRD funds.

- (b) See (1) (a).
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) The construction in 1984-85 of a bus/rail transfer station at Armadale is dependent upon the result of economic and financial evaluations being conducted at present, and on subsequent Commonwealth approval of ABRD funding.
- (b) Not applicable
- (4) 30 XWB grain wagons to be completed
30 XW grain wagons to be commenced
3 XF alumina wagons to be commenced.
- (5) (a) and (b) The \$3.416 million shown in the printed loan estimates for Westrail in 1984-85 against the quarry joint venture, together with the \$271 988 actual for 1983-84, is made up of a mixture of a cash contribution, a repayable loan, rolling stock, and other Westrail assets represented as per the following list—
- conversion of surplus iron ore wagons
 - construction of Chris Hill siding
 - steelwork and infrastructure at quarry
 - steelwork and infrastructure at Kewdale distribution point

construction of Kewdale siding
working capital contribution
land
cash loan

As the joint venturer, Western Quarries Pty. Ltd. is a private company in a competitive market; further financial details are confidential.

1324. *Postponed.*

WOMEN'S INTERESTS: WOMEN'S INFORMATION AND REFERRAL EXCHANGE

Cost

1333. Mr CLARKO, to the Premier:

- (1) What was the cost of setting up the Women's Information and Referral Exchange?
- (2) What services does it provide?
- (3) Who was directly involved in setting up the Women's Information and Referral Exchange?
- (4) If the Women's Information and Referral Exchange was set up by a consultant, what was the name of the firm and who is its principal?
- (5) If the Women's Information and Referral Exchange was set up by an individual or a group other than in (4)—
 - (a) what are the names of the people involved;
 - (b) what was their fee?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) A budget of \$480 360 was allocated for the establishment of the Women's Information and Referral Exchange and also to cover ongoing costs for the current financial year.
- (2) See answer to question 1312 of 1984.
- (3) The Women's Information and Referral Exchange was set up by the women's interests division, Department of Premier and Cabinet, after consultation with the Women's Advisory Council and members of the community who attended a public meeting.
- (4) Deborah McCulloch was retained as a consultant by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Her duties from February to June 1984 were generally to assist in establishing the infrastructure for implementation of policy and priorities relating to women's interests. These included assisting to set up Women's Information and Referral Exchange. Ms

McCulloch was retained as an individual, she was not a member of a consultancy firm.

(5) (a) See answer to (3);

(b) this function was performed as part of the general duties of the officers of the women's interests division.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: PEEL INLET

12 metre Yacht Facilities

1335. Mr READ, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Can he give some detail of the work which would be required to develop an entrance suitable for 12 metre yachts at the entrance to Peel Inlet?
- (2) Would any blasting of rock be necessary to develop such an entrance?
- (3) Would that entrance require ongoing maintenance and, if so, what would this entail?
- (4) Who would bear the cost of this maintenance?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) About 322 000 m³ of accumulated sand would have to be dredged from around the ocean entrance to form a permanent channel at least 3.5 metres deep and to clear an associated silt trap of sufficient size to prevent the channel from being blocked by sand which moves rapidly into the entrance during severe winter storms.

Probing has indicated that natural rock exists within the entrance channel area at a level of about 3.0 metres below sounding datum. Some of this rock would have to be removed.

- (2) Yes. Blasting would be required to remove any rock which prevents dredging of the 3.5 metres deep channel.
- (3) Continuous maintenance dredging of the channel and sand trap areas, at a cost of up to \$650 000 annually, would be required to maintain a permanent channel for 12 metre yachts.
- (4) Funding sources to cover the ongoing maintenance cost have not yet been negotiated.

1338 to 1345. *Postponed.*

WORKS: LAND PURCHASE

Waroona

1346. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) At what stage are the negotiations to purchase land for the Education Department at Waroona?
- (2) If the negotiations have not been concluded, when does he anticipate the block will be purchased?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) Negotiations to purchase land for the Education Department at Waroona will now recommence following approval of allocation of funds in the Budget.
- (2) Until negotiations have been satisfactorily concluded it is not possible to anticipate a date for purchase. However, it is hoped to finalise the matter this financial year.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Clifton Park

1348. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (a) Has consideration been given to building a primary school at Clifton Park;
- (b) if so, when?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) and (b) The need for a school at Clifton Park has been given close consideration in recent years. As the Eaton School, where these students now attend, has easing enrolments, another school is not yet required to serve the total area.

1350. *Postponed.*

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Waroona

1351. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (a) Is he aware of the need for a new primary school at Waroona;
- (b) if so, does he intend to have a new primary school built at Waroona;
- (c) if so, when?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) to (c) Replacement of buildings for the primary section of the Waroona District

High School has been an accepted principle, but no timing has been given to the project.

1354. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Marriage Guidance Council of WA (Inc.)

1356. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier and Treasurer:

- (1) (a) Does the policy of the State Government place value and importance on the maintenance, retention and encouragement of family units in society;
- (b) if "Yes", in which way has this policy been implemented?
- (2) (a) Does it recognise the value of the work being done by the Marriage Guidance Council of Western Australia in keeping families together;
- (b) if "Yes", in which way?
- (3) Does the State Government acknowledge the cost effectiveness, let alone social value of the work done by the council?
- (4) Is he aware that the work of the council will be severely restricted in this year because—
 - (a) its commonwealth funding has been reduced by 5 per cent in real terms;
 - (b) he has dropped State assistance in this year's Budget?
- (5) Will he explain why the State Government failed to provide any funds this year?
- (6) (a) Did he, as Treasurer, make any representations to the Commonwealth on behalf of the council prior to the August Budget;
- (b) if not, why not?
- (7) (a) Does his Government consider the level of marriage support and marriage counselling available to Western Australians is adequate;
- (b) if not adequate, what action does he propose to remedy the situation?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (7) Since 1973-74 the Commonwealth has assumed prime responsibility for the funding of the Marriage Guidance Council of Western Australia.

In that year, the State provided a grant of \$14 000 towards operating costs, the level of assistance being increased to \$20 000 in 1976-77.

In 1974-75 the State agreed to meet the annual instalments of \$8 282 on \$50 000 of a loan obtained by the council for the development of a new headquarters. Total annual assistance from the State continued at the level of \$28 282 from 1976-77 to 1981-82.

In 1982-83 the previous Government decided to discontinue the operating grant, but continued to meet repayments on the loan. The loan was extinguished in 1983-84.

Funding of the Marriage Guidance Council is now entirely a responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. The present Government merely continued an arrangement introduced by its predecessor.

However, in view of the important work undertaken by the council I am prepared to consider a further submission on its financial arrangements.

HEALTH: NURSES

School Nurses

1357. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Health:

Adverting to question 1175 of 16 October 1984, would he please advise whether school nurses are categorised as community nurses?

Mr HODGE replied:

The nurses public health and industrial award stipulates different rates of pay for school health nurses and community health field nurses. Both are categorized in functional terms as community nurses.

