

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 28 October 1982

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

ACTS AMENDMENT (ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS PLANNING AUTHORITY) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced without notice, on motion by Mr Shalders (Minister for Community Welfare), and read a first time.

Second Reading

MR SHALDERS (Murray—Minister for Community Welfare) [10.47 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before the House seeks to amend the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act 1972-73 and the Petroleum Act 1967-1981.

I will address the matter of the amendments to the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act first.

The amendments are aimed at streamlining procedures for issuing routine permits to persons wishing to enter Aboriginal reserves.

The Aboriginal Lands Trust currently has no power to delegate its functions in connection with reserve entry permit applications. As the trust meets only quarterly this, on occasions, has created administrative difficulties in processing applications in the periods between full trust meetings.

The amendment being introduced to the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act will provide for a delegation to be issued to a nominated member or members of the Aboriginal Lands trust or a nominated officer or officers of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority to sign reserve entry permits. The new section will, however, restrict this delegation to ensure that the delegate cannot sign a permit allowing a person to enter a reserve who could exercise some right over the land; for example the right to remain on the land or to conduct exploration or mining activities.

In relation to exploration or mining, however, clause 3 of new section 21A will allow the delegate to approve a permit covering changes in company personnel requiring entry to reserves where that company already has been issued with a permit for its personnel for that same period under the terms of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act. It is a regular occurrence

for mining and exploration personnel to change as part of normal field operations and it has become administratively inefficient to process separate approvals each time such changes occur.

I now wish to address the legislation relating to the Petroleum Act. The amendment seeks to ensure that the requirement to obtain a reserve entry permit would prevail in cases where mining and petroleum exploration is proposed on Aboriginal reserves.

The amendment will bring the Petroleum Act into line with amendments to the Mining Act in providing that where rights are granted under either of these Acts, such rights do not prevent, or in any way affect, the application of section 31 of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act, which provides for the separate authorisation of entry by persons onto Aboriginal reserves.

It is the Government's view that the power to grant the right of entry onto Aboriginal reserves should be in the hands of the Minister for Community Welfare.

The amendment proposed under the Petroleum Act has been included with the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act amendment as an expedient to process the amendments using the one Bill.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

JUSTICES AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Deputy Premier) [10.52 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Earlier this year the Government announced that it had set up an advisory committee to consider amendments to deal with the question of domestic violence and other family law matters.

The work of the committee was, amongst other things, directed towards providing some immediate protection for members of a family who may be trapped in violent or threatening situations with limited legal redress.

At present the legal proceedings open to persons in such situations are fairly cumbersome. One method is for the person to obtain an order under the Justices Act that the offender should be bound over to keep the peace, but this is a fairly complicated and even rather ancient procedure involving a formal complaint being sworn out and subsequently a time being fixed for a hearing.

An alternative is for a person to obtain a non-molestation order under the Family Court Act,

but once again this means going to the Family Court and getting an order.

In both cases there are inevitable delays.

For various reasons many people are reluctant to go through these procedures and involve themselves with solicitors and unknown legal costs. The principal objection, however, has been that such orders were not effective so as to offer any real protection for the victims of domestic violence.

The advisory committee has been awaiting the outcome of proposed amendments to the Family Law Act in the Commonwealth Parliament and has not been able to complete its work. Therefore it may be some time before the stage is reached when its recommendations can be considered.

In view of this, and the desirability to provide some immediate legal redress for those who find themselves in situations of domestic violence, the Government has decided to introduce this Bill.

The Bill is based largely on a 1981 amendment to the Justices Act in South Australia, which resulted from a report to that Government by its domestic violence committee. Although the South Australian legislation has been in force for a relatively short period of time, the indications from that State are that the provisions have worked satisfactorily.

The legislation will apply generally to all domestic violence—even to violence which may not strictly be classed as domestic—and is not limited to violence between spouses. In order that the provisions will apply generally, it has been considered necessary to include the amendments in the Justices Act to be administered in the Courts of Petty Sessions.

This Bill will provide for a new part VII of the Justices Act, to be entitled "Orders To Keep The Peace". A complaint may be made under this part where a person has caused personal injury or damage to property and is likely to do so again unless restrained; where a person has threatened to cause personal injury or damage to property and may, in fact, carry out that threat unless restrained; or where a person's behaviour is such that it is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, unless that person is restrained. A complaint under this part may be made either by a police officer or a person against whom or against whose property a threat is directed.

The amendment will permit justices to make orders imposing such restraints on a person as are necessary or desirable to prevent him from acting in the apprehended manner.

A provision has been added that orders are to be served personally on defendants by the Clerk of Petty Sessions.

Breach of a court order will itself be an offence for which the police can arrest the offender if appropriate. The Bill also provides that where a suspected offender is arrested, he shall be brought before a court as soon as practicable, but no later than 24 hours after the time of arrest.

This Bill also makes provision for parties to these proceedings to apply at any time to justices to vary or revoke an order after having heard submissions from the parties to the case.

The Bill will, by tightening procedures, provide some immediate relief for victims of domestic violence. It is pointed out that although these amendments are being brought into Parliament prior to receipt of the advisory committee's report, the committee has been informed of the Government's action. It has been requested to continue with its study and, if it is found necessary, further amendments may be made to this aspect of the law at another time. The committee's deliberations on other items included in its terms of reference relating to the co-ordination of Commonwealth and State Acts will be awaited with interest.

The main point, however, in bringing this Bill into Parliament at this stage is to provide a speedy and uncomplicated method of dealing with breaches of the peace involving violence or threatened violence and to give the unfortunate victims a more immediate and effective avenue of legal redress.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from 27 October.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Treasurer) [10.57 a.m.]: I listened intently to most of the debate by the members of the Opposition in connection with this Bill. It is obvious they found little to discredit in it, and, in fact, they agreed it was a good Budget. Members opposite say how good they are in oratory.

Mr Davies: We never complained about the Budget.

Mr O'CONNOR: I believe among the ingredients for a Treasurer to bring down a good Budget are sincerity and honesty and they are the qualities that have been lacking by some members

of the Opposition in this debate. The performance by the Opposition has been the poorest on a Budget Bill in the 24 years I have been in this House.

Mr Tonkin: That is said every year.

Mr O'CONNOR: It shows that the Opposition is getting worse every year.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have had to listen to some terrible debate over the last few days and members of the Opposition know what they can do if they do not want to listen. They do not have to remain in this Chamber.

The Opposition's performance was a mixture of arrogance and ignorance—ignorance of the State Treasury, which ignorance was shown on many occasions by members opposite and particularly by the Leader of the Opposition. I say that arrogance was shown because of the imagined ability of the Leader of the Opposition to strut on the national and international stages in relation to what he thinks he could do away with in this State.

Mr Pearce: Why read out your insults? I think they should come from the heart.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have a member interjecting who spoke on a Bill last night without mentioning the Bill and he did not know what was in it. He probably knows just as much about the Budget as he did about that Bill. People need a Government that will deal with circumstances as they occur. They do not want a Government of pretense and that is what they would have if the Opposition were in Government. People want a Government which will give facts; a Government that will give worthwhile results; and a Government concerned about the people in this State.

The State Budget is a declaration of priorities as to where funds are distributed in this State, and where they will be best used for the benefit of the community. This Budget has been prepared on that basis; that is, it shows understanding of the circumstances that exist today. The difficulties in the economy, not only in Western Australia, but also throughout the world, ought to be our priorities. We must try to introduce measures that will benefit everyone in this State and the only way we can do this is by the correct allocation of available funds.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Budget, when I introduced it, was boring and dismissed it as mere bookkeeping. He said that the State was poorly served. That statement shows lack of quality in the Leader of the Opposition—he says the State is being poorly served and he finds that boring! Quite frankly, any mem-

ber of Parliament who felt that the State was poorly served ought not to be bored, but should do something about it. I would not find it boring. If I thought that the State was being poorly served, I would do something about it. I believe the Leader of the Opposition, in his position, is serving the State very poorly.

The Budget that has been brought down is as good as any Budget brought down by other Governments in Australia—there is very little doubt about that.

Several members interjected.

Mr I. F. Taylor interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Treasury had a great deal to do with the Budget and when the member for Kalgoorlie left the Treasury, it improved. I will come back to the member for Kalgoorlie later regarding the statements he made. I mentioned earlier that members of the Opposition lack quality and the member for Kalgoorlie has picked up their poor qualities in the short time that he has been in this House.

One only has to look at the Budgets brought down in the Eastern States to ascertain how better served this State has been. It has been better served than any other State in Australia except possibly for Queensland, which I am unable to comment on because I have not yet seen its Budget.

The Labor Government in New South Wales has put up a dismal performance over the last few years. That State has deteriorated enormously and this has been covered up to some extent, and this has now spelt disaster for the New South Wales people. Compare our Budget with the New South Wales Budget. Its Budget has shown substantial deficit, and further deficits have been covered up. Let us look at Victoria, and the substantial deficit that that Government will accrue in the coming year. Let us look at Tasmania and see what has happened there. There is absolutely no doubt that the Western Australian bookkeeping has been second to none. It has benefited everyone in this State.

Mr Pearce: So you are a Government of bookkeeping.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition played the role of "The Great Pretender". When summing up his speech, he made false statements. He said that I claimed I was the best Treasurer in Australia. That is totally false.

Mr Pearce: He said that you said you thought you were the best Treasurer Western Australia had had.

Mr O'CONNOR: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr Pearce: You did. You said you were the best Treasurer the State had had.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I will challenge the member for Gosnells now. If I said that, I will resign from my seat providing that if I did not say that he will resign from his seat. Will the member for Gosnells give that undertaking?

Mr Pearce: Of course I shall.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Gosnells said that I said I was the best Treasurer of Western Australia.

Mr Pearce: You said that you thought you were the best Treasurer that Western Australia had had.

Mr O'CONNOR: We will just see who leaves this House.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition took on the role of the great pretender. He claimed I made certain statements; and that is totally untrue.

Mr Pearce: But you misquoted the statement.

Mr O'CONNOR: He said I was the only one commenting favourably on this Budget—again, a totally false allegation and well he knows it, because he reads the newspapers. *The West Australian*, *The Canberra Times*, and *The Australian* are amongst the newspapers which said it was a very good Budget.

Mr Wilson: Who owns *The Canberra Times*?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yet the Leader of the Opposition claimed falsely that I was the only one commenting favourably on the Budget.

Let us see whether the Leader of the Opposition matches up to his misguided guidelines. Some of the statements he made are so crazy that it is unbelievable that he is the best the members of the Opposition could select to lead them.

Mr Pearce: You were shaking in your boots last night.

Mr Young: Last night was prostitution by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr I. F. Taylor: He cut you to ribbons; and everyone else on that side would know that.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition's number one priority in connection with the Budget was that when he became the Treasurer of the State, he would move for the devaluation of the Australian dollar by five per cent, or possibly 10 per cent—not much of a variation,

except that the variation could be more than our Consolidated Revenue Fund total for the year. This is the sort of statement the Leader of the Opposition makes.

Mr I. F. Taylor: What a strange comment.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is strange that he would make statements of that nature. He talks just off the cuff about a devaluation of five per cent or 10 per cent—does not matter which. That is the way he has gone on.

Mr I. F. Taylor: How do you relate it to the Consolidated Revenue Fund?

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition said that the Australian Labor Party in this State had an absolute commitment to economic growth. What a false statement—an absolute commitment to economic growth!

Mr Wilson: You keep repeating yourself.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am just trying to put my point over because I know that members opposite do not understand very well. Which State of Australia has done more than Western Australia in this area? We have only to consider the destructiveness during the Whitlam Government era in this field.

Mr Davies: Come on!

Mr Carr: Poor old Gough!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition stated his absolute commitment to economic growth.

Mr I. F. Taylor: That is the eighth time you have said it.

Mr O'CONNOR: What a joke! Does he say this to cover up, in an effort to hide from people on his side that he knows that what he says will not be carried out? He cannot change the ALP's policy throughout Australia. He already has been steamrolled by the people in Carlton and Paddington in connection with some of his policies. "Absolute commitment", in my opinion, means "total commitment"; and these are major areas. I am sure he knows that. Do members opposite believe that the Leader of the Opposition has an absolute commitment in this area?

Mr I. F. Taylor: Of course we do.

Mr O'CONNOR: What will they do? Will they override the issues in connection with uranium development to enable that to go ahead?

Mr Nanovich: They have plenty of answers, haven't they?

Mr Wilson: You are pretty uncommitted on uranium yourself.

Mr Nanovich: Gutless cowards!

Mr O'CONNOR: Here is their absolute commitment—as false as can be.

Mr Wilson: You are the most uncommitted person in this House.

Mr O'CONNOR: An absolute commitment, yet he and the members on his side of the House will not override the uranium policy of the ALP. Will they override the environmental aspects established by Mr Bartholomaeus? We know what the score is in that regard.

Mr Davies: Tell us about Dr Dadour and your smoking recommendation.

Mr O'CONNOR: After the absolute commitment, the Leader of the Opposition contradicted himself. This shows how flat was his speech, when one looks into it. People say that the Leader of the Opposition has a great deal of breadth; but he has very little depth—very shallow in that regard. After making his absolute commitment, the Leader of the Opposition then claimed that people should be persuaded to short-term sacrifices, including a decline in economic activity. It is almost unbelievable that in one speech the Leader of the Opposition could make those contradictory statements; yet he did. He goes on like this all the time. While the words flowing from his mouth sound very good, when they are considered, they become very shallow.

Mr Wilson: You don't sound too good either!

Mr O'Connor: I admit I am not a great debater, but at least I am honest and sincere. Members opposite ought to try to be that way.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Carr: Self praise again.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is hard to believe that those contradictory statements were made in the one speech by the same person. He neither knows nor cares what he says. Members should be at least sincere and honest in what they say in this House.

The Leader of the Opposition said that we need increased Government expenditure in growth-promoting infrastructure; and he gave us instances of that. Coal loaders—what a crazy statement! What a poor Treasurer he would be if he wanted to build coal loaders before he obtained orders for coal, or before the State had quality coal which it could export. All he would do would be to build monuments. He said this about building coal loaders probably because his national president, Mr Wran, stated in his Government's speech that he would build coal loaders in New South Wales. However, that State happens to have coal of the quality that can be exported; and it has orders for

the coal. According to the Leader of the Opposition, coal loaders would be the number one priority in that regard.

Then the Leader of the Opposition said that to move the coal out, the State would build railway lines. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would know that the operating coal-fields in this State already have railway connections with the ports; yet he makes such ridiculous statements.

Mr Pearce: You are quoting them out of context.

Mr O'CONNOR: The next point that the Leader of the Opposition made was that a Labor Government would establish industrial estates. Estates have been established in this State already, and they are fully serviced; yet obviously the Leader of the Opposition does not know that. People talk about the breadth of this man; but when his depth is considered, it is found to be ice thin.

The comments by the Leader of the Opposition about boredom were designed to cover up his incompetence and the fact that he really had not looked at the Budget. He knew that it was a good one, and it embarrassed him.

The next statement made by the Leader of the Opposition was that a Labor Government would review Federal economic policy. He could review economic policy in the Federal sphere; but I tell him there is not much he could do about it. I discovered that when I tried to impose some of my policies on the Federal sphere. I know how difficult it is.

Mr Wilson: What a blunder!

Mr Carr: You have trouble imposing them on the State sphere.

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite laugh because they are embarrassed, obviously. The way the Leader of the Opposition spoke showed his total insincerity.