TRANSPORT: FREIGHT

Western Wild Flower Farm

1358. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that Total West has advised Mrs Rhonda Tonkin of Coomerdale, who operates the Western Wildflower Farm, that it will be increasing the price from \$2 a box to \$5 a box for flower arrangements transported to Perth?
- (2) In view of the fact that such operations as Mrs Tonkin's are a boon to the State

in tourism, and an export earner, will he investigate this matter with a view to reducing this overnight increase of 150 per cent in freight charges to another country business?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) While the increase may seem exorbitant, it is clear the rate of \$2 per box was totally artificial. In fact, the rate of \$5 per box is an extremely keen rate given that each box has a weight of about 50 kilograms and is transported to Perth by the Total West Sprint Express Service.

I understand that other wildflower producers are charged transport rates equal to or greater than the \$5 per box now applying to Western Wildflower Farm. For me to intervene to reduce the rate would be clearly unfair to competitive producers. However, Western Wildflower Farm is of course free to further negotiate with Total West or any other commercial carrier. The basic situation is that Total West is a commercial operation in a commercial market. The Government does not interfere in commercial decisions.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Katanning District Hospital: Permanent Care Section

1359. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Health:

When is it expected work will commence on the proposed extensions to the permanent care section of the Katanning District Hospital?

Mr HODGE replied:

Contract documents are expected to be completed by mid-November 1984. It is expected that, after allowing for the tender and acceptance process, a contract should be awarded by mid-January 1985 for completion of construction in early June 1985.

EDUCATION: BUNBURY

Remedial

1360. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of the commitment made by the Labor Party prior to the 1983 election to PLEDGE at Bunbury?

- (2) Does he intend to fulfill the commitment under item 49 of the Labor Party pre-election promise respecting remedial education and funding for a pilot programme to be used in Bunbury?
- (3) How much money has the Government provided to PLEDGE since coming to office?
- (4) How much money does he intend to allocate in the 1984-85 Budget?
- (5) If he does not intend to meet the pre-election promise, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (5) The Labor Party's pre-election promise presented in the 1983 State election policy as regards education for handicapped and disadvantaged people was as follows—

Educational provision for handicapped and disadvantaged students will be upgraded and restructured and, as far as possible, integrated into the mainstream of schooling.

This policy is now in the process of implementation through the establishment of educational support units as a pilot project in some schools for 1985. My Press release dealing with this is passed to the member.

The item in the 1982 Labor Party platform to which the member refers is being effectively implemented in this way. However, it is not proposed to establish one of the education support units in a Bunbury school in 1985 as there are special problems in Bunbury following a recent and continuing court case. It is intended to establish such a unit in Bunbury as soon as is feasible.

As the State Government is making this comprehensive provision for integrated special education, it does not propose to provide funds to private organisations to do the same thing.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Mandurah-Pinjarra

1361. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he considered a bus service between Mandurah and Pinjarra?
- (2) If not, will he investigate the possibility of such a bus service?
- (3) If "No" to (2), why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) The member for Mandurah raised the issue of an MTT service between Mandurah and Pinjarra with me earlier this year, and he and I had discussions with the MTT in July. Unfortunately the answer I must give to the member for Murray-Wellington is the same as that I gave to the member for Mandurah: There appears no feasibility of providing the service at present. However, the situation will continue to be under review at the MTT from time to time.

TRANSPORT: CONCESSION

Unemployed

1362. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Do metropolitan unemployed people receive special fares arrangements for public transport?
- (2) Do country people who are unemployed receive lower fare benefits?
- (3) Is he aware that not every country town has a Commonwealth Employment Service office and therefore unemployed people have to travel to register?
- (4) If there are no special fares on public transport for unemployed people in the country, will he consider lower fares?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Free vouchers for travel on public transport are available through the Commonwealth Employment Service for unemployed people resident in the country who are attending job interviews.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) All concessionary fares for travel on public transport are currently under review.

HEALTH

Caravan Parks

1363. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he intend to introduce any legislation regarding alteration to the Health Act concerning caravan parks?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If so, what changes does he intend to make?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) There is no proposed alteration to the Health Act in relation to caravan parks. The caravan park and camping ground regulations, made under the Health Act, are currently under review.
- (2) Amendments to the caravan parks and camping ground regulations are contemplated early next year.
- (3) The major feature of amendments to the regulations is the categorization of caravan or camping parks into various types with appropriate standards for each type.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Operations

1364. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) Are there waiting lists for surgery at Fremantle, Sir Charles Gairdner and Royal Perth Hospital;
- (b) if so, what are the current numbers on the various hospital waiting lists?
- (2) What were the numbers for the same time last year and the year before?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The member is referred to the answer to question 1027 of 9 October 1984.
- (2) Statistics for 1983, where available, are included in the answer referred to in (a) and (b); statistics for 1982 are not available.

HEALTH: PRIVATE CLINICS

Control

1365. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he any intention to introduce legislation to tighten controls on private clinics or health centres in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If so, what are the basic intentions of the legislation?

Mr HODGE replied:

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

AGRICULTURE: APIARIES

American Brood Disease: Elimination

1366. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will the Government encourage Ansett International in its wish to make a feasibility study for an ionising energy plant in Western Australia which would eliminate the necessity to destroy beehives with American brood disease?
- (2) If "Yes", what action is the Government taking?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) It is in the interests of bee disease control to have a facility for irradiation treatment of infected beehives in Western Australia. I will make inquiries regarding any proposal to establish such a facility in this State.

AGRICULTURE: APIARIES

Chemotherapy

1367. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are beekeepers to be allowed to use chemotherapy in diseased hives as an alternative to burning when provision for it has been made in the Beekeepers Act?
- (2) If "No", why is this particular stand being maintained?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Departmental policy is to eradicate American brood disease in infected apiaries and this cannot normally be achieved by use of chemotherapy in diseased hives. This policy is generally supported by industry. Use of chemotherapy would result in antibiotic residues in export honey.

AGRICULTURE: APIARIES

American Brood Disease: Elimination

1368. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of the strong view held by beekeepers that disease is widespread in the feral bee population; it cannot be controlled, so destruction of commercial beehives is only putting the beekeeper out of business and not controlling the disease?

- (2) What action has been taken to control disease in feral hives?
- (3) What alternative methods are both policy and departmentally acceptable instead of destruction of the hive by burning?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The department is aware that some beekeepers hold the views expressed in this question.
- (2) None. This is not a practicable option.
- (3) At this stage destruction is the only acceptable policy for the eradication of brood diseases in infected apiaries. This policy is generally supported by industry.