Mr Davies: We are amused, not embarrassed.

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite should be embarrassed. The member for Victoria Park would be a much better leader of the party, which he was before; and even he would not deny that.

Mr Wilson: You are so weak, you are funny.

Mr Pearce: How many potential leaders do you have on your side? Three of them are scurrying around now; and you know who they are as well as we do.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition said that the financial management of Western Australia was serving the people poorly.

One has to consider only that statement to realise he has a total lack of understanding, and that he has not looked at the Budget. If we had followed the pattern of the ALP and the Labor States of Australia, we would have reason for concern.

New South Wales has had a deteriorating position in six successive Budgets and the latest Budget produced has been the worst ever. *The Australian Financial Review* of 27 September refers to the "New South Wales Budget outcome" and let me indicate to members the Budget referred to is that of Mr Wran, the National President of the ALP. He is the ALP's top man in the country and he has shown he cannot manage the finances of his State. A report in *The Australian Financial Review* indicates as follows—

Costs particularly public sector interest and wage charges soared almost out of control with payments through consolidated revenue exceeding receipts by \$69.3 million.

Members might say that is not too bad; but it is certainly not too good.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: To continue—

As a result of this consolidated revenue as at 30 June was overdrawn by \$161.3 million.

However, there is worse to come. Here we have the member for Mt. Hawthorn supporting Mr Wran's policies which are the same as those of the ALP in this State and which would be disastrous for Western Australia.

Mr Wilson: Are you the New South Wales Leader of the Opposition? You sound like the Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales.

Mr O'CONNOR: If I were, I would certainly bring these points—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Auditor General in New South Wales—members would be aware that he is respected and people take note of what he says—had the following to say about the Budget—

Point of Order

Mr PEARCE: Would you, Sir, advise me as to the new material requirements in relation to the right of reply with regard to Budget and other debates? Is it not normal that the member replying to the debate must deal with matters which have been referred to during the course of it and is not allowed to introduce extraneous material to which the Opposition has no right of reply?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has made his point. There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Gosnells has shown the little knowledge he has of these matters, as he does when he gets hurt.

Mr Wilson: Why don't you get back to Western Australia?

Mr Bryce: Come home again.

Mr O'CONNOR: I shall in due course. In speaking on the Budget, the Leader of the Opposition strutted on the national and international stages and, therefore, it is necessary for me to go there to reply to some of the comments he made.

Mr Pearce: Why don't you go there altogether?

Mr O'CONNOR: The Auditor General said that there was cause for concern—

Mr Carr: Are you talking about New South Wales or Western Australia at the moment?

Mr O'CONNOR: —and the position would have been much worse, but for the unbudgeted receipts of \$221 million from rail. Had that sum not been injected into the CRF, the Budget deficit in New South Wales would have been \$408 million. I ask members: What happened in relation to that \$221 million? According to my information, Mr Wran sold \$221 million worth of Government railways equipment and leased it back in order to produce false figures in his Budget. That is what the Opposition in this State would do were it to become the Government and it has indicated that attitude in this debate. Were that position to occur, we would have grave cause for concern.

Several members interjected.

Mr Wilson: You have leased back \$4 million worth of housing.

Mr O'CONNOR: If I may continue, I point out that this hurts members opposite, because I have provided proof of the situation.

Members referred to the increases in charges in this State. Indeed, those increases were very moderate when compared with the increases in other States and bearing in mind the current position.

I have a report by Mr Max Smith who refers to the position in New South Wales and in which he indicate that SEC power charges have increased by 60 per cent since 1981.

Mr Davies: Power is cheaper in New South Wales than it is here. It is cheaper for the domestic user in New South Wales than it is here.

Mr O'CONNOR: Would the member for Victoria Park agree also that it is much cheaper to install power lines in a very compact area like that

of New South Wales than it is to do so over the vast areas of this State?

Mr Davies: The end result is what counts.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition hates to see country people getting some of the benefits from this policy and the member for Yilgarn-Dundas has objected because we subsidised people who live in the country to the extent of \$50 million.

Mr Carr: He has not objected. That is a blatant misrepresentation!

Mr I. F. Taylor: That is quite wrong!

Mr Carr: That is quite wrong!

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe we should be aware of the fact that a number of school children are present in the gallery today. We ought to act responsibly at least in their presence.

Mr O'CONNOR: I shall now quote some of the increased charges in New South Wales in order that members might compare them with the position in this State. The increases in charges here were at least kept within the rate of inflation. The increases in charges in New South Wales were as follows—

	Percentage increase
SEC and power charges	60
Theatre agents' licences	900
Doctors' registration fees	250
Liquor licences	400
Maritime services	114
Waterfront rentals	700
Parking fines	400
Water	20
Bus fares	20
Rail charges	20
Rail freights	40
Water resources, agriculture, and meter fees	536.4
Petrol tax	3c to 3.8c a litre

The New South Wales budgeting recurrent deficit is \$159.5 million and that has resulted in a reduction in expenditure on works and services.

One only has to look at these figures to understand that the increases in charges in the New South Wales Budget this year amounted to \$890 million and yet the Government has still been unable to manage. That indicates quite clearly the position in that State.

This year the Budget deficit in Victoria is \$97.7 million.

Mr Grill: Mr Premier, while I was out of the Chamber did you indicate to the House that I condemned uniform tariffs for electricity throughout the State?

Mr O'CONNOR: I said that the member had objected to the \$50 million which has been lost in country centres because of subsidised electricity.

Mr Grill: Objected?

Mr O'CONNOR: I said that the member objected.

Mr Grill: Where and when?

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Speaker—

Mr Grill: Where and when?

Mr O'CONNOR: The member has complained recently about the \$50 million loss in this area, and this matter has been dealt with recently by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr Grill: When have I ever objected to uniform tariffs?

Mr Pearce: Of course he has not.

Mr O'CONNOR: Did I say "uniform tariffs"? I did not use those words. If the member for Yilgarn-Dundas cares to read *Hansard* he will find out what I said.

Mr Wilson: After you have corrected it!

Mr O'CONNOR: This year the deficit in Victoria will be \$97.7 million. That is under the new Cain Government and I ask members whether they think that is desirable. This shortage was made up from pooled liquid assets in the public sector, so public authority money has been used to finance those shortages. This is the sort of financing we could expect from the Opposition in this State if we were unfortunate enough for it to become the Government.

Mr Wilson: Their housing programme leaves yours for dead.

Mr O'CONNOR: When the Premier of Victoria was Leader of the Opposition, he stated that, when his party became the Government, it would reduce charges. However, he was in Government one week and he went back on his election promise. The Opposition in this State is in exactly the same position. It would have to retract its promises if it became Government, because it would not be possible to meet them. The Opposition should be honest about these matters.

The Leader of the Opposition said that we should concentrate on industrial infrastructure, but members should examine what this Government has done in that area. A total of \$450 million has been allocated in this year's capital works budget for power creation work involving the pipeline, etc. Is that not growth? Indeed, it represents substantial growth. On top of that, I point out I was successful in obtaining an additional \$20 million from the Federal Government in connection with the outlet at Kwinana.

Mr Pearce: How much did everyone else get? You got a miniscule sum compared with the Premier of Queensland who got a fortune out of the Federal Government.

Mr O'CONNOR: Let us see what the Opposition would do were it in power. Members opposite said they wanted to abolish payroll tax.

Mr Bryce: Don't you?

Mr O'CONNOR: Of course I do.

Mr Bryce: That is right; we agree.

Mr O'CONNOR: However, we have written already to the Federal Government about this matter and our request has been rejected. It is not possible for the Government to abolish payroll tax and, if it did, it would cost the State \$200 million.

The Opposition said it would take a substantial equity in the aluminium industry. I presume a substantial equity would be 25 per cent, so this would amount to \$175 million.

It has said it would grant subsidies to single income people who paid over 25 per cent of their income for housing. This could cost many millions of dollars, but as yet the fine print is not available.

Mr Wilson: That is what applies in other States.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does it?

Mr Wilson: Yes; don't you know that?

Mr O'CONNOR: Will it be open ended?

Mr Wilson: You are ignorant.

Mr O'CONNOR: I ask the Opposition spokesman on housing matters: If the Opposition becomes the Government is it its intention to give a subsidy to all people who pay more than 25 per cent of their earnings on housing?

Mr Wilson: That is not what we said.

Mr O'CONNOR: What did the Opposition say?

Mr Wilson: Our programme would be means tested to help those who most need it.

Mr O'CONNOR: That was not said.

Mr Wilson: Yes, it is in our policy.

Mr O'CONNOR: It has not been indicated in any statement I have seen.

The Opposition has said it would establish a major city both north and south of the metropolitan area.

Mr Wilson: Keep repeating your falsehoods.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does the member say that is not so?

Mr Wilson: You keep repeating your falsehoods.

Mr O'CONNOR: Tell me where I have said something false.

Mr Wilson: You are quoting.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have taken this from the Leader of the Opposition's speech.

Mr Wilson: We will check later.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have here—

Mr Wilson: We will do it because you are not always true.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member's mouth is opening and shutting and pushing out words he is not thinking about, which is normal.

The idea of a major city both north and south of Perth is not a new concept. A similar idea was tried in South Australia—but what happened? The Government there supplied \$28 million and has recovered only \$8 million. The other \$20 million has gone down the drain.

The Opposition has said it would establish post-secondary education establishments in the country. This would cost \$8 million. It has said it would provide for the electrification of the rail line. This would cost \$145 million.

Mr Bryce: Which one?

Mr O'CONNOR: This is the metropolitan railway system. There is also the ongoing cost. But all this would be more than our loan funds for a full year! Where is the Opposition to get the money for all this?

It has said it would establish a planning department—\$750 000. It has said it would finance the fire brigade—\$22.9 million. It would provide grants to the opera and National Trust—another \$2.7 million. The Opposition has said it would organise the partial nationalisation of the aviation system in Western Australia. I do not know how much that would cost because it has not said how far it would be nationalised.

It has said it would provide for the expansion of new and existing industries. This is something we have been involved with already. It has said it would take an equity of 15 per cent in the Ashton Joint Venture—\$150 million—disregarding the fact that already we have a 22.5 per cent equity in that.

Mr Bryce: Do you want to rethink that? Where did you get the \$150 million for a 15 per cent equity?

Mr O'CONNOR: From the people involved.

Mr Bryce: From the top of your head. Are you saying a 15 per cent equity would be \$150 million? The total project is worth no more than \$400 million.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition has said it would also have an equity in resources development in Western Australia. If it took a 15 per cent equity this would amount to \$2 700 million. On top of that we have the amazing statement from the great pretender that, if the Opposition were to become the Government, it would reduce Government charges. Good heavens, everyone knows it would be a total disaster to this State if the Opposition were to move into the areas suggested. I need say little more about the house-keeping policy of the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition in this State. It is ambiguous and misleading in almost every case.

The Leader of the Opposition said I was the only person supporting our Budget, but let us see what *The Canberra Times* of 17 October had to say.

Mr Wilson: What did *The Age* say?

Mr O'CONNOR: I quote as follows—

Mr Burke said it was pedestrian and "likely to be forgotten by the weekend".

Certainly it is not spectacular, but probably Mr Burke was defeated by the fact that there is little in it to attack and a great deal to praise. It is another example of the good housekeeping principles followed by Mr O'Connor's predecessor, Sir Charles Court.

For a pre-election Budget (the State election is due early next year), it is remarkably restrained.

I have done this because while we are in economic difficulties, as are all people throughout the world, it is better to have firm foundations beneath the State, which is what we have here. The article goes on as follows—

It could also be described as a minor miracle in the face of the Federal Government squeeze on State funds: revenue and loan fund allocations have been limited.

It concludes as follows—

... since it seeks to boost the economy while restraining government expenditure, it is a Budget which other States and Canberra should study with interest.

Mr Bryce: Which one of your staff members planted that story?

Mr O'CONNOR: It hurts members opposite when they hear something unpalatable.

Mr Bateman: Clutching at straws.

Mr O'CONNOR: I would have had to get a long rope last night to drag up the member for Gosnells, because he went down so far.

Mr Pearce: At least I was not reading my speech.

Mr O'CONNOR: This is your policy. I am not reading my speech; these notes are in my own handwriting.

The ALP in this State, if it were to gain office, would redistribute people's income. Opposition members are calling around to see small business people and saying they will help them, but the only help they will provide will be to take money from them for redistribution. A Labor Government would also introduce legislation for capital gains.

Mr Bryce: Capital gains! Since when could a State Government introduce a capital gains tax?

Mr Wilson: Where is that indicated?

Mr MacKinnon: It is within your power.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is in the ALP policy.

Mr Bryce: It is not.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is. I will not read it out, but I have it here.

Several members interjected.

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

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition's policies would crucify small businessmen and the average individual of this State.

Mr Pearce: Rubbish!

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Kalgoorlie repeated the Leader of the Opposition's comment about the need to retain charges at the same level as that of last year. When I went to the Premiers' Conference last year I was handicapped by the Leader of the Opposition's making comment along these lines. I will quote the article.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Make sure you read the headline.

Mr O'CONNOR: It reads as follows—

Burke: WA needs at least \$903m.

WA NEEDS \$903 million from the Premiers' conference this month to maintain the real value of its Federal funds...

What hogwash. We needed \$946 million, which is the amount I was battling for on behalf of the State, but the Leader of the Opposition handicapped me by his comments. We came back with \$909 million plus \$20 million for the effluent outlet at Cockburn Sound, a total of \$929 million. The Leader of the Opposition said it was the worst deal for WA in years. That just indicates the lack of depth of the man.

The member for Kalgoorlie said I had agreed with the amount provided by the Grants Com-

mission. Yesterday he read out a portion from a book which is supposed to be confidential.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You asked that it be tabled.

Mr O'CONNOR: It was public after the member had read it out. It is abominable that Labor Premiers or people involved with the Labor Party should leak these confidential documents to other people in this way.

Mr Tonkin: To the people. It is the people's right to have information.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will now embarrass the member for Kalgoorlie, who said I did not fight for Western Australia. I was the first person to enter that conference debate, and in regard to the Grants Commission recommendations, I said this to the Prime Minister—

This is absolutely disastrous as far as we are concerned.

I could not accept this in a fit.

You said that you have helped us. I would hate you to try to hurt us. This is something I could not take.

I went on to say—

... I do not know how you can implement something which, as far as we are concerned, is given under false premise.

I then indicated clearly what the position was, and said—

I support the views that have been expressed by the three major States—

The member for Kalgoorlie indicated this section when he said I had agreed with the Grants Commission report.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Read the lot.

Mr O'CONNOR: To continue—

—which are not only for the implementation of the Grants Commission report but also for a topping up of the three smaller States.

The recommendation was that the States be given the difference—the amount by which they would have been handicapped by the Grants Commission. In other words, Western Australia would have received an additional \$137 million, and that is the point the member for Kalgoorlie failed to make in his efforts to mislead the House.

Mr I. F. Taylor: I read the document in full.

Mr O'CONNOR: Many of these points were underlined by the member—he knew what was in that document—but he said the amount was totally unacceptable to him. To continue—

Mr Prime Minister, before we go any further with the matter I say as far as I am

concerned I do not see any point in going into that matter. It is something I have had a quick look at and which I would not be prepared to accept.

That was a very firm statement. To continue—

Prime Minister, I move that the proposition be rejected.

These remarks come from the document quoted by the member for Kalgoorlie. I went on to say—

Prime Minister, I would not have any objections to the implementation of what Victoria suggested during this year. If it were implemented, I would want some cover as far as the following year was concerned . . .

This related to the proposition the States put up for a further \$108 million from the Commonwealth. I was able to convince all other States that Western Australia ought to receive 26 per cent of that extra amount. If one is aware of how hard each State fights for its own rights one would know the importance of the amounts agreed to by all States. The proposition was that Queensland would receive \$38 million; NSW, \$18 million; Victoria, \$15 million; SA, \$5 million; Tasmania, \$4 million; and WA, \$28 million. That is indicative of the effort made by this State, and the efforts made by me, to have other States realise how much we needed funds for this State.

Western Australia has had extremely good housekeeping as evidenced by seven consecutive Budgets; we have shown financial stability above that of any of the other States. Western Australia has a firm foundation, and has shown restraint in regard to wages within the community. As far as we are concerned, we have put up incentives to attract Eastern States and overseas industries to this State, and will continue to do so. We have had the highest rate of increase in employment in Australia over the last 12 months; Western Australia's increase in employment has been about 12 200 as against a drop in NSW of about 43 000.

Mr I. F. Taylor: What about the people working in full-time jobs? It is a quite different result.

Mr O'CONNOR: Members on this side of the House realise that the Budget before us is a good one, and that it is fair. It is a Budget to look after people, housing, and Western Australia generally, and it does so in a particularly difficult economic climate. If the Opposition had control of this State—if it became the Government and sat on this side of the House—WA would finish at the bottom of the harbour with a millstone around its neck—the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Pearce: The Liberal Party finance committee has been there first.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Division 2: Legislative Council, \$332 000—

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Bryce (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Report: Adoption

Debate resumed from 12 October.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [11.45 a.m.]: I would like to make a few comments about the report because one of my colleagues suggested that he was disappointed that no great changes were made. A new set of Standing Orders cannot be brought in every week. For a start, it would take days to argue about them. Some Standing Orders obviously require amendment and that is what we did on this occasion because some have stood for a long time and could have had disastrous consequences in certain circumstances.

For instance, no control is vested in anyone when the House sits after an election. If there were an argument about the appointment of the Speaker, the House could be in complete uproar and there would be no-one to control it. It has been accepted, under tradition, that the Clerk pointed to the Premier who nominated the Speaker-elect and someone would then second that nomination. However, that has not always been the case. If there were a situation as was the case in South Australia after the last election where the Speaker nominated by the Government was not elected, there could be quite an acrimonious debate. Under those circumstances there would be no-one in charge of the debate. We would look ridiculous in the eyes of the public for not being able to control our own affairs, so the proposition is that until the Speaker is elected, the Clerk shall act as the Chairman of the House with the full rights of the Chairman for that time only. That brings us into line with the Australian House of Representatives and other Parliaments of a similar nature.

The House of Commons requires the most senior member to take the Chair. I do not want that responsibility so we will not persist with that argument. It is more appropriate that someone such as the Clerk, who knows the Standing Orders, should control the House for that period until the Speaker is elected.

Another provision caters for a change in format after a Speaker has been elected. The Speaker has been required to present himself to the Governor but the Governor could be in any one of a thousand places at that time and would have to return to Government House for the purpose of complying with the Standing Orders. This has been changed and once the Speaker resumes the Chair he then follows the normal procedure.

The Standing Order dealing with the introduction of members to the House was a difficult one because it may be that some nondescript Communist or person who is greatly disliked by the people in this country—so we were told by the Liberal Government members—is elected to Parliament at a by-election and has no-one to introduce him. It could be a ludicrous situation. Such a person, when elected, would take his seat as we all do and be sworn in as we are, after a general election. Our names are called in alphabetical electorate order and we are sworn in.

Standing Order No. 72 deals with people being censured by the House for the day. This situation proved to be ludicrous earlier in the year when the member for Fremantle was suspended from the House for a few minutes one night for being naughty to someone.

Mr Parker: I described the activities of the President in the Legislative Council.

Mr JAMIESON: He said something that was considered by the House to be improper.

Mr Parker: By Government members.

Mr JAMIESON: If there is to be any meaningful punishment, the Committee felt that it was desirable that it be a day's suspension. If a person is suspended just after the House has begun, then it is unfortunate that he has to spend two days away from the House. There was no way in which we could draw a line on this if we were to find a fit punishment to cover the situation.

Perhaps knowing that they could be suspended for a full day, members will not try to get away with unparliamentary language and think that they will be suspended for the remainder of the sitting only.

Standing Order No. 275 has been of concern to the member for Morley for some time. This Standing Order requires that, when we are deal-

ing with a Bill which has a new clause, the new clause be introduced after the Bill has been debated completely at the Committee stage. The Committee felt that if a new clause is to be brought in by the Government or private members, it is appropriate for it to be incorporated in the Bill in its correct sequence and debated at that time.

The Standing Order which deals with grievances clarifies the position. The Speaker has determined, because of our change in format, whether Government business will be dealt with on private members' day at a certain time. The Speaker often has determined the time when grievances shall be debated. With the new Standing Order the situation is more satisfactory, because it clearly indicates that a time and certain day will be determined by the Speaker when grievances shall have precedence over other business. It clearly indicates that the Speaker has the responsibility to bring grievances on at the appropriate time. The amendment to this Standing Order makes it more pliable than it has been up to the present time.

In relation to Standing Order No. 351, the committee has recommended that the report be put forthwith without debate. This will confirm the practice that prohibits debate on the motion to report progress during the Committee stage. I have never known a debate that has transpired at this stage of proceedings, but because it is not covered by a Standing Order we could get into the ludicrous situation where the Chairman when about to report to the Speaker becomes involved in a lengthy debate which is unnecessary under the circumstances.

For a long time the Public Accounts Committee has had to move a motion in this Parliament that its report be printed. The Committee feels that when the report is ready to be printed, the Public Accounts Committee should have the authority to send it direct to the Government Printer in order that it might be presented to the House. Therefore, Standing Order No. 415 has been altered to cover that situation.

The amendments the committee have made may not be world shattering. However, if the committee brings amendments of this kind forward from time to time the Standing Orders can be updated to suit the existing climate. Further amendments need to be made and I hope that the Standing Orders Committee will consider them next year. One that comes to mind is the Standing Order concerning the introduction of a private Bill. The existing provision should be deleted because it has lost its usefulness. On one occasion I referred to the Standing Orders in this House and

members did not know to what I was referring because they did not have a copy of them. The relevant Standing Orders should be deleted in both Houses of Parliament, but it would require action from both Houses.

The Standing Orders dealing with the election of a senator are vague and need clarification. It is indicated that the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly shall be used in a joint sitting if any debate transpires. However, when we tried to debate in the Legislative Council, the President ruled—as he did last time—that there is no debate. If this is the case, it should be made clear in the Standing Orders. I hope that next year the Standing Orders Committee will give its attention to this and similar matters so that they will not be able to run *ad infinitum*.

The report should be adopted without any opposition, but some members may require clarification of some features in it. The committee consists of members from both sides of the House and the decisions it arrived at were unanimous. The committee felt some Standing Orders required further consideration. No doubt these have been noted by the Clerk and they will be brought before the new Standing Orders Committee next year.

Another provision which I did not mention is in connection with the Estimates. Once an Estimate was adjourned it was necessary to go through the entire Estimates before it could be discussed again. It is now proposed that if the Minister handling that Estimate is in the House the following day it can be moved that the particular Estimate be debated.

The points I have mentioned were adopted by the committee after several meetings with the Speaker. To make sure that we could all attend, the Speaker adopted the system of conducting the meetings while wining and dining during the dinner adjournment.

Several members interjected.

Mr Davies: No wonder some decisions are strange.

Mr JAMIESON: If the Speaker continues his practice—

Mr Davies: There will be a lot of applicants for the committee.

Mr JAMIESON: —and the new committee meets early next year, I am sure it will find other Standing Orders that need attention. Some Standing Orders Committees have gone through a parliamentary session without even meeting. If such a committee exists it must be aware of its

responsibilities and update Standing Orders accordingly.

I support the report.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [12.03 p.m.]: We should be grateful to the member for Welshpool for the comments he has made on the proposed changes to Standing Orders. We have a document before us which gives the reason for each of the changes, but he has been able to amplify the needs and we are grateful to him.

Generally, I support them. However, there is one exception, and I see no reason for changing that particular Standing Order. It is amazing that we can go on for years and years operating under Standing Orders and operating under the laws of the land and suddenly we find they do not meet our needs and must be altered. Apparently, from what the member for Welshpool has said, it is necessary that some further changes be made, and these will be made by the next Parliament. In relation to what he said about the chairman of the committee, Mr Speaker, wining and dining the members, I am sure many members will want to be part of that committee.

The **SPEAKER**: It is the only way I can get them there.

Mr DAVIES: You are a shrewd Speaker, and I congratulate you on the methods used in this matter.

I refer to the Standing Order which relates to the suspension of a member. It was amended in November 1980, because the Standing Order merely said that the member was suspended for one day, and it was altered to read "the remainder of that sitting". I believed that was reasonable and the only person who disagreed with the change on that occasion was the member for Merredin who said that he thought that suspension from the House was a serious matter and the member concerned should be suspended for one day. I did not take that line myself and considered that the Standing Order was vague and that it was not unreasonable to change the word "day" to the words "the remainder of that sitting".

During that brief debate the point was raised—the same point raised by the member for Welshpool—that it might be unfair for the member to be suspended within minutes of the closing of the parliamentary sitting. That aspect was considered.

Of course, it was also considered that a member could be suspended as soon as the sitting started and be put out of the House for the whole of that sitting. I believe the current Standing Order is perfectly fair and acceptable. It means that whenever a person is suspended—I do not think anyone

deliberately gets himself suspended—it is for the rest of that day's sitting.

I recall the instance when the member for Fremantle was suspended, but I cannot recall the precise reason for his suspension.

Mr Parker: He said that the President of the Legislative Council was engaged in a cheap trick.

Mr DAVIES: That is correct; I did not think the remark was unparliamentary, or warranted suspension. However, the hour was late, Mr Speaker was not in the Chair, and the member for Fremantle was suspended. The member hardly had time to walk out into the corridor before the House rose for that day.

In my opinion, it is not the actual physical barring from the House which is of consequence when a member is suspended; the important thing is that, whether the member is out of the House for two minutes, 10 minutes, or five hours, he has received the censure of the House for his actions.

Indeed, occasionally a member might be delighted to be away from the House for a complete day's sitting. On one occasion, the member for Morley was suspended quite early in the sitting and, while he was home in bed, the rest of us stayed here and saw the sun come up the next day.

In the November 1980 debate, the matter was argued both ways. It was claimed to be unfair for a member to be suspended towards the close of a day's sitting, but that it was fair for a member to be suspended relatively close to the beginning of a sitting. However, I repeat it is not a member's physical absence from the House which counts; it is the fact that the House has seen fit to censure a member for his actions.

I see no reason to alter the Standing Order. In 1980, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wanted a change and I understand the member for Merredin did not want a change. The member for Karrinyup suggested the change we were making was a good one. I cannot see that it has been good or bad. Standing Order No. 72 is perfectly clear, and should remain in its present form.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [12.08 p.m.]: I have read the report of the Standing Orders Committee and believe it has done a commendable job in bringing forward its recommendations.

However, I wish to comment on Standing Order No. 83 in the hope that the Standing Orders Committee will give some consideration to my suggestions at its next meeting. Standing Order No. 83 relates to questions without notice, and, among other things, provides that questions

without notice shall be at the discretion of the Speaker.

As members know, the system of answering questions on notice has been changed so that instead of Ministers standing in the House and reading the answers, the printed replies are distributed and the House moves to a period of questions without notice. More and more members from both sides of the House are becoming involved in this period. We see members jumping to their feet repeatedly, seeking the call. I do not believe this situation makes the Speaker's job any easier in allocating the call in a fair and equitable manner. Frequently, a member may jump to his feet several times without receiving the call. In addition, because of the time factor involved where it is agreed the House will rise at a certain time, the questions without notice period can conclude without some members having the opportunity to ask their questions.

I suggest the Standing Orders Committee could consider a system whereby those members who have questions without notice could submit them, through their party Whips, to the Speaker so that he would know which members wished to ask questions without notice.

Mr Parker: That is an absurd suggestion; it would take away from the whole concept of questions without notice.

Mr McPHARLIN: It would not. The present system does not make the Speaker's job very easy.

Mr Parker: It is the Westminster system.

Mr McPHARLIN: The system I suggest applies to some degree in other Parliaments. The Speaker could be left with the discretion as to the allocation of priorities. My suggestion would avoid the undignified spectacle of members jumping up and down, seeking the call, and I believe it is worthy of consideration.

I have written to the Speaker on this matter and he has indicated to me that the correct procedure is to refer my suggestion to the Standing Orders Committee for its consideration. Therefore, I commend my suggestion to members, and to the Standing Orders Committee.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [12.13 p.m.]: I did not intend to enter the debate; however, lest members of the Standing Orders Committee read the debate and gain the impression the suggestion of the member for Mt. Marshall has the approval of the House, I feel constrained to make a few points.

The whole concept of the period of questions without notice should be to allow question time to develop in a way which may mean that questions

which were not intended to be asked in fact are asked as a result of a Minister's reply to a previous question. It frequently happens, particularly where questions are asked by the Leader of the Opposition or another Opposition spokesman on a particular matter, that the Minister's reply provides certain information which gives rise to the need for subsequent questioning.

The member for Mt. Marshall suggests that the practice whereby members jump to their feet seeking the call is quite undignified. It may be undignified. However, many of the procedures of this House, to put it mildly, are undignified—some might even be described as absurd or surreal—but they are part of the tradition of the House. I suggest to members that the procedure we follow during question time is very much part of the Westminster and House of Commons tradition and, as I understand it, of the tradition of the House of Representatives and the New South Wales Parliament; I cannot speak for the other State Parliaments because I am not aware of the system adopted there. Although by no means do I suggest question time is perfect, I disagree strongly with the suggestion of the member for Mt. Marshall.

If the Standing Orders Committee is to consider the Standing Order relating to questions without notice, I believe it could well examine the provision that questions without notice are at the discretion of the Speaker, because I believe that situation to be quite improper. The current Speaker has allowed questions without notice to be asked, and has been very fair in allocating the call to all members who seek to ask questions. The practice by which the House can be threatened that questions without notice can be terminated at any time and that, as it were, sticks can be held over the heads of members as to their conduct with regard to questions without notice, and the time available for questions without notice can be altered at the whim of the Speaker—as I have said, the current Speaker is fair in the way in which he handles it—is inappropriate; and the system in which there is a specified time allocated for questions without notice, at an appropriate time in the day's proceedings, ought to be considered.

Question put and passed.

Standing Order No. 7—

Standing Order 7 is deleted and the following new Standing Order 7 is substituted—

Writs of election produced and Members are sworn or make affirmation.

7. Members shall then be sworn, or make affirmation, as prescribed by the Constitution Act, and a certified copy of the writ of election of each Member, with the return endorsed thereon, having been previously delivered to the Clerk, shall be produced on the oath or affirmation being taken or made by such Member.

Mr BLAICKIE: The purpose of the recommendation is to amend the Standing Order to ensure that the affirmation can be taken.

I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The Standing Orders were further amended, on motions by Mr Blaikie, as follows—

Standing Order No. 8—

Standing Order 8 is deleted and the following new Standing Order 8 is substituted—

8. (1) The House shall then proceed to elect a Speaker.