AGRICULTURE: APIARIES

American Brood Disease: Apiarists

1369. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many beekeepers in Western Australia have hives affected by American brood disease and what is being done about it?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Department of Agriculture is treating the problem individually and not as an overall disease situation?
- (3) What policy and programme has the Government and department towards controlling and eliminating disease in beehives?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Thirty-four of the 1 613 registered beekeepers in Western Australia were under quarantine restrictions as at 30 September 1984. The department is actively pursuing eradication of the disease from infected apiaries.
- (2) No. The programme is State-wide.
- (3) The policy for the control of brood diseases in honey bees is to identify and destroy diseased colonies thereby eliminating disease in infected apiaries. Compensation is available through an industry funded compensation fund.

AGRICULTURE: APIARIES

American Brood Disease: Laboratory Examination

1370. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Why is a slide only taken from one diseased hive in an apiary?
- (2) Will the Government and the department, on request from beekeepers, take slides from all diseased hives and be tested for European brood disease as well as American brood disease and the results given in writing?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Once the disease has been confirmed by laboratory examination in an apiary it is not necessary to have laboratory confirmation on each colony as the disease can be recognised by visual examination in infected colonies.
- (2) This has been agreed to so far and will continue to be as long as resources permit.

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Armada-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital Landscaping

1371. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) For what purposes are the new brick structures being built on or near the Albany Highway frontage of the Armada-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital?
- (2) What consideration has been given and action taken to protect the aesthetic and environmental beauty of the site against indiscriminate placing of buildings on the site?
- (3) Is he aware the buildings will block the view to and from the hospital?
- (4) Will he please table a ground plan for the hospital site showing where present and future development and building programmes are to be sited?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The brick structures at the entry of the Armada-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital are a—
 - (a) high voltage switchroom;
 - (b) security enclosure to house gas connection.
- (2) All current and proposed buildings for the site are consistent with an overall

master plan to ensure buildings are not indiscriminately located. the architectural and landscaping brief requires all developments to be planned in sympathy with the natural environment.

- (3) Statutory authorities require site services connections to be in close proximity to the frontage of the site. Therefore, some restriction of the views to the hospital was unavoidable. Current and future developments for the site will, as much as is possible, preserve the view from all hospital buildings.
- (4) No. The total development of the Armadale-Kelmscott Hospital site is still under review.

ROADS: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Reserve: Development

1372. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to the excavation and development taking place on or near the Mitchell Freeway road reserve and on the, eastern side between Malcolm and Mount Streets, is the road reserve being used for the development?
- (2) Will he advise the details of the development?
- (3) What approvals were obtained and given for the development to proceed?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The owners of the property, lot 54 Mount Street, are developing a hotel on the site which abuts the eastern boundary of the reserve. The developers have sought and obtained the department's conditional approval to over-excavate on the common boundary on the basis that they will reinstate the grounds and landscaping within the reserve at the completion of the below ground works.
- (3) The developers have obtained Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and Perth City Council approval for the development in the usual way.

ARTS: LIBRARY BOARD

Funds

1373. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What is the Budget percentage increase this year for the provision of library books through the Library Board of Western Australia?
- (2) What grant is to be made to the Town of Armadale for library books from the Library Board this year?
- (3) What percentage increase is the grant referred to in (2)?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) The increase in the Budget line for the purchase of books by the Library Board over 1983-84 is 17.3 per cent.
- (2) Cash grants are not made to local authorities for book purchases. The principal form of subsidy is in the provision of new books. Armadale Town will receive new books through the exchange system as follows—

Armadale Library	2 156
Kelmscott Library	2 517
Additional entitlement consequent upon a 2 500 addition to basic stock through the development programme	153
	<hr/> 4 826

At an average cost of \$12.25 the allocation is thus worth \$59 118.50. This does not include cost of processing.

- (3) The increase over the 1983-84 provision is 17.7 per cent

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASE

Mt Anderson Station: Compensation

1374. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Referring to the compensation payment due to Mr Blair for Mt. Anderson Station, why is the Government not honouring its commitment to have an independent arbitrator appointed on a normal commercial basis?
- (2) Is he aware that the Aboriginal Development Commission is refusing to sign a letter accepting the decision of the independent arbitration as final?
- (3) Why has he signed the transfer of lease before a satisfactory agreement has been reached?

- (4) Has he handed the signed transfer of lease to the Aboriginal Development Commission?
- (5) Is he still in a position to tear up the lease agreement if the Aboriginal Development Commission does not accept the independent arbitrator's decision based on normal commercial factors?
- (6) What is the present position regarding the leasing of Mt. Anderson Station?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Government has and is still endeavouring to achieve complete mutual agreement, from both parties involved, on the terms of the appointment of an independent arbitrator. To this end, I have arranged a meeting with all interested parties for Friday, 26 October.
- (2) No.
- (3) The transfer of the Mt. Anderson pastoral lease was signed to avoid any further hardship being incurred by the vendor and mortgagees.
- (4) The endorsed transfer documents have been returned to the solicitors representing the Aboriginal Development Corporation so as to permit settlement of the sale of Mt. Anderson.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) See (1) to (5) above.

1375. *Postponed.*

AGRICULTURE: WHEAT

Wild Radish Control

1376. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has there been a significant increase in the past 12 months in the cost of chemicals used by wheat farmers for wild radish control?
- (2) What is the current price of a 200 litre drum and what was it 12 months ago?
- (3) Has he an explanation for the increase?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) The retail prices for a range of herbicides used for wild radish control in cereals in 1983 and 1984, as quoted by a single firm, are—

	Pack Size	1983	1984
Glean	500g	\$345.00	\$330.00
Igran (+ MCPA)	20l	\$320.00	\$266.00
2,4-D Amine (50%e)	20l	\$46.23	\$51.76
2, 4-D Ester (80%e)	20l	\$91.00	\$101.83
Bromoxynil	20l	\$156.68	\$169.00
MCPA	20l	\$58.00	\$63.43

Some prices have risen by 8 per cent to 10 per cent, others have fallen.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Land Claims: Apiarists

1377. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

When Aboriginals are granted land in the coastal belt north of Perth, will beekeepers be barred from using this area which is the beekeepers traditional wintering and spring building-up country?

Mr WILSON replied:

This is a hypothetical question and I am not prepared to make a response. The member will be aware that the Government will be presenting a draft Bill, on Aboriginal land, to the House and he will then be in a better position to inform himself.

PLANNING: URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE OF AUSTRALIA

Land Tax Assessments

1378. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Planning:

- (1) Has the Minister received representation from the Urban Development Institute of Australia with various recommendations to restructure land tax assessments?
- (2) (a) Was there consideration given to these recommendations;
(b) if there was, by whom?
- (3) (a) Were any of the recommendations accepted;
(b) if not, can he please expand on the reasons why not?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Yes;
(b) by a committee comprising officers from the treasury and the State Taxation Department.

- (3) (a) and (b) The report of the committee is now under consideration.

1379 to 1383. *Postponed.*

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

City Beach

1384. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Would he please advise whether there is an amount set aside in the Budget for maintenance work in the City Beach Primary School?