(2) Until a Speaker is elected, the Clerk shall act as chairman of the House.

Standing Orders Nos. 16, 17, and 18—

Delete these Standing Orders and substitute new Standing Orders 16 to 19 as follows:

Appointment for presentation of Speaker to Governor.

16. Members having then congratulated the Speaker, a Minister of the Crown shall inform the House at what time the Governor will be pleased to receive Members of the House for the purpose of presenting to His Excellency their Speaker, and the House shall then suspend its sitting until a time subsequent to that presentation.

Speaker presents himself.

17. At the time appointed by the Governor the Speaker, with such Members as desire to accompany him, shall present himself to the Governor.

Speaker lays claim to privileges.

18. The Speaker when presenting himself to the Governor shall, in the name and on behalf of the House, lay claim to their undoubted rights and privileges, and pray that the most favourable construction may be put upon all their proceedings.

Speaker reports to House.

19. The Speaker having resumed the Chair shall report his presentation to the Governor to the House and shall report as well that he has laid claim, on behalf of the House, to their undoubted rights and privileges.

Standing Order No. 19—

Renumber this Standing Order to read "20".

Standing Order No. 20—

Delete this Standing Order.

Standing Order No. 72—

Delete "the remainder of that sitting day" in line 3 and substitute the following—

"the remainder of that sitting day and the whole of the next sitting day".

Standing Order No. 167—

Insert after "305. (7) State Trading Concerns Estimates—Adoption of Report." the following—

"351. Chairman to report progress."

Standing Order No. 226—

Standing Order 226 is deleted and the following Standing Order 226 is substituted—

226. Notwithstanding Standing Order 225 on each second Wednesday following the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, at a time on such day to be determined by the Speaker, "Grievances" shall have precedence over other business.

Standing Order No. 275—

Standing Order 275 is deleted and the following Standing Order 275 is substituted—

275. The following order shall, unless otherwise ordered by the House, be observed in considering a Bill—

1. Clauses as printed and new clauses, in their numerical order.
2. Postponed clauses.
3. Schedules as printed and new schedules in their numerical order.
4. Postponed Schedules.
5. Preamble, if any.
6. Title.

Standing Order No. 306—

The proviso to Standing Order 306 (5) (d) is deleted.

Standing Order No. 351—

Add to Standing Order 351 the following—

"Such motion shall be put forthwith, without debate."

Standing Order No. 415—

Add to Standing Order 415 the following—

"Provided nothing in Standing Order 382 shall be construed to prevent the

Public Accounts Committee from presenting any of its reports to the House in printed form."

GRAIN MARKETING AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 30 September.

MR EVANS (Warren) [12.20 p.m.]: This measure has been sought by both primary industry organisations in Western Australia. I understand it was instituted at the suggestion of the Grain Pool, with the co-operation and concurrence of the two organisations. It has been agreed collectively that the two measures contained in the amendment are acceptable; and on that basis the Opposition has no objection to supporting the Bill.

The first measure in the Bill is that the Grain Pool allows a "cash out". This is to enable a producer to take the equity due to him for the grain lodged with the Grain Pool before the termination of the pool into which the grain has been delivered. The Minister was perfectly accurate, as always, in the remarks that he made in his second reading speech, though he did not give as much detail as would have been desirable in the interests of the members of this Chamber.

On the question of discounting, reference was made to the fact that any "cash out" after harvest would be at a discount. It is obvious that it will be on the basis of the user paying; so any grower receiving a pay-out will do so on the basis of the cost to the Grain Pool. The grower has the advantage of receiving the money, which may obviate his having to operate on other sources at a rate of interest. On the other hand, the Grain Pool may have access to a lower rate of interest. All in all, that balances out in the interests of the industry.

The cost of money at the time will have a bearing on the amount of the discount. In addition to that factor to be considered by the Grain Pool, there will be the physical cost of the book work and everything else which the Grain Pool chooses to levy.

Therefore, it would be a commercial judgment for the individual grower to make. It would be up to him; there would be no compulsion about it. It may suit some growers to take a cash-out; it may assist them greatly. Others would be served better by waiting until the termination of the pool. To that extent, this amendment offers a further service for grain growers in Western Australia.

The other measure is in connection with redefining the terminology of lupins. Lupins are one of the great success stories in the breeding

programmes of the Department of Agriculture. Without question, the growing of lupins in Western Australia must be abreast of anything in the world, and certainly in Australia.

The redefinition to include all narrow-leaved lupins makes good sense. The alteration of the word "proclamation" to "order" and the definition of "appointed date" are mechanical matters. The definition of the concept of a "cash out" is acceptable and it has the support of members on this side of the House.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [12.26 p.m.]: This measure has my full support. It will be of assistance to growers who owe money and choose to accept the "cash out" offer as it is referred to by the Grain Pool. The measure would be welcomed by grain growers who are prepared to accept the discount. Indeed, at the present time the Wheat Board offers discount payments to growers who are prepared to accept them and the provision in the Bill follows similar lines. It is a worthwhile and commendable measure which will help numerous growers who use the Grain Pool.

Of course, separate accounts will need to be kept for those who are using the "cash out" or discount system and those who are not, but that is an administrative matter and will have to be watched carefully.

The provisions will be well received and it is a commendable measure which the growers will accept with alacrity.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [12.27 p.m.]: I thank the members for Warren and Mt. Marshall for their support of the Bill. As the member for Warren pointed out quite rightly, it is a matter of commercial judgment as to whether a grower avails himself of this measure. The Grain Pool has introduced the provision and, in some cases, it will alleviate financial hardship and at the same time give the Grain Pool flexibility in its payments.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

HOSPITALS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 30 September.

MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie) [12.30 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to the legislation before the House. In fact it is appropriate that we should congratulate the Government on the prompt action it took to ensure a hospital was built in the Karratha area as soon as possible. I can make a rather unique comparison between the action the Government has taken to ensure the construction of the Karratha Hospital in such a short time, with the inaction of the Government in relation to Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital.

In his second reading speech the Minister said—

When consideration was being given to the funding of the recently completed Nickol Bay Hospital, an opinion from the Crown Solicitor was sought.

I suggest that perhaps this matter should have been cleared up at the very beginning before the hospital was commenced and then the complication which has caused this Parliament to introduce what is effectively retrospective-type legislation would not have arisen.

Clause 2 of the Bill states that it is intended the hospital board will be able to borrow for buildings and equipment notwithstanding when such costs arose. Therefore, the hospital board will be able to borrow for a hospital which has been constructed already and the funds will go into another situation.

The total cost of the hospital at Nickol Bay as at September 1981 was \$9.394 million. Of that amount the contribution of Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty. Ltd. was \$5.373 million which was made up of a capital contribution of \$2 428 500 and a recurrent cost contribution of \$2 944 500.

That is rather remarkable when we consider that, in the borrowings for authorities legislation which was introduced in this House last year the then Premier (Sir Charles Court) said—

It is important to note that the allocations by the Loan Council for infrastructure purposes have been approved on a project-by-project basis. As such, the capital requirements for a particular project can involve borrowings by several authorities including, in the case of water supplies in country areas, the Minister for Works and Water Resources. A typical example is the approved allocation for infrastructure associated with the North-West Shelf gas project.

He went on to say that—

... related to the provision of the items such as water supplies, hospitals, and harbour works. Borrowing approvals for infrastructure associated with the Worsley alumina project . . .

The Premier then went on to point out that, in the first example which related to the North-West Shelf gas project—

... the need for State authorities to borrow has diminished as the joint venturers, for their own commercial reasons, have decided to make capital contributions to fund certain of the infrastructure requirements, in lieu of meeting debt charges on borrowings by the authority concerned.

What has happened in relation to the Nickol Bay Hospital makes very interesting reading from the point of view of the State Budget over the last two or three years. In 1980-81 the General Loan Fund Budget proposed expenditure on this hospital of \$250 000, all of which was to come from the State development fund. The actual expenditure in 1980-81 was just over \$1 million which came from the State development fund. In 1981-82 the General Loan Fund Budget proposals for the Nickol Bay Hospital contained an expenditure of \$7.863 million with \$3.083 million coming from the State development fund and \$4.8 million coming from infrastructure borrowings.

The Government then started to run into some difficulties in relation to its borrowing under the infrastructure programme. The actual expenditure for 1981-82 on this project was just over \$7 million. As stated in the Budget speech, \$3.063 million came from the State development fund and \$4.8 million rather than being obtained under the infrastructure borrowing programme, was obtained through private borrowing.

In 1982-83 proposed expenditure is \$1.012 million and further reading of the General Loan Fund Budget suggests \$5.296 million will be raised under the infrastructure borrowing programme.

In conclusion, I have a couple of questions in relation to this Bill which perhaps the Minister for Health may be able to answer. Will the infrastructure borrowings be used to recoup the outlay made by the Government under the General Loan Fund programme?

Mr Young: They will be used for that purpose.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Okay. I then ask: Who will repay the borrowings and are the borrowings to be undertaken by the hospital board or by the Treasury, as the central borrowing authority, on behalf of the board?

In conclusion, I say that the Opposition supports the legislation and congratulates the Government for its rather prompt action in the construction of the Nickol Bay Hospital.

MR YOUNG (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [12.36 p.m.]: I thank the member for Kalgoorlie for his support of the Bill and particularly for the constructive manner in which he viewed the actions of the Government. I can add little to what the member has said except that, if members look through the various papers and the various questions and answers dealing with the finances involved, they will understand it does get a little complicated when trying to end up with the figure anticipated to be borrowed. Nevertheless I have managed to reconcile the figures, and what the member said essentially is correct.

I should place on record the fact that the new estimated final cost of the Nickol Bay Hospital will be \$184 000 less than the amount budgeted for. The amount to be borrowed probably will be \$5.1 million rather than \$5.3 million and this will be recouped to the General Loan Fund advance.

The member asked whether the money would be borrowed by the board or by the Hospital and Allied Services.

Mr I. F. Taylor: By the board or by the Treasury as the central borrowing authority on behalf of the board.

Mr YOUNG: I understand the situation is that the board will actually borrow the money and the repayment will be made through the Hospital and Allied Services to the board as part of the cost of running the Nickol Bay Hospital.

Mr I. F. Taylor: So the joint venturers will not be involved?

Mr YOUNG: No; they will not be involved in any further commitment except if by arrangement they have to contribute to some ongoing costs; but at this stage there will be no further commitment by the joint venturers.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Young (Minister for Health), and transmitted to the Council.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN OVERSEAS PROJECTS AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 12 October.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [12.40 p.m.]: We support the legislation and the amendment to the Act. Some few years ago when the parent legislation was passed, we on this side indicated to the Government that had we been in office at the time we would have been proud to bring to the House that sort of legislation. It fulfilled a very important need.

We have had pleasure in tracing the development of the work of the authority. It has become quite apparent that the operation of the board—in respect of the terms of the parent Act, which required all the heads of departments of a number of important State Government departments specifically named to be on the board—has not quite worked as well as it might because of the obvious pressures of time and commitment. The Bill seeks to enable those departmental heads to specify proxy representatives on the board. This is a logical amendment and one which has become quite apparent.

The other amendment relates to the change of the name of the Department of Industrial Development. It is a common-sense amendment and we have pleasure in supporting it.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development) [12.41 p.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr MacKinnon (Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development), and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 12.43 to 2.15 p.m.

AERIAL SPRAYING CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 October.

MR EVANS (Warren) [2.15 p.m.]: This Bill is unique as a result of the purpose for which it was introduced. As far as I am able to gather, an indi-

vidual is operating two aircraft modified to carry out spraying work, and while that work is carried out on a commercial basis he is not licensed to do it. However, as a result of his not being licensed he cannot be compelled to take out insurance.

It is of great importance in this day and age of modern chemicals that any aerial sprayer is well insured against his causing damage to crops, and properties generally. The member for Geraldton would well know of instances of 2,4-D wiping out an entire tomato crop. Similar damage can be caused merely by someone going through the Swan River area with an open can of that chemical; virtually all the vineyards in that area could be wiped out if proper care were not taken.

The difficulties associated with spraying accurately are appreciated by everybody in this House. If an operator makes an error, an innocent landholder adjacent to or downwind from an area sprayed may witness his crop or property suffering deleterious effects. For that reason alone it is proper that aerial sprayers carry insurance to meet any liability that may arise from an accident or unforeseen occurrence such as I have mentioned.

Licensed operators must carry insurance to a required level, and lodge the policy with the Department of Agriculture before they are allowed to operate. But unlicensed operators can work without that insurance, and therefore offer a rate considerably lower than that of their competitors who operate legitimately.

The premiums for this type of insurance are quite high. It appears the case that will be covered by this legislation has been quite difficult to handle; it has been almost impossible for the Commonwealth authorities to obtain a conviction of the individual operating illegally. One of the difficulties they have encountered no doubt has been that contact between aircraft and a base is available automatically for all aircraft throughout the State. It is appreciated that it is difficult to pin down an unlicensed operator in order to obtain sufficient evidence to enable a conviction, but the purpose of the Bill is to rectify that situation.

As I have said, the Bill is unique in that it will enable the authorities to take legal action against an operator not carrying proper insurance. For that reason the Bill will make it mandatory for any owner or operator of an aircraft adapted for aerial spraying to carry insurance.

As I have said, the measure is slightly unusual, but the responsibility rests with this House to ensure that innocent landholders are not subjected

to a risk not of their own making, and about which nothing can be done to prevent.

For the reasons I have given, the Bill is not opposed by this side of the House.

MR TUBBY (Greenough) [2.20 p.m.]: I will support this Bill; it is an important measure. Certainly it is required for the protection of the farming industry of Western Australia.

It is of vital importance to farmers in my electorate because of the wide diversification of farming in that area. For example my electorate has witnessed the promotion and growing of white lupins, which is a valuable crop. Pilots flying aircraft modified for aerial spraying should be conversant with their obligations to the farming industry, and should be insured against any damage that may be caused from spray drift.

The growers of lupins and similar crops should have protection from damage caused by this drift, and should have the opportunity to follow avenues to obtain compensation for any damage caused. For that reason I support the Bill.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.22 p.m.]: I thank the member for Warren and the member for Greenough for indicating their support of the Bill. They enunciated clearly the reason for, and the object of, the Bill.

In the first instance—in 1966—legislation was introduced to cover aerial spraying, but obviously it did not cover all circumstances. Legislation is designed to cover the people who work within the law, but on occasions, such as this, it is seen that some people work outside the law. In this case an aerial sprayer has not operated within the Federal law, and that has impinged on the State legislation.

The State must protect people against others who illegally use aircraft, and in this case we must ensure that all aerial sprayers are insured against damage they may cause.

At present a couple of legal cases are pending. I am aware of one over which some doubt exists about the activities of the company concerned. As the member for Warren said, the operations of an aerial sprayer may have a deleterious effect on an innocent party who happens to be next door or downwind of the area being sprayed. By way of this legislation, we are endeavouring to protect the rural community against such damage.

Aerial spraying is an important tool in agriculture—it mostly provides protection against insects; but at the same time it can have a bad effect on crops likely to suffer from the spray of a certain chemical.

The legislation requires the users of aircraft modified for spraying chemicals to be insured against any damage they may cause, but it is possible that the purchaser of an aircraft modified for spraying and, probably, once used for spraying, intends to use the aircraft for private purposes only. For that reason provision was made in the existing Act for the Director of Agriculture to exempt that user from the requirement to have this insurance cover provided evidence is provided that the aircraft will not be used for aerial spraying.

I thank members for their support of the Bill, and commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

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

CHICKEN MEAT INDUSTRY AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 October.

MR EVANS (Warren) [2.26 p.m.]: This is a complex measure because it involves an industry which has become embroiled in a situation which has brought about an unsatisfactory result for producers.

The chicken meat industry has developed into a modern industry in the sense that it uses a high degree of technology and mechanisation. As a result, it has become a contractual type of industry in the sense that the broiler chickens can be brought to maturity in a matter of nine weeks or so. This industry involves a limited number of companies which places them in a good position.

The chickens are raised by growers in battery-type sheds and under strictly controlled dietary situations. The formula for the feed is closely controlled and with a minimum number of feedings the chickens are brought to the stage where they can go to the processor for treatment, packaging, and marketing.

The processors have an involvement on the feeding side either through subsidiary companies or contracts, so we have what may be termed a

vertically integrated industry which has resulted in a lower cost to the consumer.

As everyone is aware, chicken is a fairly common commodity these days. In the past, chicken was for special occasions such as Christmas or Easter—it was in the luxury class. It has now made considerable inroads into the beef, lamb, pork, and other meat sales. One reason for this is the highly organised nature of the industry and the fact that that has brought about a decrease in the price, offsetting the costs that have bedevilled other industries which compete with chicken.

The Minister has kindly provided me with some figures. The number of broiler chickens processed in the past three years was 18.9 million for 1979-80; 19.5 million for 1980-81; and 18.5 million for 1981-82. The decrease of one million in the last 12 months has been caused to some extent by imports. Those figures were not available so it is difficult to be precise.

Nine processors operate in Western Australia and, of these, the top two are responsible for processing approximately 90 per cent of the production. This provides quite a degree of flexibility in the industry and has brought about an unstable situation.

The Chicken Meat Industry Act of 1977 had as its objective the setting up of a chicken meat industry committee, the function of which was to regulate the broiler industry to give it stability. That was necessary at the time. The committee comprised three growers, three processors, and one non-voting independent officer of the Department of Agriculture as its chairman.

The industry was expanding with new technology and had made inroads into the meat industry and was able to flourish, but required regulation. The regulation of the industry involved the setting of the price to be paid to producers by the processors, and in the event of disputes an arbitrator was to be appointed by the Minister for Agriculture. With nine processors and 42 producers in the industry, it is a close-knit situation.

For the purposes of this Act, a grower must have a contractual arrangement with the processor and the type of sheds and buildings required are stipulated by the regulations; a well-ordered industry. The terms and requirements for processors and producers as well as growers are set down and the working base of the industry is spelt out.

A model farm has been provided, upon which standard basic prices can be determined—it is something of the order of 64 000 birds, providing 5.2 batches per annum.

The growers claimed further that in recent times the spirit and the purpose of the Act have become undermined to the extent that contracts have been interfered with to a degree. They feel that the industry is becoming unstable and I would imagine everyone would see that happen only with reluctance and regret.

The actions of the processors over the last 12 months have been something akin to unfortunate. The Act provides that the price of birds be determined annually with a survey being conducted bi-annually. This keeps an ongoing check and the survey is conducted by the marketing and research section of the Department of Agriculture.

In March this year the processors asked for a review of the costs because they believed that the existing growing fee of 27.5c per bird was too high. The department did carry out a survey in March 1981, but the processors disputed the result and the growers requested that the matter go to arbitration. The Minister informed the growers that the arbitrator would be Mr Crawford.

Another problem which exists is the extent to which shedding has been permitted in the industry. The term "shedding" is used in relation to the number of birds produced and in 1979 unnecessary shedding was permitted to be erected. It was claimed that processors were manipulating the Act. If sheds are built, the required number of birds must be produced in order to give an economical return, otherwise capital is lying idle. If one is producing birds, one must have an avenue through which to sell them. One of the difficulties that arises is that, where there are several processors each competing in the marketplace to dispose of the birds he is processing, some processors will be more successful than others. They will take a greater share of the market at the expense of their fellow processors. The result is that the successful processor will look for a further supply of birds and, as I understand it, he will not look to the grower who is less successful.

I refer to a letter to the Press from Mr Laurie Byatt of Gosnells. He said—

One of the major companies subsequently secured by market negotiation a big portion of the chicken sales and refused, through the Minister of Agriculture, to employ the growers previously growing birds for those sales.

Instead, as a sweetener to the deal they gave the vendor of the sales a contract to grow those chickens—a duplication of growing facilities surplus to the industry.

This is one of the problems which relates back to 1979 when a further eight sheds were permitted to be built in addition to the existing shedding.

The effective surplus of production is regrettable, but it is a situation with which we are faced. On 21 August 1981 the Minister received a deputation regarding the surplus shedding issue and the fact that the growers had not been required to go to arbitration on the question of a standard price. It appears it was a deputation that conveyed information to the Minister. Subsequently a further 5 407 square metres of shedding was permitted. That would imply there is a production capacity of 503 936 birds per annum. A situation arose as a result of price rises and the approval for extra shedding where five growers from one processing firm received notices that their growing contracts were to be terminated. The contracts were for a four-year period with a one-year option and were due for renewal on 1 September 1982. Subsequently those notices of termination were not withdrawn.

I understand that the Minister met the processors and he is aware that the department did not take any decisive action and now we have presented to Parliament an amendment to the Act. This matter could have been resolved in another way because the terms of the amendment do not appear to be totally satisfactory and certain points need to be considered.

That is the position as it came before the chicken meat committee on 24 May 1982. I feel the atmosphere of concern of the committee is contained in the minutes of its meeting held on that day, and I would like to quote rather lengthily from them. The President of the WA Broiler Growers Association advised that he had met with the five growers. He said—

The Association deplores the fact that the letters were written in the first instance, they were in bad taste and had placed severe mental stress on the wives and families of the growers involved. They certainly highlighted the fact that there are certain pitfalls in the industry. It was felt that the Processor concerned had little regard for the feelings of growers.

The chairman of the meeting interrupted, stating—

... that the growers should present their case without placing any interpretation on the feelings of processors. This has been the cause of problems within the Committee in the past and once an accusation is made it evokes a reply.

The president continued, saying that five growers had been notified the company intended terminating their contracts. The minutes continue—

This stems from the current overproduction problem and in part from the standard price determination made by the arbitrator.

Growers were aware that the industry was facing a difficult time but the last thing they wanted to see was growers being dismissed. Some of the affected growers had recently spent large amounts of capital on new shedding. Growers found it hard to believe that this type of notice had taken place.

This was the atmosphere of the committee meeting, and it is contained fairly clearly in the record of that meeting of 24 May. A processor member advised that the notices had been issued to correct an overproduction capacity which was causing uneconomic cost of production. A deal of discussion took place on the manner in which the excess shedding had occurred in the industry. One significant point was, and I quote—

Growers had always said that if there was to be a cut back, then it should be uniform across all growers.

The same processor refuted the claim that surplus capacity was the fault of the processor. He made the point that the processor had no way of knowing it was going to lose part of its market share, and as a result, have a surplus of production capacity throughout the whole of its organisation.

Two points are worthy of comment. The first is that when it came to the question of a cut equitably across the board to all growers, it would have meant that the processors who also operate as growers—they have their own production farms—would have grounds to object from their point of view. This is precisely what occurred when one of the major processors indicated he was not prepared to accept the transfer of growers at that particular time. He made the further point that this would interfere with the operation of the company—one of the larger companies which also was involved in the actual growing of broiler chickens. One can see that the industry becomes fairly complex.

I will not go through the detailed figures with which I have been supplied. The standard basic prices are available on the question sheet in the answers supplied by the Minister. However, at the meeting, the processors saw that the reasons for the oversupply were a drop in sales, a drop in consumption *per capita* Australia-wide, the introduction into this State of a new processor,

and importations from the Eastern States. That is probably a fair assessment of what has transpired. Now that the development period of the industry has levelled out, this situation remains, and as a consequence, the problem of shedding has yet to be resolved.

It has been suggested by the growers, some of whom have spent a considerable amount of capital in new shedding, that rationalisation is possible and should take place. A number of alternatives have been put forward by growers, the first being a seven-year contract with seven-year options which would enable Commonwealth Development Bank loans to become a reality. This longer term finance is necessary in any primary industry. It is most difficult to operate without it. Secondly, it was proposed to transfer growers from one group to another to balance out anomalies brought about by the disparity in obtaining a portion of the market; or as an alternative, licensing, as with the egg farmers in the egg industry. That could be a further solution.

The amendment before us proposes several things, but none of them is very positive. It changes the composition of the chicken meat industry committee so that instead of having three processors, three producers, and an independent non-voting chairman, it will comprise two processors, two producers, two people who are independent—it does not indicate from what area they will be drawn—and a chairman. I do not know whether the chairman has voting rights; I do not think he has. That may make it difficult to arrive at a decision. The composition of the committee with two independents gives room for some concern inasmuch as they could have a predilection to the processors or the growers. A problem exists there particularly if they come from some sort of ancillary industry—whether the food or consumer side, or whatever.

The other part of the amendment confers additional powers on the committee to enable it to approve existing new growing facilities. At the meeting of 24 May from which I have quoted, the growers recorded their opposition to any further shedding being permitted. They recorded that that had been their attitude all along and this raises the point as to how the additional shedding came about in the industry, starting in 1979.

The Minister indicates in a reply, and it has been claimed in this newspaper article, that control over shedding existed then and exists now. Part of the responsibility for the additional shedding must rest with the Minister, going back to 1979 when he could have taken a decision. Although he says in his answer that it was on the recommendation of the committee, the committee

indicated in its minutes that the growers had never required additional shedding. Something of a disparity exists.

Because of the complexity of the situation it is not sufficient to remove the problem from one committee that has very little teeth and give it to another which has slightly more teeth, and allow it to resolve a difficult and complex issue, albeit on a reasonably small scale.

When these five growers received their notices, it was asked whether they were efficient growers. The document reads as follows—

...enquired as to whether the five growers notified of the intention to terminate their contracts were in fact efficient growers.

Chairman pointed out that under the current definition they were not inefficient growers but it was recognised that there was a need to amend the definition.

Without going into the dates of the changes in price and the problems which exist between the processors and the growers on the dates of alterations, that broadly is the situation. It is not necessary to outline any further the detail of the position.

It is for that reason I suggest this legislation does not go far enough. It will not overcome the problem in the long term and it will not sort out the predicament of the five growers who have received notification of the termination of their contracts. It is for that reason I suggest the legislation could be referred to an inquiry, and I ask the Minister to give consideration to such a move. If he does not accede to my request, I give notice of my intention, after the second reading stage has concluded, to move to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. The Bill lends itself to such a move, comprising as it does only two provisions; namely, the restructuring of the existing committee, and an increase in its powers.

In effect, this Bill deals with the body which advises upon the broiler chicken industry. I ask the Minister to give consideration to my request.

MR NANOVICH (Whitford) [2.58 p.m.]: I support the Bill. I have known a good deal about this matter for some time. I recall that when the industry was controlled by a committee, not a statutory body, when terms of contracts between growers and processors were being entered into, it was difficult to arrive at terms agreeable to both parties, and the industry suffered badly as a consequence. At that time, approximately 65 growers were in the industry. This number quickly diminished. When after consultation with growers and processors, the Government decided

to introduce a Bill to give stability to the industry, only about 36 growers remained.

I recall that at that time the Government was criticised for providing what was virtually a closed shop situation. However, this was not the case because since the introduction of the legislation, the industry's operations have expanded. At a later stage, the legislation was amended to provide the committee with a little more strength in the making of decisions; however, it still did not go far enough.

I am pleased the Minister has brought forward this legislation. I have had discussions with members of both sides of the industry, all of whom are very happy with the Bill. It will give added strength to the committee and enable it to make decisions which previously were not being made; disputes have been taken to arbitration which, as the Minister said, is a costly process. Many people in the industry have been able to survive simply because of the Government's action in introducing legislation to assist the industry.

The chicken meat industry is very sophisticated and is quite costly to enter; room exists only for those who are efficient. The committee has the power to determine whether it will allow individual producers to expand their operations; in making such decisions, it will take cognizance of the inefficiency of the applicant and whether expansion will make the producer more viable.

I do not support the contention of the member for Warren that the Bill is not strong enough. The provisions of the Bill will allow the committee to negotiate in the matter of contracts, prices, and expansion, and to make decisions. I believe it would be dangerous to consider wholesale changes to the present legislation, particularly as both sides of the industry are quite happy with the Bill.

With those few remarks, I support the Bill, and I am sure it has the support of the entire industry.

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [3.03 p.m.]: I am less approving of the Bill than is the member for Whitford. Like the honourable member, I have a number of chicken producers in my electorate, many of whom are hopeful of the situation which will be created by the passing of this legislation. Fundamentally, all the Bill does is to provide for a new committee which should work better than the old one.

The producers are particularly concerned that under the situation which has arisen at present—that is to say, where production in the industry has fallen, but where the same number of producers with the same amount of sheddage remain in the industry and still have a restricted number of processors to whom they can sell—the fall in

output of the industry has put the processors in a very strong position *vis à vis* the producers, particularly when the industry is so tightly controlled.

As the shadow Minister for Agriculture explained in his speech, the industry works on the basis that the chickens are hatched by the processors and then "leased" to the producers who raise them to the point at which they can be returned to the processors, processed, and sold to the consumer. As a result, the producers are dependent on the processors. As long as an amicable arrangement applies, this very tightly controlled industry operates satisfactorily.

The difficulty arises in times like the present, when a downturn in the market is experienced and when people must either start cutting costs or losing profits. When it comes to a competing interest, the processors are in a much stronger situation than are the producers. In fact, this is the situation this year.

Because the membership of the committee is balanced between processors and producers, it has not been able to reach decisions based on consensus agreement, because the interests of those two groups are heavily divergent. In September, we saw the situation where a contract for prices was up for renegotiation, and this is where the dispute between processors and producers hit its peak. Before negotiations were entered into for a new price—the producers were not seeking merely to keep the price at the same level, and allow inflation to erode the real value of the price; they wanted a reduction in price—in order to give themselves bargaining strength, the processors issued letters of intent to terminate the contracts of five growers, two or three of whom were in my electorate.

The chicken producers could not have taken those letters of notice of intent to terminate contracts—12 months' notice being required—as anything other than a scare tactic exercised on the producers in order to have them agree to lower production prices.

In fact, the producers have not agreed to that; and the whole business has gone off to arbitration. As the Minister pointed out in his second reading speech, that is a fairly costly process, and one which could be avoided.

The proposal the Minister is putting up to get out of that situation is, as the member for Warren said, something of a "Pontius Pilate" arrangement; he is washing his hands of the whole business and giving it back to a new committee—a completely new committee. The new

committee will not have to deal with consensus agreements. It can make agreements on a majority vote.

A significant aspect is that on the committee there will be an element other than representatives of the producers and representatives of the processors. In fact, two independent people will be on the committee. Therein lies the nub of the matter, because the additional voting persons will control the chicken meat industry. They will make the decisions about who is right and who is wrong between the producers and the processors. In fact, they will do the arbitration—the two members of the committee who are neither representatives of the producers nor representatives of the processors.

Mr Old: That is a lot of rot.

Mr Evans: No. He is spot on.

Mr PEARCE: Can the Minister tell me why it is a lot of rot?

Mr Old: I will tell you.

Mr PEARCE: If he can give me a hint now—

Mr Old: I will not give you a hint. It will give you something to talk about.