Mr McIVER replied:

Yes.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Floreat Park

1385. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Would he please advise whether there is an amount set aside in the Budget for maintenance work in the Floreat Park Primary School?

Mr McIVER replied:

No amount has been set aside in the Budget for maintenance work in the Floreat Park Primary School.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Kapinara

1386. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Would he please advise whether there is an amount set aside in the Budget for maintenance work in the Kapinara Primary School?

Mr McIVER replied:

No amount has been set aside in the Budget for maintenance work in the Kapinara Primary School.

1387. *Postponed.*

BUSINESS: CORPORATE AFFAIRS OFFICE

Expenditure

1388. Mr TRETOWAN, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) What was the expenditure of the Corporate Affairs Office during 1983-84?
- (2) What was the revenue raised by the Corporate Affairs office during 1983-84?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) \$3 211 027.
- (2) \$8 845 806.

HOUSING: SHC

Construction Contracts

1389. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) (a) Does the State Housing Commission involve itself in construction contracts;
- (b) if so, where is it currently so operating;
- (c) if not, does the State Housing Commission give indicative construction prices to any organisations which may request such guidance?
- (2) Does the State Housing Commission tender for construction work and then subcontract it out?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) (a) The State Housing Commission acts as a construction organisation only in the instances of Aboriginal village projects where they are responsible for the supply and erection of building materials, labour, and supervision;
- (b) current villages under construction are—
 1. One Arm Point;
 2. Christmas Creek;
 3. Noonkanbah;
 4. Kurnagki (Fitzroy);
- (c) the State Housing Commission as an agent for various bodies will provide provisional estimates of cost.

(2) No.

ROADS

*Pinetree Gully Road-Burrendah Boulevard
Intersection*

1390. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

How many accidents have occurred in each of the last 12 months at the intersection of Pinetree Gully Road and Burrendah Boulevard?

Mr GRILL replied:

Number of reported accidents at the intersection of Pinetree Gully Road and Burrendah Boulevard—

September 1983—0
October 1983—0
November 1983—0
December 1983—1
January 1984—0
February 1984—0
March 1984—2
April 1984—0
May 1984—2
June 1984—4
July 1984—0
August 1984—0.

AUSTMARK INTERNATIONAL LTD:
BUNBURY*Construction*

1391. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

(1) Has work on the Government's Austmark office tower in Bunbury been stopped?

(2) If so, for what reason?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES:
ACCOMMODATION*Bunbury: Rentals*

1392. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

What is the lowest and highest rentals per square metre per annum that the State Government is currently paying for office accommodation in Bunbury?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Lowest rental—\$22.66 per square metre per annum.

Highest rental—\$94.56 per square metre per annum.

1393. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Number

1394. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

Will he let me have the total number of government employees in each of the Government departments, commissions, agencies, etc. as at 1 October 1983, or at the latest date these figures are available, on the same basis as the list provided in answer to question 2398 of 1 December 1983?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The information required is contained in a letter to the member for Dale dated 23 October 1984, copy of which is tabled.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 240).

EDUCATION: CLEANERS

Mrs Balloqui

1395. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) (a) Is it a fact that the Government is discriminating against women employees, who in their judgment are not "the fittest persons" to fill the vacancy;

(b) If "Yes", does not this action discriminate unfairly against older people, particularly women?

(2) Will he give consideration to reversing this decision which can be seen to discriminate against the employment of older women and to the employment of Mrs Balloqui in particular?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) (a) No. The Education Department only discriminates between potential cleaning employees on the grounds of medical fitness and work experience;

(b) see (a).

(2) No.

ROTTNEST ISLAND: BOARD

Chairman

1396. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

Who is the current Chairman of the Rottne Island Board?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Premier.

1397 to 1399. *Postponed.*

HOUSING: SHC

Rentals: List

1400. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

Will he provide me with—

- (a) a detailed list of the current State Housing Commission rentals being charged to tenants;
- (b) a detailed list of the current rentals being charged to Government Employees' Housing Authority tenants?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (a) and (b) I will table details of the current rents being charged on State Housing Commission and Government Employees' Housing Authority rental properties.

The details were tabled (see paper No. 241).

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES: ACCOMMODATION

Leased: Kings Building

1401. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) (a) Does the Government have a lease over any section of the Kings Building in Hay Street, Perth;
- (b) if so, what are the terms of that lease?
- (2) What Government departments or authorities are currently located in these offices?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) Yes;
- (b) rental: \$96 per square metre per annum inclusive of all outgoings.
- (2) Currently being established—
1st floor—Department of Lands and Surveys
2nd floor—State Taxation Department
3rd floor—Health Education Council
5th floor—Land Valuation and Town Planning, Appeal Tribunals, Barristers Board of WA.

LAND: URBAN LANDS COUNCIL

Land Purchase: Jandakot

1402. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Urban Lands Council recently purchased Lot 416, Lyons Road in Jandakot?
- (2) What is the current zoning of that property?
- (3) For what reason has this property been purchased by the council?

Mr WILSON replied:

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

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: SWDA

Property Purchases

1403. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) Is it fact that the South West Development Authority has been negotiating to purchase residential lots or properties in the Bunbury area?
- (2) If so, what is the reason for the authority wishing to purchase these properties?

Mr GRILL replied:

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

HOUSING

Spot Purchase Programme

1404. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many properties will be purchased in Bunbury during the year ending 30 June 1985, in the Government's spot purchase programme?
- (2) How many of these properties have been purchased to date?
- (3) What has been the average price paid for those properties?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The commission has targetted to purchase some 21 properties in Bunbury including two for Aboriginal tenants this financial year.
- (2) No properties have yet been purchased, but negotiations are proceeding on seven with executed offers and acceptances.
- (3) Average price in the order of \$45 100.

HOUSING

Spot Purchase Programme

1405. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

In what suburbs in the metropolitan area or in what country towns will the 15 to 20 spot purchase houses funded from the Commonwealth Aboriginal grant funds be purchased during the year ending 30 June 1985?

Mr WILSON replied:

The properties purchased from Aboriginal grant funds will be selected following an assessment on suitability and will be scattered throughout the metropolitan area in northern, south-eastern, and Fremantle region suburbs.