Mr Tonkin: Don't play games. You have said he is wrong. Back it up.

Mr Old: I will back it up.

Mr Tonkin: You are being very coy.

Mr Old: He does not know what he is talking about.

Mr PEARCE: I am prepared to concede I am not a great expert on agricultural matters—

Mr Old: Spot on.

Mr Tonkin: It is a pity you people do not admit your mistakes sometimes.

Mr PEARCE: —however, I have a number of chicken growers in my electorate and I have discussed this matter at considerable length with some of them, and they have given me a lot of information. In addition, I can read a second reading speech and a Bill as well as anybody else; and when I suggest that the new committee will be composed of representatives of producers and of processors, and of persons appointed by the Minister, that is not a matter which is open for argument. Does the Minister wish to deny that?

Mr Old: No.

Mr PEARCE: Let us look at the practical situation. It is not now an agricultural matter, but a straight political matter. Anybody who has ever been on a committee knows the way in which committee people vote; and their decisions are not based necessarily on anything other than the

interest group that they represent. If there is to be a divergence of opinion between producers and processors about relevant trends in the industry, the present committee, because it consists of equal numbers from both sides, has to reach a consensus before a decision can be made. The committee is locked in a bind because it cannot make decisions on that basis. We cannot argue about that.

The Minister is trying now to scrap the old committee and set up a new committee which will still have equal representation from the producers and processors; but added to the committee will be other persons who will be neither producers nor processors. At times when the interests of the processors and the producers diverge, the other people on the committee who have a vote will be the ones making the decision. One does not have to be an agricultural expert to understand that.

Mr Old: That is the two people with other interests you are talking about?

Mr PEARCE: That is what I am saying. Effectively, they will have the vote so to that extent they will replace the arbitration process which is going on at present. The purpose of bringing the Bill to the House is to try to resolve the issues within the committee, rather than have them decided elsewhere; and that is crucial for the way in which the industry operates.

The reason both parts of the industry are happy with the Bill at the moment, as the member for Whitford asserts correctly, is that all parties hope that the new committee will work better than the old one. However, I realise that after the appointment of impartial people to the committee, it might be that the parties become tired of the committee and the way in which it works, particularly if the so-called independent people are actually covert representatives of one interest group or another.

I will make a further prediction, and that is that, in fact, the people who are happy with the idea of a new committee will be less happy when they see the committee in operation. They will look at the qualifications of the people appointed to the committee at first and say, "That is not a bad appointment." I bet my bottom dollar that after the committee has made a few decisions, they will be less happy about it.

The solution proposed by the Minister is a fairly neat one, in a sense—get rid of the old committee and have a new committee with an extra voting bloc, which will be able to vote either with the producers or with the processors. But I believe that approach is unlikely to be successful in the long term, although it might overcome a short-term problem.

The fact that the Act will expire after seven years indicates that the Government and the Minister realise it is only a short-term solution to the problem, or it is likely to be. I am more enamoured with the proposition put up by the member for Warren, that the whole matter ought to be looked at thoroughly—more thoroughly than it has been. What is required is not a "Pontius Pilate" decision, but one based on a thorough survey of the whole industry and its requirements—one that would be more likely to be satisfactory to both sides.

I understand that the Minister has moved to pre-empt suggestions that the additional members on the committee might be biased one way or the other by suggesting that he will appoint somebody with agricultural interests and somebody with economic interests. Is that, in fact, a clear commitment, or is that a suggestion made by certain people?

Mr Old: I have not heard that.

Mr PEARCE: I take the Minister's word for that. That means that the suggestion which has been heard around some of the traps does not emanate from the Minister. It might be that the people who are prepared to accept the proposition for the restructuring of the committee are basing their acceptance on rumours of that type. Therefore, their confidence about the matter may be a little less firmly based than otherwise it might be.

I am not opposing the Bill, although I think it is unlikely to provide long-term solutions. I foreshadow my support for the move by the member for Warren for a Select Committee to inquire into this matter.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [3.13 p.m.]: I thank the three members for their support—somewhat qualified in some instances—for this Bill. I will make a few comments and answer some of the points that have been raised.

The member for Warren, who was the lead speaker on the Bill—

Mr Watt: For the Opposition.

Mr OLD: The member for Albany is quite right—mentioned that the number of chickens slaughtered in the State has declined; and that is quite true. While we do not have records, as the member rightly said, of the number of chickens imported, certainly we have seen an influx of chickens from the Eastern States. This has been brought about by a matter of economics on the part of the retailers of chickens—and probably the processors; I do not know. Under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, we can do nothing in the world to stop the processors from

importing chickens, unless there is some health hazard. Then, of course, the appropriate action can be taken.

It is a very dicey situation and this is a matter of which the producer members of the committee are aware. Their big fear is that if they continue to seek higher and higher growing fees, if the arbiters appointed agree higher and higher growing fees should be allowed and the processors say the fees are too high or the retailers say the prices charged by the processors are too high, they, in turn, will import the chickens from the Eastern States where the growing fee is lower.

Good reasons exist for the growing fee in Western Australia being higher than that in the Eastern States. One reason is that the industry here is smaller and it must be remembered also that a number of processes have been involved. Therefore, increased costs occur when a greater number of processing people must be paid.

As was enunciated by the member for Warren, the problem started as a result of shedding. This was brought about by the fact that a medium size processor who was a factor in the industry was bought out by another processor. The problem started here inasmuch as some shedding was allowed to be allocated and it was surplus to the amount of shedding required. I have no quarrel with the fact that that occurred. However, the chicken meat industry committee did not have control of shedding and that is where the base of the problem lies. As a result of the proposed amendment, the committee will have control over shedding.

Mr Evans: But you have control over shedding.

Mr OLD: No; I assure the member the committee will have control over shedding and, if he reads the Bill, he will realise that.

It has been alleged the constitution of the committee under the proposed amendment will result in virtually the same situation as that which existed previously. The allegation was made to the effect that the proposed committee will comprise two processors, two growers, and two independent people and that those two independent people will control whether the industry progresses. However, that is not quite correct, because previously the committee was made up of three processors, three growers, and a chairman who was an officer of the Department of Agriculture. Under the committee proposed in the Bill, the chairman will not necessarily be an officer of the Department of Agriculture. It is true also that the chairman will not necessarily be an officer of the department; but he will have a vote.

It was suggested to me previously that we could overcome the problems evident in the chicken meat industry by giving the chairman a vote, but that would then have created the position where an officer of the Department of Agriculture with a casting vote, would virtually become the decision-maker in the industry. Not only would that be unfair on the industry, but also it would be grossly unfair on the chairman, because whatever he did would be wrong.

Mr Pearce: I accept that, but adding two people does not help.

Mr OLD: I am seeking to add three people. The chairman has a vote now and so will the other two people; therefore, we will have three people against two people against two people. The same result would be achieved if you had 25 people.

Mr Pearce: Of course it would; that was the point I was making.

Mr OLD: What is the answer?

Mr Pearce: The suggestion we are putting to you is that, although the proposed committee is better than the situation which has pertained in the past which has turned out to be hopeless and we accept that—that is why we are not voting against the Bill—this will turn out to be a short-term answer to the industry's problems, because in the end you are giving those three people the power to control the industry and the industry will not be happy about it.

Mr OLD: I do not agree that it is a short-term answer. A sunset clause has been included in the Bill and the member for Gosnells has indicated that because of this action this represents a short-term answer to the problems of the industry. That was not the reason for the sunset clause. The reason is that now the chicken industry is a much more closed industry than it was previously and the people who will get the greatest advantage from the closure of the industry are the growers and processors; it may well be that protection will lead to an inefficient industry and, if it does, in the future the Parliament will be able to decide whether the industry should carry on as a closed shop.

As the Opposition has said on many occasions in regard to sunset clauses, and I am sure the member for Gosnells would agree, reviews should occur and this sunset clause provides the opportunity for a review in five years' time.

Let me assure members we have not just sat down and decided the best way, by numbers, to do the job. Extensive inquiries have been made and much discussion has taken place between processors and growers. I am under no illusions about

the fact that two factions exist in the industry—the growers and the processors. I have spoken to some of the people from the member for Gosnells' electorate and it is clear some of them have been treated very badly in relation to continuity of contracts.

The member for Warren stated that the threat to withdraw their licences had not been retracted, but my understanding is the matter has been resolved amicably, the growers have negotiated with the processors, and those licences will not be cancelled now.

Mr Evans: That must have happened within a day or so.

Mr OLD: No; I was advised of this by the chairman of the growers' committee some three weeks ago. He told me very definitely an arrangement had been made whereby those people would retain their licences. This occurred as a result of negotiations on the growing fee.

One of the biggest problems in the industry is the fluctuation of success amongst the processors. Not long ago the processor who is on top now was being defeated by another processor, and so it goes on. Much of this relates to marketing and demand from the people being supplied, which amount to the same thing.

In the past I have had meetings with the processors when they have agreed between themselves to even up the situation by redistributing the growers. Unfortunately, however, that spirit of co-operation has died, so the committee will now be able to decide these matters as well as whether a surplus of shedding has occurred and matters relating to the number of batches, etc.

Today we have two major processors, one of which is able to provide a greater turnover than the other. While the price may be constant between the growers who are growing for both processors, the number of batches being turned over per year is quite different and obviously, therefore, the income to the growers in the two camps is quite different.

The running of the chicken meat industry now will be handled by the committee, not by the growers or processors. Decisions will be made by the committee. The two independent members will be appointed by the Minister and they will have some sort of commercial expertise. The member for Gosnells voiced the fact that rumour had it one of the independent members would have agricultural expertise and the other would have commercial expertise. That is not necessarily right or wrong. It is possible an accountant and a lawyer would be appointed; but the arbitration aspect of the Bill will be completely removed. We

would expect the decisions made by the committee to be in the best interests of the industry. If those decisions are disadvantageous to a grower, some growers, or some processors, that person or body has the opportunity under the Act now to appeal to a court.

I think this is a much fairer way to do this than to go through arbitration which, when all is said and done, produced a decision on growing fees—the only matter that went to arbitration—and if the arbitrator's decision meant that the processors thought they could not afford the fee, that was the end of the line and we had a stand-off situation. At least now we will have an avenue of appeal against the decision by the committee.

Mr Evans: An appeal to the Minister.

Mr OLD: No; the producers can appeal through the courts; I will not be a decision maker at all.

While I can understand the Opposition's reservation, I firmly believe that when this committee gets going—it will be formed very shortly provided the Bill is passed—we will see an improvement in the industry; I do not think it will be a short-term improvement. Once the committee gets going I am sure the industry will settle down; if it does not we will have to do something about it. I will be very disappointed if the committee does not solve most of the problems currently facing the industry. Obviously, we will have some problems as we go along, bearing in mind that we do have a definition in the regulations of an "efficient grower". If a person is not an efficient grower he will be penalised or tipped out of the industry. Obviously, such a person would have a chip on his shoulder and might try to gain political clout to overcome his problem. This sort of thing must be faced all the time, and there is no way it can be overcome by legislation.

The contracts and the real negotiating part of the industry will be handled by regulations. The Act provides purely the framework within which the committee will work. The committee will decide by regulation what an efficient grower is and will decide on matters such as growing fees, shedding, and so on.

I believe the Bill goes just about all the way to overcome the problems in this important industry, although we could never expect to get it 100 per cent right and so solve all its problems. It would be very disadvantageous to the State generally, and to the producers in Western Australia in particular, if we reached the stage where the retailers and processors were importing their chicken requirements from the Eastern States,

which is the big threat we face. When considering the growing fees in the Eastern States and their payments to producers, we must remember that those people are working on a larger scale than are people here in Western Australia. I am sure the Opposition and the Government are in total agreement in the wish for a stable industry in this State which can support successful producers.

Mr Evans: We would be happy to give it a go for 12 months to see how it works, but are you certain those five growers who received notices of termination have been reprieved?

Mr OLD: That is the information transmitted to me by the chairman of the growers' association. My comments were based on what he told me. I understand those growers have been successful and have been given another breath of life to continue in the industry.

Mr Evans: We will not proceed to ask for a Select Committee if that is so.

Mr OLD: Perhaps the member for Whitford could comment—although I know I am supposed to be addressing you, Mr Acting Speaker. However, I understand that the growers concerned have been assured their licences will not be suspended.

Mr Nanovich: That is my understanding, also.

Mr OLD: I will check on this and advise the member for Warren accordingly.

Mr Evans: If the five growers are no longer in jeopardy, we are prepared to allow this measure to take effect for 12 months and then review it at that time to see whether it is working in the manner in which the Minister and we hope it will.

Mr OLD: I will check on this matter immediately and if what I have said is incorrect there will be an opportunity to do something about it in another place.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

In Committee

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Division 2: Legislative Council, \$332 000—

Progress was reported on Division 2.

Mr BRYCE: I take this opportunity to voice my concern about a lack of provision in the Budget to plug Parliament into the next century. I will explain for the Premier's benefit what I mean by that comment.

Mr Tonkin: For a start, why don't you refer to bringing it up to the 19th century?

Mr BRYCE: It has been suggested to me in a somewhat facetious manner by one of my friends and colleagues that when someone expresses his concern about the lack of modern hardware and software about this institution, he ought to refer to bringing the Parliament up to date with the last decade or so rather than with this one. I draw attention in this debate to my disappointment that no allocation has been provided in the Budget that would suggest that we as an institution are preparing to project the Parliament into the electronic age.

We have been passed well and truly by the rest of the community. Year after year seems to roll by without very much evidence appearing to suggest that very much serious thought and planning has been engaged in in this institution to bring it up to date. I will demonstrate what I mean.

It seems that members of this place are quite happy for the rest of the community to pass them by in the sense that a great many changes are occurring outside the Parliament which affect the methodology, efficiency, and productivity of businesses, Government departments, and Government agencies, but the Parliament seems to stand still.

Mr Coyne: Yes, exactly; I think the first thing you have to do with Parliament House is restructure its management. It is the worst managed place in this State.

Mr Jamieson: Under this vote you are saying we should bring the Legislative Council up to date. Surely we don't want to do that. I would be interested in this on the next vote.

Mr BRYCE: I am happy to use the platform this vote gives me because the platform involves both Houses. If I discussed this matter under the

vote relating to the next House I may fall between two stools.

I suggest to the Premier it is time serious contingency plans were made to examine the efficiency and productivity of the most famous QANGO of them all—this place.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr Coyne: I will support you all the way.

Mr BRYCE: It is true a great deal is said in this place about the 300 to 500 QANGOs in this State, yet rarely is there any sense of serious analysis of the efficiency and productivity of this institution.

Mr Bertram: That is precisely right.

Mr Coyne: There are four managing authorities.

Mr Bertram: They just keep adding every day to the membership of the place.

Mr BRYCE: I have indicated how interesting it is that no allocation has been made in the Budget for the provision of so much of the hardware applied to so many businesses in the community. I know there may be members on my side of the House who do not altogether agree with me, but I suspect some members on the other side of the House do agree with me. This question should be approached on the basis of our interest and concern for this institution.

We have entered the information society. If there is one important institution in this community which is a critically important part of the information society, it is clearly this Parliament. Yet the supply of information to this place, and the way we handle it and organise our use of that information, is quite pathetic, especially if we reflect upon the fact that we have arrived in the year nineteen hundred and eighty two.

The Parliament should be a highly efficient arm of government, and we should be able to point to the Parliament as an institution and say, "There is the model for the rest of the community". But, of course, in a whole number of ways this institution lags sadly behind the rest of the community.

Precedents exist in Parliaments in other parts of the world and, I understand, even in Parliaments within our own nation, where fairly serious action already is under way to transform the existing situation. Certainly significant precedents have been established in some of our important Government departments with regard to the computerisation of activities. That computerisation is designed to increase the efficiency and productivity of, and to save time and money in, the activities of those departments.

I draw to the attention of members that our State Treasury introduced in 1967 a form of computerisation, and likewise the SEC in 1972, the Medical Department in 1976, and the Police Department in 1978.

A member: Is it the electoral or the electrical system you want to bring up to date?

Mr Gordon Hill: It is the basic information system, and how we handle it.

Mr O'Connor: Have you discussed it or have you had anyone discuss it with the House Committee? I am just asking.

Mr BRYCE: In all seriousness, I have raised it in conversation with a whole heap of individuals, and I happen to know some decision makers in the senior levels of management of this institution are very keen to have a look at this question. I give them my encouragement, and I hope the Government, after our brief discussion on this aspect of the Estimates, will provide similar encouragement to the people of this institution who would like to see it modernised, at least, in the avenue I have suggested. Probably quite a number of ways are available to modernise and improve the efficiency and productivity of this institution.

Mr Coyne: Do you know who blocks that off every time? Do you know who stifles it? It is the members themselves; they don't want to be intruded upon. They don't want their rights and privileges intruded upon.

Mr BRYCE: I have never found myself at one with the House Committee; and I suspect that if we start to look for the culprit we will find that the House Committee has been responsible for unbelievably staid attitudes.

Mr Tonkin: I don't think you have a right to say that about all its members.

Mr Gordon Hill: It has wanted to maintain the status quo.

Mr Coyne: Four or five years ago we had consultants in to do this, and they lasted about three days. They made a few inquiries, but they were blocked completely by members.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: If I may, with the assistance of my friends and colleagues, I will continue. I will identify some of the facets of our operations which fairly obviously lend themselves to computerisation and thereby improved productivity.

The finance and personnel section of this institution deals with a considerable amount of money, and makes a significant number of transactions. The payments and accounts associated with members of Parliament personally, plus all the accounting associated with the activities of

both Houses, including the catering service, could well be adapted to this new process.

I will not stand here today and pretend that I am a suitably qualified individual to suggest to the Premier what sort of hardware or software would be best selected to do the job. I have friends in the industry, however, who visit me in this place from time to time and find it absolutely extraordinary that this institution is so far behind the rest of society.

Perhaps I can remind the Premier that at a recent seminar attended by his Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development and me, along with about 300 others in the audience, the leading speaker of the day posed the rhetorical question, "Which one of us could say that our work place has not been significantly affected by the electronic revolution in the last five or six years?"

The Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development and I looked at each other and smiled. We realised we were probably the only two in the room qualified to be able to stand up and say, "Please Sir, our place of work has not been affected in any way by the electronic revolution."

Since returning to this institution I have been reminded that a digital clock has been installed in the Legislative Assembly—one we appreciate very much. Therefore, it is not true to say we have not been affected at all, but we are a long way behind.

Mr Young: We polished up the hour glass.

Mr Gordon Hill: A giant step forward.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the member does not need the assistance of others.

Mr BRYCE: We must consider the question of the operations of the Houses of Parliament and the direct connection between this place and the other place with the Government Printing Office. It is a significant one as far as the efficiency of our operations concerned.

The preparation of our notice paper, the recordings of proceedings, the drafting of Bills, etc., are all essentially the preparation of information and the processing of information, yet we are using tools of the last century to do it.

There are a number of ways in which our methods could be significantly modernised and the productivity and efficiency of this place significantly improved. Most of this work can be done on discs and sent to the Government Printing Office, and time could be saved in proof reading.

There are many ways in which efficiencies could be effected. The computerisation of our Statutes is something which will be done this decade and I would like to think it would be done sooner than later. I saw the effect of having Statutes computerised, when I visited North America about 18 months ago, in the State Assembly building in Minneapolis, St. Paul. I was engaged in a discussion on this matter with some of the local congressmen and we looked at a Statute which was called up on the screen. We discussed that piece of legislation and to make the point they called up on the same screen comparative Statutes of four other States of the United States simply for the purpose of making comparisons and useful analyses.

Everyone in this place would appreciate that when we legislate we are inclined to ask ourselves leading questions as to what is happening in the rest of the world and what has happened in comparable communities. One of the reasons we rarely obtain an answer to that question in our daily legislative process in this place is that we cannot get hold of the information.

I will suggest to the Premier the specific example of what occurred in the past and which would have been of great interest to members on both sides of the Chamber. When we were debating section 54B of the Police Act, it would have been interesting and relevant, as well as appropriate, to have been able to readily call up information from all the other States of Australia and some of the States of the United States of America to make a valid comparison and to discover how those communities dealt with problems concerning the laws of assembly. That is only one of hundreds of examples I could have made which would have improved the quality of information available to members in this place and improved the quality of the debate itself.

The library is another area that would be affected by technology. If we had a computerised link in our Parliamentary Library, it would give us access to all the libraries in our Government and private sector, in the immediate community, which are going on line, and access to the data systems that are being established.

The strongest comment I can make on the importance of having this facility in a Parliamentary Library is that it would give us, in a short space of time, access to communication satellites. Many people in the community have not thought about it, let alone become serious enough to plan for it. However, if we do not, we will be in a world which will rapidly fall into two categories: the information rich and the information poor. We shall

rapidly become part of the community designated "information poor."

If it is good enough for our Government departments to exercise some degree of supervision over a vast supply of up-to-date information, it is certainly good enough for Parliament to be well informed and to have information available at our fingertips.

I witnessed a most extraordinary exhibition of the OTC Midas system not so many months ago where it was possible to electronically communicate with a computerised data bank in New York and to receive information on a screen, from thousands of kilometres away. We then set the printer going and received a hard copy of the information. The information could be transferred so readily, and at a minimal cost, from one side of the world to the other. If we decided we wanted access to that sort of information system and to receive a hard copy, in our hand, of a Statute from California or New York State or anywhere else in the world, we would have it in a few hours.

At the moment we tend to bring down the intellectual or mental shutters and imagine the rest of the world is beyond our reach. Perhaps I may draw the Premier's attention to another example with the debate we had in this place 12 months ago on the diamond industry. The Opposition was given one week to study a 165-page Bill and I have no hesitation in saying that my telephone account was significantly inflated because I rang the South African Mines Department in order to discover how things are done with regard to royalties and other matters there. Those telephone costs would not have been necessary if that sort of information was readily obtained through the sort of information system I have described.

Mr Rushton: When West Trade Centre was established as a data bank to plug into the business world, it was not at all successful. You would have thought that would be an example of the demands of the commercial world and its need for information. It makes it a large challenge when we think of establishing a similar facility.

Mr BRYCE: I am not sure at what stage the business community and the community at large will wake up and realise the significance of their having access to that information which is the best and most up to date. It is part and parcel of our geographic isolation, I am sure.

Mr O'Connor: You are speaking futuristically rather than in the present.

Mr BRYCE: The Australian satellite will be in the air shortly.

Mr O'Connor: In three years, I think.

Mr BRYCE: Those data banks developed in the United States and in western Europe are significant indeed and I believe that funds will not fall out of the sky in one allocation to enable us to do this. I would like planning to commence now because this would give encouragement to those people who want to see it happen and I would like some of the cobweb thinking to be pushed aside.

Mr Rushton: You could have a central system where anyone who wanted to connect to the terminals would be able to do so.

Mr BRYCE: I have no doubt that in future years we will all have terminals in our parliamentary offices and whether they will be linked to a computerised data base or a central source within the building will depend on the advice we receive about the system. It concerns me that we are not making plans and provisions to enable this to occur.

Mr Pearce: You are before your time. I tried to get microfilm in the library and I was told by the member for Cottesloe that I was 10 years before my time.

Mr Rushton: You are four or five months before the end of your time.

Mr BRYCE: With the help of my colleagues, I will just about be able to wind up the comments I wanted to make on this matter by emphasising that the cost involved is not a dramatic amount when you consider the actual size of the Budget.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The amount of money involved in this Budget is \$4.6 million and a fairly reasonable estimate of what would be involved to bring us up to date in a sound way would be somewhat less than \$400 000. No-one could be dogmatic about that sort of figure. I have spoken to a number of people who are interested in this subject and it appears we would be looking at a figure in the vicinity of \$250 000 to \$400 000 for Parliament House to be brought screaming into this century.

Mr Rushton: The member for Gosnells indicated he was going to resign his seat. I wonder whether he will reappear at election time.

Mr BRYCE: Will the Deputy Premier be good enough to accommodate me and address his interjections, which are highly out of order, to the subject under discussion rather than try to set up a diversion to it?

This figure is fairly modest, but it will grow and the question will become increasingly complex, more difficult, and more expensive if we do not take action now rather than stall a decision for a number of years.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Pearce.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

**APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REV-
ENUE FUND) BILL***In Committee*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Division 2: Legislative Council, \$332 000—

Progress was reported after Division 2 had been partly considered.

Mr TONKIN: I desire to comment on this division, which is "Legislative Council"; however, as in the case of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I would be happy to make comment more generally on Parliament itself rather than divide my comments on the two Houses.

I am concerned about the standards shown in this House particularly by Government Ministers who have made errors. If a person makes an error, he should be able to admit he has done so, but that practice is quite contrary and foreign to many Ministers in this place. This is a very bad state of affairs and is not in the best traditions of the Westminster system.

On 23 September this year the Minister for Consumer Affairs replied to a question in the following manner, "The consumers therefore are entitled to a refund from the trader". I then asked a subsequent question of the Minister to ascertain whether this meant the consumers were entitled to a cash refund, to which the Minister replied, "No, I am not saying they are entitled to a cash refund". The Minister is either a liar or a fool.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are now speaking to Division 2, "Legislative Council".

Mr TONKIN: Mr Chairman, if you had not been speaking to someone else at the time I rose, you would have heard me indicate that, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had referred to Parliament generally in his remarks to this division as we do not have a general "Parliament" division, I would do the same. If you want me to make half my comments on the Council and half on the Assembly, I will be happy to do so. I do not see that it makes much difference when referring to ministerial responsibility if I speak to this division, because there are Ministers in this

Chamber. I am talking about the operation of Parliament.

Mr O'Connor: You don't get the opportunity for a general debate here; it is only for Council matters.

Mr TONKIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was allowed to speak about Parliament generally.

Mr O'Connor: If you do it that way we will have a major debate all the way through.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Morley to resume his seat.

Mr TONKIN: Could you do something about my time?

The CHAIRMAN: The member's time will be recorded.

When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke on this division he talked about more sophisticated aids and I believe he related that to the Legislative Council, although speaking in a general vein.

Mr Tonkin: He was talking about Parliament generally.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Morley indicated he was referring to questions asked in the Legislative Assembly, but Division 2 relates specifically to the Legislative Council. Division 3 relates to the Legislative Assembly. Although it may appear tedious to speak to two parts, that is precisely the rule we will need to follow.

I would like to read to the Chamber a ruling given by the Chairman last year when dealing with this matter. I quote as follows—

The CHAIRMAN: Before I begin, I should like to make a brief statement. Since we last dealt with an Appropriation Bill in Committee, the Standing Orders have been changed. The effect of the change should be twofold and, in the main, members will be given a greater opportunity to speak on matters which come within the Estimates. When I call the first part, which deals with Parliament, I shall immediately call the first division. In the past, free-ranging and broad debate was allowed on the part and, subsequently when the division was called, many members used item 1 as a means to have a general debate.

The wish of the Standing Orders Committee, which has now been carried out, is that members have the opportunity, when the division is called, to have a general debate. That will be the opportunity for everybody to speak within the parameters of that particu-

lar division and the part will no longer be a place for general debate.

Members will understand that, in the first part which deals with Parliament, there are approximately 20 divisions, so a person could speak 20 times in a general nature on the divisions, whereas previously he had to encompass his general comments when he spoke for 30 minutes on the part. When we get to the items, debate must be confined to the matter under consideration. No longer will a person be able to use an item 1, as members have done in the past, as an opportunity to have a free-ranging discussion.

When we get to the items, members will have to be much more relevant and specific than they were previously. As Chairman, I shall have to restrain members if they seek to wander away from the specific item. Of course members will have a much greater opportunity to speak generally when the division is called and there will be many more opportunities to do so, because, for example, as I have stated, in the first part there are 20 divisions. However, when dealing with the items, members will have to be specific in their comments, because the new Standing Orders are now designed in that way.

The Chairman made that ruling following the amendment of Standing Orders, and that was the practice followed last year. Although the member for Morley has said it could well be that he will be obliged to speak for double the time if he must speak separately on the Legislative Council and then on the Legislative Assembly, so be it.

Point of Order

Mr PEARCE: When the new Standing Orders were adopted, it was on the understanding that the general debate would be carried into more specific areas; there was an implicit understanding that members would not be disadvantaged in that sense. Mr Chairman, you will appreciate, as the Chairman did last year, that in debates on the topic of Parliament, or indeed on any other area where there are separate divisions, overlapping will occur. Last year the discretion was given to allow general debate on the Parliament to be conducted under the first of the parliamentary divisions, which is the Legislative Council. If you are to reject that procedure and to say we cannot speak about Parliament generally and we must comment firstly on the Council and then make the same comments later on the Assembly, much time will be lost and members will have lost the right to have a general debate. I believe you should ex-

ercise the discretion shown by the Chairman last year.

The CHAIRMAN: The procedure I outlined was accepted and adopted last year. Although the member for Gosnells has sought the discretion of the Chairman to allow a flow of general comment, it would be quite unworkable in other divisions. The member would be well aware that the Standing Orders were amended and accepted to prevent this general debate. If the member would like to place his submission before the Standing Orders Committee, I am sure it could consider it; but the practice of the House has been established. I call the member for Morley.

Committee Resumed

Mr TONKIN: The lack of consistency in rulings is absolutely appalling. I am happy to follow your ruling if it is to apply to other members, but only an hour ago you did allow the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to speak about Parliament generally and the need to plug it into the electronic age. At the beginning you should have set the parameters and standards so that we knew where we were. The member for Ascot was not talking about the Legislative Council, but about the Parliament generally, and I thought I would follow suit. I am quite happy to talk about the Legislative Council, about that wretched and anachronistic place.

The cost of the Legislative Council is an absolute scandal; it is a place not needed at all in this institution. The only purpose it serves is to rubber stamp Government business when the Liberal Party is in Government, and to act as a House of obstruction when the Labor Party is in Government.

Mr Shalders: You would have a Federal Labor Government get rid of both Houses. That would be even better, wouldn't it! Do you think that's a good idea? Of course, it is what the Whitlam Government had in mind.

Mr TONKIN: It is not at all what we have in mind, little man. The present situation is that we in this State have electoral malapportionment worse than that in Queensland. This Liberal Party has shown its contempt for the people; it does not care how many people want an ALP Government, it cares only about maintaining the Legislative Council to block legislation of ALP Governments. Not one piece of legislation is on the Statute book of this State which represents the complete intention of an ALP Government. That situation has existed for 92 years—since responsible government has existed in this State—and is an example of the Liberal Party's utter contempt for the people of this State. No wonder the Minister

for Community Welfare smirks; his party has been so successful at achieving its desired end.

Mr Shalders: It is probably why the State is doing so well, actually.