Some may also be purchased in country and north-west towns depending on demand, market, and land availability.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Operations

1406. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Do the public hospitals in the metropolitan area and regional centres keep records of average waiting times for the various categories of surgical operations?
- (2) What were the average waiting times for each category of operation in each of the metropolitan and regional hospitals at the time Medicare was introduced?
- (3) What are the waiting times now?
- (4) Has there been any change in the seriousness of operations now subject to waiting times since Medicare was introduced?
- (5) (a) Has there been any change in the average post-operative hospital stay for patients in each category and each hospital since Medicare was introduced;
(b) if so, what is the change?
- (6) Has there been any other change in treatment patterns which is attributed to the introduction of Medicare and consequent patient pressure on public hospitals?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (6) The amount of research required to provide a response to such a wide-ranging general question would be very time consuming, and expensive. Much of the information is not kept on central records and would require a massive departmental effort to acquire. Many doctors keep personal lists and each practitioner who provides services to the hospitals will require to be contacted. I am not prepared to authorise the allocation of departmental time in this manner.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Indian Pacific

1407. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that the major drawback to the success of the *Indian Pacific* train is the unreliability of the service?
- (2) Has he taken steps towards a contract being negotiated with the unions to guarantee the continued running of the train?
- (3) Is he aware that Australian Railways are not keen to keep the train service?
- (4) Does he intend to move towards cessation of the service if he cannot gain guarantees of a continued reliable service?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Unreliability, caused by industrial disputes, mainly in the Eastern States, is one of the problems to be addressed. Other problems are, providing the type of service which will be attractive to the multifarious requirements of the travelling public, divided control by the rail authorities, and competition from other travel modes.
- (2) This matter is under consideration by the Australian Transport Advisory Council.
- (3) No.
- (4) The member's question is hypothetical and, therefore, cannot be answered categorically.

I am confident that the train's future can be assured and to this end I have arranged a seminar with participation by leading transport and tourism people and the railway unions to be held in Western Australia in January next.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY: HERB GRAHAM HOUSE

Offices

396. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

Can the Premier advise me when he will be in a position to respond to question on notice 541 I asked on 22 August to the Acting Premier, concerning Government contracts in relation to Herb Graham House? The reply given on the day was that the information was being collated and would be forwarded to me directly. I raised specifically with the Acting Premier at the time the question of how long that might take and he undertook to expedite it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I am not immediately familiar with the question, but I will have it checked out and the answer forwarded to the Leader of the Opposition as soon as possible.

STATE FINANCE C.R.F.

Budget Surplus

397. Mr READ, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he been made aware of claims today by the Leader of the Opposition that the 1983-84 Budget surplus should have been around \$15 million instead of \$1 million as announced by the Government, because of amounts of money shown in the Auditor-General's report as having been retained in the hospital buildings and equipment account and the State employment strategies fund?
- (2) Has he investigated the claims and, if so, with what result?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes, I was made aware of these allegations by the Leader of the Opposition.

The facts of the matter are that the State Government followed the conventional and traditional accounting practices in calculating the Budget outcome for 1983-84.

The practices were the same as those used every year since 1979-80, except in 1982-83.

Under the provisions of the Lotteries (Control) Act, all lottery proceeds paid to the Government must be placed in the

hospital fund, not the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

As a former Chief Secretary, with responsibility for the Lotteries Commission, the Leader of the Opposition ought to be aware of this.

Since 1979-80 some of the lottery proceeds paid into the hospital fund have been placed in the hospital buildings and equipment account.

The amounts were—

1979-80—	\$5.4 million
1980-81—	\$6.3 million
1981-82—	\$8 million
1983-84—	\$11.6 million

The funds in the account at 30 June this year had already been allocated for work for which contracts had been let.

The work was on the Perth Dental Hospital, \$1.8 million, contract let in June; Sir Charles Gairdner hospital, \$2.3 million, contract let in August 1983; Kalgoorlie Hospital, \$3 million, contract let in May; and extended care facilities at various hospitals, \$4.5 million, main contract let in April.

If the Government had done as the Leader of the Opposition suggests, this work would not be done. What the Leader of the Opposition has been arguing today is, in effect, that these hospitals should not be upgraded.

Mr Hassell: That was not said very clearly. You obviously do not have your facts right.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am pleased to differ from the Leader of the Opposition. I know what I am saying.

Mr Hassell: You do not know what I said because you have it wrong once again.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This will be of particular interest to the people of the eastern goldfields who were repeatedly denied decent hospital facilities until this Government took office.

The state employment strategies fund is a Government trust fund that contained about \$2.8 million on 30 June which had been earmarked by Parliament for expenditure on employment.

It is normal practice to pay amounts appropriated by Parliament to the relevant trust fund.

The balance in the fund at 30 June was held for employment programmes and was taken into account in determining the allocations for 1984-85.

It is surprising that the Leader of the Opposition should be attacking the Government for following practices used by the Court Government in which he was a Minister. This speaks volumes about the level of attention—or, more correctly, inattention—given to financial matters by the Leader of the Opposition when he was a Minister.

His claims suggest he and his advisers do not understand very much about financial management.

HOUSING: SHC

Industrial Disputes

398. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the dispute between Plunkett Homes Pty. Ltd. and the Building Workers' Industrial Union which threatens to stop work on the State Housing Commission sites which was referred to last night in a question which I asked of the Minister, is subject to a meeting between parties to the dispute and the SHC tomorrow morning?
- (2) What is the Minister's attitude to the central issue of the dispute; that is, whether a duplex site is an industrial site and therefore subject to industrial site awards?
- (3) If the resolution of the dispute is that the site is covered by an industrial site award, will the Minister ensure that the SHC recompenses the builders for the additional costs that they will incur as a result of that determination?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes, I am aware that a meeting is to be held.
- (2) to (4) I do not agree that duplex sites constitute what the member says they might constitute. I understand that the responsibility of the State Housing Commission is to be faithful to the contract into which it entered with the builders.

FISHERIES: ROCK LOBSTERS

Illegal Catches

399. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a series of recommendations that were made to the Fisheries and Wildlife Department by the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee in which claims of widespread illegal activity by divers were described?
- (2) Is he also aware of the distress these allegations are causing members of scuba clubs, all of whom are qualified divers whose rigorous training includes conservation and preservation of marine life?
- (3) Does he also realise the allocation of eight lobsters per day is rarely achieved because of difficulties associated with regulations which stipulate they must be caught by hand?
- (4) Is it his intention to act on these recommendations?
- (5) If so, will he take into consideration the effect any restrictions will have on tourism?
- (6) Would it be possible to designate areas where divers could operate?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (6) I thank the member for Greenough for giving me adequate notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

I am aware of the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee's report.

I have asked the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife to consider the implications of the committee's recommendations, and advise me further.

UNIONS: BWIU

Standover Tactics

400. Mr COURT, to the Premier representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Has the Government requested industrial inspectors to visit the building site at lot 1, Beechboro Road, Morley where standover activities by the Building Workers' Industrial Union have been reported to the Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

This question was addressed to me as the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations. In the time allowed by the graciousness of the member's notice of this question, inquiries have been made. I am informed that there have been no reports to the office of the Minister for Industrial Relations of any standover tactics by the BWIU at the site referred to.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: DEPARTMENT

Future

401. Mrs BEGGS, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he had an opportunity to check the situation with regard to the future of the Department of Administrative Services following the question asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition?
- (2) If so, what is the position?
- (3) Has he also been made aware of other claims by the Leader of the Opposition that the funds of the Lotteries Commission and the Totalisator Agency Board are to be used for political purposes?
- (4) If so, are these claims accurate?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) The Government is to establish the Office of Racing and Gaming. In the process of the establishment of that office, some of the functions presently discharged by the Department of Administrative Services will be distributed amongst other departments and agencies.

Astronomical Services will go to the Department of Technology, the Correspondence Despatch Office will go to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Registrar General's Office will go to the Crown Law Department, and the Licensing Court is to be an identity on its own responsible to the Minister for Tourism. The Lotteries (Control) Act, the Lotto Act, the Soccer Football Pools Act, the Charitable Collections Act and the Street Collections (Regulation) Act will be the responsibility of the Department of the Treasury and the Minister for Budget Management.

Commissioners for declarations will go to the Attorney General and censorship

will go to the Minister for the Arts. The Office of Racing and Gaming will have responsibility for liaison between the Minister and the Totalisator Agency Board in relation to racing Acts and matters involving the Western Australian Turf Club, the Western Australian Trotting Association and the Western Australian Greyhound Racing Association.

It will also be responsible for the administration of gaming Acts including the Casino Control Act. The Government casino inspection staff will be part of the office.

The claims made by the Leader of the Opposition about the Government's wanting to get control of the funds of the Lotteries Commission and the TAB, and to use them for political purposes, are absolute nonsense.

Mr MacKinnon: Did you say you had no knowledge of all of those claims yesterday?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I certainly had no knowledge of the detailed changes to which the question referred.

Mr MacKinnon: I am amazed.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member's amazement reflects his own position rather than any objective analysis of the situation.

Mr MacKinnon: I doubt it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I expect the member would doubt it, otherwise he would not be amazed.

The claims by the Leader of the Opposition about the Government's wanting to get control of the funds of the Lotteries Commission and the TAB and use them for political purposes are absolute nonsense. Exactly what he means by that is not very clear. I doubt whether he even knows himself.

Under the existing Statutes—

Mr MacKinnon: Did he make that claim in the question he asked you last night?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not sure; I cannot remember the nature of the detailed question.

Mr MacKinnon: He did not make that claim. I cannot recall his ever making that claim.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If he did not make that claim, I wonder why it was broadcast on the news.

Mr MacKinnon: That is not what the question said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not saying what the question said. This question tonight stated—

Has he also been made aware of other claims by the Leader of the Opposition that the funds of the Lotteries Commission and the Totalisator Agency Board are to be used for political purposes?

That is tonight's question and I am answering this question tonight. The member is referring to last night.

Mr MacKinnon: I would like to know where that claim was made. I don't believe that it was made.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It was not made in the question asked last night. We have established that fact.

Mr MacKinnon: Correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: However, that is not exclusive of the claim having been made at another time in another place.

Mr MacKinnon: Which I doubt very much.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This question asked about the matter so I will answer it. Exactly what he means by this is not very clear and I doubt whether he even knows himself. Under the existing Statutes governing those bodies I do not see how it would be possible to use their funds for political purposes. This Government has certainly not made any study of how such a thing could be carried out. If, as the Leader of the Opposition seems to suggest, such a thing were possible I can only assume that any knowledge he has results from investigations he made while he was the responsible Minister. If such investigations were made during his term as Minister, I think he had better acknowledge those investigations and explain why they were made. This is another example of the Leader of the Opposition making wild and irresponsible allegations.

Mr MacKinnon: You do not know that he made any allegations.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I heard them on the radio.

Mr MacKinnon: Did you hear the Leader of the Opposition make the allegations?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I heard the report of his making the allegations.

Mr MacKinnon: You have not even checked out whether in fact that report was factual. You have not verified whether the Leader of the Opposition made the statement.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In that case the Opposition members will never be able to ask another question. All they do is pick up the *Daily News* for the current evening and ask questions on the basis of reports they have not checked out.

Mr Blaikie: I have a different one tonight.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are going to break new ground.

That is the absurdity of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's position. This is another example of the Leader of the Opposition making wild and irresponsible allegations without a shred of evidence and without offering the slightest justification for his outlandish claim. It is indicative of his increasing desperation about the circumstances of his party and more particularly about his own circumstances as leader. It is about time his colleagues stood up and told him that they want him to concentrate on real issues and policies instead of inventing and perpetrating falsehoods.

DAIRYING: PRODUCTS

Imports

402. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an increase in the importation of processed dairy products from the Eastern States at prices below those agreed by the industry?
- (2) If so, what action is available to redress the situation?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware of the importation of some dairy products and I have had the prices examined. I assume that the member is referring to "Big M" products?

Mr Old: Yes, in the main.

Mr EVANS: As a result of my inquiries I have received figures from a firm involved in the importation. From the

figures I received it appeared that the agreement had not been breached to that time.

Mr Old: Is there any mechanism under the levy agreement on market milk that applies to processed products?

Mr EVANS: This would be outside the scope of market milk. There is a gentlemen's agreement on the purchase of milk that is used in UHT and other special dairy products.

I am not aware that any agreement has been breached. However, if the member has some information that suggests the matter should be investigated, I will be happy to do so.

WOMEN'S INTERESTS

Equal Opportunity Bill

403. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Premier:

Would the Premier as Minister for Women's Interests, please report to the House on the passage of the Equal Opportunities Bill and its significance?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The passage of the Equal Opportunities Bill which completed the Committee stage in the Legislative Council last evening, has surprisingly enjoyed bipartisan support in both Houses. Both Houses have acknowledged the necessity for the Bill which offers a standard of non-discriminatory conduct for all West Australians and toward all West Australians.

For this reason the Bill is one of the most important pieces of social justice draft legislation to enter this Parliament during this parliamentary term.

The passage of the Bill demonstrates specifically the sensitivity of members and their parties to an issue of great importance to women. It reveals that the Parliament can respond to and deal with sophisticated social issues which are often difficult to quantify.

Lastly, the smooth and consensual passage of the Bill is a tribute to the support of many people, especially women, from diverse groups in the community and the women in this Parliament.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST POLICE BILL

Reports

404. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

Will the Minister table any reports relating to the Complaints Against Police Bill, which will give the points of view for and against the legislation?

Mr Bryce (for Mr CARR) replied:

The Minister for Police appreciates the fact that the member for Dale gave notice of this question and he has asked me to supply the following information—

I am not aware of any reports to which the member might be referring.

The Bill in its final form has resulted from extensive consultations with the Police Commissioner, the Police Union and the Ombudsman, with comment also provided from other bodies such as the Law Society.

TECHNOLOGY

Rural Activity

405. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Minister for Technology:

What is the Government doing to ensure development in information technology is also of benefit to people involved in traditional rural activity?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The Department of Agriculture and the Technology Directorate are presently working closely together to assess the videotex system.

Videotex is a computerised data base which uses telephone lines and adapted television sets or modified computer terminals in the home or office to give the user access to a wide range of information.

A Department of Agriculture adviser has been seconded to the Western Australian Technology Directorate to draft a proposal for a Government-wide service using videotex and other related information systems. He will also assess priorities for the Department of Agriculture's entry into an agricultural videotex information service.

Overseas, videotex has proved to be an attractive and convenient means of making selected Government information more accessible to the general public. It can improve avenues for rural people seeking Government information and services and can improve the quality of the services delivered.

A number of efficiencies and savings are ensured by co-ordination of Government departments in the areas of consistent data base construction and design, systems operation, delivery systems and operating resources.

In the future, effective farm management will be as challenging as effective farm production. Access to reliable, up-to-date information using the latest in information technology is the key to meeting that challenge.

The Department of Agriculture adviser is Mr Warren Harding who is a science graduate of the University of WA and who has monitored the development of videotex services closely in Australia and during visits to Canada and the United Kingdom.

EDUCATION: DEPARTMENT

Beazley Report

406. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

Recommendation 252 of the Beazley report proposes—

That the promotion system for Education Department personnel be revised urgently and reviewed regularly with the aim of eliminating bias against women.

What progress has been made to date towards meeting this most desirable objective?

Mr PEARCE replied:

I hope the Press noted that question, because it would be a hallmark statement in this Parliament that the member for Karrinyup is in favour of having a fair promotional system for women, because when he was the Minister—

Mr Peter Jones: We made this point in the Bill, and it was not answered by the Government. Under the Equal Opportunity Bill, will the educational system have guaranteed fair promotions for women?

Mr PEARCE: There is a need for equal promotional opportunity.

Mr Clarko: You make me tremble when you criticise me! I asked you a straight question; there is no need to be smarmy about it.

Mr PEARCE: There has been considerable discussion about making a fair system of promotion for women, and in fact it has been put in place. There was argument against it, particularly by some male deputy principals who wrote me a number of letters, and some of whom, but not enough, attended the conference of the Teachers' Union.

As a result, a number of women have found their way into promotional positions as high as principal who would not have done so if we had persisted with the system that was in force when the member for Karrinyup was the Minister for Education or, indeed, when the member for Narrogin was the Minister for Education.

Mr Clarko: And in 1974 when the Tonkin Government was in power.

Mr PEARCE: Possibly.

I am pleased to say that as a result of the discussions between the Education Department and the Teachers' Union, a fairer system for women will apply from this year, following the recommendations in the Beazley report. I must say, however, that the system is still not completely fair in that, in my view, there is still some discrimination against women in the system; but that is being addressed by the department and the union in discussions, in order to have a fairer system next year, and so on. However, we are approaching a fair system, and the difficulty involved is in redressing the discrimination of the past. That is what is causing so much trouble and difficulty because promotions were based on the promotional lists drawn up under the previous Government. That has led to women moving up promotional ladders to positions ahead of people whom they were behind previously. Not surprisingly, that causes a great deal of objection.

The Government is determined to have a fair promotional system for women. We have taken the first steps this year, and improvements will continue next year and in the years to come.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS *Indian-Pacific*

407. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Transport:

With reference to this morning's editorial in *The West Australian*, can he give details of the seminar on the future of the *Indian Pacific* service to be held early next year?

Mr GRILL replied:

At the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, I advised that Western Australia would be pleased to host a seminar on the future of the *Indian Pacific* passenger rail service. This seminar is to be held on 22 January 1985. My opposite numbers in the Federal and State Governments were informed by cable of this date last week.

The seminar will bring together the most senior decision makers from the tourist and transport sides of Government, industry, and unions, along with specialist experts from other appropriate areas. A programme is currently being prepared which will give all participants adequate opportunity to express their views and shape the outcome of the discussion. It is envisaged that the seminar will be held over one day.

I am confident that, flowing from the seminar, there will be a better understanding of the problems which have beset this unique service, and a consensus approach as to how its future potential to be one of the great train journeys of the world might be fulfilled.

The programme and a list of invitees should be ready for mailing shortly.

I understand from informal enquiries that the seminar will be most timely and well attended.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS *Midland Workshops*

408. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

In view of his reply to a question without notice yesterday when he indicated that the Government was under pressure from employees at the Midland Workshops regarding the amount of work that is not being done there, I ask—

- (1) Has the Government undertaken a cost benefit analysis of doing general fabrication work at the Midland Workshops compared with the private fabrication sector?
- (2) What is the cost efficiency at the workshops?
- (3) Is it proposed to undertake a costing survey at the workshops to establish its present competitiveness?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) As far as I am aware, a cost benefit analysis has not been carried out. However, there has been an ongoing programme of updating and modernising the workshops. That has been continuing for four years, and it is going into the fifth year. So far, the process has been successful, and there will be continued success.
- (2) and (3) I do not know the present level of cost efficiency, but I can tell the member that it is improving very substantially. There has been an improvement in the last 18 months, and a very substantial amount of work, similar to what was being performed before—

Mr Peter Jones: I am talking about the general fabrication work, not the rolling stock.

Mr GRILL: I cannot give answers in respect of general fabrication work; but I will look into the matter and give the member figures later.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT BILL:

Professor Martin Webb

409. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

Now that the Premier has had time to read the letter from Professor Martyn Webb and the former Conservator of Forests (Allan Harris) in relation to the Conservation and Land Management Bill, will he acknowledge the combined competence and expertise of those gentlemen, accept their advice, and withdraw the legislation, at least to permit further discussion?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I have answered the letter received from Professor Webb and Mr Harris, and I must say I was a little disappointed that they should choose to send the Opposition and the Press a copy of the letter at the same time as it was sent to me. However, it is sufficient to say that I will have tabled, for the benefit of members, a copy of my reply to Professor Webb and Mr Harris.

As an example of the mistakes that some people can make, it is sufficient to say that the main point of the letter dealt with the land resources council, and the failure of the Government to establish that council. In fact, the establishment of the council is well under way within the Department of Premier and Cabinet; and I am sure that Professor Webb and Mr Harris will be pleased to know that.

In any case, it is not the Government's intention to withdraw the Bill, as suggested by the member for Vasse. It is a little disappointing that these two gentlemen should write a letter in such a fashion after having attended seminars in respect of the matter, and having had ample opportunity to make submissions and comment.

MINERALS: NICKEL

Agnew Mining

410. Mr COYNE, to the Premier, representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Following the Minister's recent visit to the Agnew nickel project at Leinster and his consultation with the management, was he able to produce a formula which would overcome the financial and liquidity constraints which have brought about the retrenchment of 170 employees?

- (2) Bearing in mind the geographical location of this very important enterprise and its vital role as a major employer in the region, will the Government take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that the mining development continues in production?

- (3) Will the Premier advise the House exactly what assistance is being offered, and any other information which may help overcome the pessimism being felt in the north-east goldfields province?

Mr Brian Burke (for Mr PARKER) replied:

- (1) On behalf of the Minister for Minerals and Energy I advise that the Minister has had discussions with senior management of the companies and the unions involved in the Agnew joint venture. The Government is aware of the problems and is examining the means and the extent of possible Government assistance.
- (2) and (3) The form and extent of any assistance is yet to be determined.

EDUCATION: NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Allocation

411. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

With reference to his recent letter to many people in the private schools sector assuring them of his Government's and the Federal Government's commitment to the private sector, has he received a number of replies questioning the positions of the State and Federal Government and the extent of their commitment to the private sector school system?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I am not aware of any replies that have been sent, although they may have been received at my office. I will certainly check to see whether that is the case. I know of some replies that have thanked me.

Mr Clarko: At least one does quite the opposite.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There may be others.

Mr Pearce: There have been two and they were referred to my office and both asked for complete funding for non-Government schools.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not aware of the letters to which the Leader of the Opposition refers, however I am obliged to

him for this opportunity to publicly, again, underline the commitment this Government has to the private school system. Under the very responsible stewardship of the Minister for Education I know from first-hand knowledge that Monsignor Jimness and the Catholic Schools Commission are pleased with the treatment they have received from the Minister's good offices. I am not aware of any dissatisfaction or discontent expressed in the terms the Leader of the Opposition expressed it.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Standover Tactics: BWIU

412. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier and his Cabinet Secretary been made aware of standover tactics being applied to a small builder, Mr Minniti, on a building site at Lot 1, Beechboro Road, Morley, by the BWIU?
- (2) What involvement has the Premier's adviser on industrial relations (Mr Tom Butler) taken in this dispute?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) I indicated previously that I was not aware of any report of standover tactics either to my department or to me personally or to the Minister for Industrial Relations, his officers or his department. As for Mr Butler, I related to Parliament the other evening the fact that he had mentioned to me that his advice had been sought on an industrial dispute involving a builder at Noranda. As I said the other evening, that was the dispute I presumed he was referring to then. Mr Butler did not say to me, "I am off to act on a complaint of standover tactics" or, "I have a complaint of standover tactics here". As far as I knew he was going about his normal duties and he certainly did not report to me that there were standover tactics taking place anywhere. That is as much as I know of the matters.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

Staff: Advisers Premiers Department

413. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

Would he please name the ministerial advisers employed in his office and the departments within his portfolio?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

If the member puts his question on the Notice Paper, I will give him a detailed answer.

HOUSING: SHC

Property Contract Maintenance

414. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the police inquiry into certain aspects of the property contract maintenance operations of the State Housing Commission been completed yet?
- (2) If so, what were the results of those investigations?

Mr WILSON replied:

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

HEALTH: MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

Mt Magnet

415. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Following the tragic road death of a young man near Mt. Magnet on Saturday night, has the Minister had any representations from the local authority seeking renewed efforts to obtain a resident doctor?
- (2) If so, could he outline what steps have been taken to overcome this chronic situation which allows a populous mining and geographically strategic community to depend on remotely located medical support to provide essential life-saving procedures?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for some notice of the question. Discussions have taken place between the Commissioner of Health and the shire clerk on whether the shire or the mining company can provide housing for a resident doctor. An inquiry has been made by a doctor currently doing locum work at Kalgoorlie about the possibility of setting up practice at Mt. Magnet, and this inquiry is being followed up. A three-times weekly visit is made to Mt. Magnet by a doctor based at Meekatharra, and emergency calls are responded to by Royal Flying Doctor Service flights.

LAND: ACQUISITION

Public Works Act

416. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Works:

Some weeks ago I asked him about concerns being expressed that more land was likely to be acquired under the Public Works Act for conservation and salinity purposes early next year, and the Minister indicated that he was unaware of the suggestion. In view of further concern expressed to me from the West Arthur Shire, I ask—

Can he please advise whether his previous answer still applies?

Mr McIVER replied:

I would like the member to place his question on the Notice Paper so that I can give him an accurate reply.

EDUCATION: DISTANCE EDUCATION

Beazley Report

417. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

Recommendation 253 of the Beazley report proposes, "That the Distance Education Centre of the Education Department of Western Australia be provided with the resources necessary to maintain and expand the range and level of services which it provides currently". I ask—

What funds, if any, are provided in the 1984-85 Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget that would enable a significant expansion in the Distance Education Centre's range and level of services?

Mr PEARCE replied:

I am pleased that at long last the member is reading the Beazley report. I guess we can now look forward to the Opposition's response to it before its final and complete implementation.

Mr Clarko: Your answer to other people was to tell them to wait until the Budget had come out. I have waited to see what you decided in the Budget to do about this.

Mr PEARCE: Included in the Budget figures is an amount of \$1.3 million which is unallocated but which is for the implementation of specific Beazley proposals. That amount, in addition to some \$6 million or \$7 million in tied sections

of the Budget for the implementation of Beazley proposals, runs to about \$8 million for Beazley implementation. None of that goes towards an expansion of the Distance Education Centre except that there is provision for, I think, two additional staff—I am speaking off the top of my head here—in the staffing allocation and this has been made to allow expansion to cater for additional numbers of students who are expected to be enrolled next year. That is on a straight demographic prediction. If there is seen to be a need for a greater level of service than is being provided for those students who are asking for it—although it is a little difficult to see that we should be providing services for students who are not enrolled, which is the only way to expand operations of the Distance Education Centre over and above the number of students who actually seek enrolment—the need will be addressed in discussions about the untied \$1.3 million. Decisions on the allocation of that money are not being made by me alone, but through discussion with the State School Teachers' Union, WACSSO, and other interested groups to establish clear priorities for implementation of Beazley recommendations.

WORKS: PWD

Restructure

418. Mr BURKETT, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is there any truth in the rumour that architects employed by the Public Works Department have been told that after they have come back from their Christmas holidays they will have to reapply for their jobs?
- (2) Are any of these employees in the architectural division of the Public Works Department at risk of losing their jobs in the new year of 1985?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) I can assure the member that there is no substance at all to the rumour; it is inaccurate.

Mr Clarko: The staff concerned are very worried.

Mr McIVER: Naturally, and so would the member be worried. In order to supply an accurate answer I ask the member to place his question on the Notice Paper;

but I can assure him that the rumour is not factual.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Kyarra Hostel: Cue

419. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Kyarra Hostel at Cue has been handed over to an Aboriginal group known as the Thoo Thoo Wandj Club?
- (2) If so, could he inform the House whether the group is locally based or regionally oriented?

- (3) Who are the group's leaders, how long has the group been established and what is its aims and objectives?
- (4) Further, is he aware that the local authority had sought to have the Kyarra Hostel vested in the shire for a general purpose facility including a camp school?
- (5) Finally, on what grounds was this decision made?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (5) A decision has been made to transfer the hostel from the Department for Community Welfare to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Arrangements for the leasing and management of the hostel are yet to be made.