Mr TONKIN: I am glad it is on record that the Minister says the people of this State do not have the right to choose a Government which has the same legislative power as this Government.

Mr Shalders: I didn't say that at all.

Mr TONKIN: The Liberal Party achieves power in both Houses of Parliament by creating more members of Parliament, and has done so especially during the last two years.

Mr Shalders: You are like a cork screw; you keep twisting words.

Mr TONKIN: This Government at its will burdens this State with extra members of Parliament. Should it be trusted with absolute power? Whatever legislation it wants to put through the Assembly and the Council, it ensures that legislation is put through. But the Minister sits over there and says with blatant dishonesty that the people of this State do not have a right—

Mr Shalders: There is no-one more dishonest in this House in the way he twists statements than you.

Mr TONKIN: Is that a fact? I ask the Minister to tell me how I twisted his statements.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Shalders: Two minutes ago you twisted my statements.

Mr TONKIN: I ask the Minister to tell me how.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest the member for Morley address the Chair.

Mr TONKIN: Mr Chairman, if you allow untrue interjections, what kind of justice is that? I am answering an untrue statement of this Minister that two minutes ago I twisted his statements. I would like an answer from him.

Mr Shalders: You read *Hansard*.

Mr TONKIN: The Minister said I am dishonest, and that I twisted his statements, but when I asked him to tell me how I twisted his statements he said I should read *Hansard*. He knows I have not twisted his statements.

Mr Shalders: That is absolute rubbish. When I made a comment about something you had said previously—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will keep order! The member for Morley will make progress by directing his remarks to the Chair.

Mr TONKIN: The point I make is that we in this State are not making any progress at all. Our electorates are gerrymandered so that metropolitan areas are deemed to be country areas. For example, the Mundaring electorate is regarded as a country electorate, and the member for Mundaring feels very smug because he has been able to hang on to his electorate; but that is only through cheating in the way his boundary is drawn. Our Speaker is able to hang on to his full seat only as a result of the way his boundaries are drawn. If that is not true, why does the Government not draw the boundaries in a fair and reasonable way? Of course, a fair and reasonable way—

Mr Herzfeld: What is this business about my cheating? Either prove it or withdraw it.

Mr TONKIN: Is the electorate of Mundaring regarded as a country or metropolitan electorate?

Mr Herzfeld: Either prove it or withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr TONKIN: Is the Mundaring electorate a country or metropolitan electorate?

Mr Herzfeld: Tell the truth.

Mr TONKIN: I am telling the truth. The member for Mundaring knows very well that he has drawn a dishonest line on the map—

Mr Herzfeld: I have not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr TONKIN: He knows he has.

Mr Herzfeld: I have never drawn such a line.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chamber will come to order! The matter the Chamber is debating happens to be related to the Legislative Council. I ask the member for Morley to direct his remarks to matters concerning the Legislative Council.

Mr TONKIN: The line that says the metropolitan area excludes Mundaring and Kalamunda, and excludes areas in Dale and Darling Range, was drawn by the Liberal Party, of which the member for Mundaring is a member.

Mr Parker: He voted for it.

Mr TONKIN: That line was drawn and approved by this Parliament; it was drawn and approved by a crooked Parliament elected on the basis of crooked boundaries. That is how this line was drawn.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr O'CONNOR: I was under the impression that members are not allowed to reflect against the Parliament. I ask for your ruling.

Mr Herzfeld: They are not allowed to reflect against members either.

Mr Tonkin: You reflect on yourself with dirty tricks.

Mr Herzfeld: You reflect on yourself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mundaring will keep order! The member for Morley made a reflection on the Chamber, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr Tonkin: Which reflection is that?

The CHAIRMAN: It is the reflection you made on the Chamber.

Mr Tonkin: Which reflection?

Mr P. V. Jones: You know the reflection you made.

Mr Tonkin: I have said a lot of things.

The CHAIRMAN: The reflection you made on the Chamber was that you used the words "crooked Parliament", and I ask you to withdraw that reflection.

Mr TONKIN: I withdraw it and point out, to you and other members of your party, that the Liberal Party is responsible for these statements having to be made.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Morley has been a member of this Chamber for some time. He would realise that the withdrawal of a remark is made without qualification.

Mr TONKIN: I withdraw it without qualification.

Committee Resumed

Mr TONKIN: I point out, however, that this Parliament drew a line—when I say "Parliament", I mean the Liberal Party—to exclude certain areas from the metropolitan area, and include certain areas in the metropolitan area. The only reason the Parliament reflects the actions of the Liberal Party is that the lines drawn on the map create a "Catch 22" situation whereby members of this place are not representative in a proper way of the people of this State.

Mr Sibson: What about the Bunbury seat?

Mr TONKIN: The line has been drawn to bring Rockingham into the metropolitan area, when it should be regarded as a country electorate.

Mr Shalders: You have a chip on your shoulder as big as the head of Mr Bartholomaeus.

Mr TONKIN: The line leaves out Kalamunda and Mundaring from the metropolitan area, but members of this Government squeal when I use the word "crooked".

Point of Order

Mr TRETHOWAN: I fail to see the relevance of the member's commenting on seats of the Legislative Assembly when the appropriation before us relates to the Legislative Council.

Mr Tonkin: That's because you are dim.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I accept that point of order and ask the member for Morley, if he is to continue his remarks, to relate them to the Legislative Council.

Committee Resumed

Mr TONKIN: In case there are more dim-witted members who do not understand the electoral situation, I indicate that the fact of the matter is that Mundaring is part of a Legislative Council province, and the line drawn so dishonestly on the map to exclude certain metropolitan areas, and to include in the metropolitan area certain country areas, causes the Legislative Council to be elected in a certain way. The relevance of Mundaring to the matter before us is obvious. We have the situation of members opposite complaining about remarks that a crooked Parliament—

Mr Herzfeld: You didn't complain about Mundaring when you held it.

Mr TONKIN: Oh, yes, we did; we introduced legislation so that equal electorates would make up this Parliament. That occurred when Mr Jim Moiler, the then member for Toodyay, a member of the Labor Party, supported this proposition. He was strongly in favour of the legislation. That shows that the member for Mundaring does not know his history, or is telling untruths.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr TONKIN: The Tonkin Government introduced legislation into this Chamber—you, Mr Chairman, and I were members then—to give one-vote-one-value to the people of this State. The Liberal Party voted against that legislation.

Mr Rushton: And so it should have been voted against because it was totally unjust.

Mr TONKIN: The Deputy Premier would not be able to win his seat fairly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest to the member for Morley that he should not canvass matters relating to Assembly seats.

Mr TONKIN: Mr Chairman, it is your fault that this—

Mr Parker interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Morley will not reflect at all on the Chair; that is a Standing Order of this place.

Mr Parker interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fremantle will keep order!

Mr TONKIN: The reason we have a dishonestly elected Legislative Council which, ever since responsible government in 1980 has been in the hands of the conservatives, is that various electoral devices have been used by the conservatives of this State to prevent the people from having a fair and proper choice.

As I have said before, even though the people of Western Australia have voted overwhelmingly for an ALP Government—for example, between 1933-47, 1953-59, 1971-74 and in the 1920s—and in spite of that preference, the ALP Government has never had the control of the Legislative Council.

Several members interjected.

Mr TONKIN: The reason for that is that if certain provinces are kept out of the metropolitan area—such as the provinces based at Mundaring, Kalamunda, and Armadale—they remain a full seat, but, if they are brought into the metropolitan area, they become part of a province. That is how the conservatives have determined the power of the Legislative Council and the Liberal Party.

When the member for Mundaring says he has never drawn a line on a map, that is untrue. The Liberal Party draws up the metropolitan area, by a majority in this House. Because of the system of voting, it has passed that as law. That is a sad situation.

We have a situation in Western Australia where the people are told, "You may have a vote, but it won't do you any good because we have rigged the electoral boundaries and you will not be able to elect the ALP majority in the Legislative Council." That is absolute power, unlike most upper Houses. It is unlike the House of Lords which was formed in 1911.

The Legislative Council is an expensive House and consists of 32 members whose job is to frustrate the wishes of the people who vote for the ALP.

We have a situation where people have to pay for the Legislative Council to frustrate their wishes. What a wicked, dishonest system that is. The people have to pay enormous sums of money and if they happen to decide they have had enough of the Liberal Party and want the ALP in Government, their wishes will be frustrated. What kind of a system is that?

I hope when the history of this State is written, it will be written in true and proper fashion so that people are aware of the way in which the conservatives have riveted upon the people of this

State a tyranny by drawing lines on a map. I hope when that history is written, there will be not too much quaint nonsense in it with what I call gossip which some people think is history. I hope it will deal with the dynamics of society which has led to this fundamentally undemocratic system.

The member for Murchison-Eyre said that I called this place a kangaroo court and had no right to talk about the standards of Parliament because I have criticised it. Of course I have criticised this place; any decent person would have done that. If members do not wish to be called corrupt and dishonest, they should reform the Parliament to ensure the will of the people prevails.

It amazes me how people can squeal when they are called dishonest, especially when they are acting dishonestly. What the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development and the Minister for Consumer Affairs have said would be called lies outside this Parliament, but in this place these comments cannot be called lies.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the member would have had ample opportunity to discuss that under division 3.

Mr TONKIN: If Government members object to terms such as "dishonest" and "acting dishonestly", they should set about acting in a proper way. The Legislative Council cannot be an instrument of good laws because any instrument which is faulty can produce nothing other than that which is faulty. If we have an instrument which has flaws, the legislation of that instrument must also have flaws. If one were to measure with a tape which is incorrect, the measurements would be incorrect. If we have a Parliament which does not reflect the will of the people and which is dishonestly elected, we will have bad laws because of a dishonest and corrupt Legislative Council. It cannot go forth with honest and uncorrupted laws. That is the simple fact.

Of course we can be self-righteous and refer to the Soviet Union and its one party-system of Government. The Government members in this State are close relatives of the Government of the Soviet Union because they have riveted upon the people a one-party system with these electoral laws in Western Australia.

When people are told they can vote at an election, but it is made difficult for them to change the governing party in both Houses, they do not have the absolute system as they have in the Soviet Union—with a one-party system—but this Government has gone as close as it will dare in Australia.

How can Government members feel self-righteous about the disgraceful situation that pertains in the Soviet Union or the Communist bloc countries? Government members are blood brothers because they have exercised their powers to keep themselves in Government, irrespective of the wishes of the people. Government members are no different from Khrushchev, Stalin, Lenin, and Brezhnev.

The Government has done the same thing. I guess its members have a sense of smug self-satisfaction that they have been able to do that. They understand what has been done by those people I mentioned and they have done the same thing.

We have seen today that the Western Australian people would have extraordinary difficulty if they were to lift the yoke of conservative government in the Legislative Council which has been unbroken right back to the last century. I do not know how members opposite can prattle on about democracy when they know very well that that crooked line is on the map.

Mr Rushton: The KGB is not working too well. If it were, you would not be there spouting about that.

Mr TONKIN: What does that mean?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Rushton: The secret service of the Russian system is not working too well.

Mr TONKIN: In this country?

Mr Rushton: You would not be talking like that if it were. You should be appreciative of the fact that you can talk about that.

Mr TONKIN: Does the Deputy Premier mean that one cannot be acquainted with Communists because one cannot protest?

Mr Rushton: You have the freedom to do what you like.

Mr TONKIN: I accept that. I am certainly not saying that we in this country have the kind of dictatorship that exists in the Soviet Union. The parallel I am drawing is that in the Soviet Union it is impossible for people to change the Government; and this Government has made it extremely difficult for the people to change the Government in this State. It is true that we have far greater freedom here. I am able to speak like this, whereas in the Soviet Union, if I disagreed with the system, I could not do the same.

I am not suggesting that we are similar to the Soviet Union in those areas. However, I still maintain that my comparison is valid to this degree: the party that rules the Soviet Union has made it very difficult for the Russian people to change its Government; and in the same way this

Government has made it difficult—not as difficult—for the Western Australian people to change the Government in both Houses. Remember that, without having a majority in the Legislative Council, the ALP can inhabit the Treasury benches and an ALP member can be a Minister of the Crown. However, not one piece of legislation on the Statute book of Western Australia is ALP legislation. The only legislation that the ALP has had put on the Statute book has been with the permission of the Liberal Party.

Mr Gordon Hill: Shame!

Mr TONKIN: I do not believe members opposite have a sense of shame; and that is an unfortunate state of affairs.

Mr Coyne: You are inconsistent. The Labor Party does not follow the one-vote-one-value system throughout its organisation.

Mr TONKIN: Would the member for Murchison-Eyre like to tell me how?

Mr Coyne: It does not work.

Mr TONKIN: It is an untrue observation.

Mr Coyne: I do not want to go into it.

Mr TONKIN: That is an untrue statement.

Mr Coyne: I stick by it.

Mr TONKIN: The member for Murchison-Eyre can stick by it, but he cannot substantiate it.

We in the Australian Labor Party have democracy. I, as a member of Parliament, have the same vote in my branch and on the State Executive as does any other member of the party. Therefore, the situation within the ALP is democratic and the member for Murchison-Eyre's observation is untrue. I guess that is why, when I asked him to substantiate his comments, he was unable to do so.

I make a plea to the people of WA to stop wasting money on the Legislative Council. If the people change the Government, the Liberal Party will see that the legislation goes through, anyway. For example, during the time of the Brand Government—approximately 12 years—I am not sure whether even one Bill was rejected.

Mr Gordon Hill: Just one.

Mr TONKIN: In the time of the Tonkin Government—three years—many Bills were rejected and many others were massacred.

Mr Parker: They have not rejected one single Bill.

Mr TONKIN: Not one single Bill in seven years. The situation is that the Legislative Council is an expensive anachronism which exists only to frustrate the people if they should ever wish to

have an ALP Government; and that situation is unsatisfactory, unacceptable, and undemocratic.

Mr PARKER: The appropriation for the Legislative Council reveals a number of very interesting points. For the first time, the appropriation has taken into account the fact that the number of members of the Legislative Council has been increased by two as a result of the gerrymander Bill which to some extent has been referred to by the member for Morley, and which was passed by this House and Parliament last year.

A result of the Bill was to increase the members of the Legislative Council from 32 to 34; and that has been reflected in the appropriation for the Legislative Council. In 1977, we had the situation where the number of members in the Legislative Council was increased from 30 to 32. Therefore, in a period of only four to five years, the membership of the Council has increased by four.

It is interesting that this Government felt the need to increase the membership of the Council by four while other Legislative Councils throughout Australia operate with fewer members. South Australia, which has a population almost identical to that of WA, has been able to operate its council with only 20 members; and one would suggest that that State has not been disadvantaged.

Victoria has 44 members in the Legislative Council, but, of course, that is a State which has a population of four or five times that of WA. New South Wales, with a population five or six times that of WA, recently reduced the number of members in its Legislative Council from 60 to 45 and it is able to operate on that basis. The Queensland Government has operated without a Legislative Council for some time and it does not seem to have done that State any harm. There is no justification for the increase in numbers in the Council in WA.

At the time that the number of members was increased, the Government introduced a constitutional amendment which prohibits the reduction in the number of members in the Legislative Council without a referendum. That might be of some merit, but it would be of far greater merit if the constitutional provision were that there should be no increase in the membership of the Legislative Council or the Legislative Assembly without a referendum. The public would be prepared to accept this move which would receive considerable support. Were the Government prepared to introduce such a constitutional amendment, it would certainly receive the support of the Labor Party. However, it is highly unlikely that the

Government would make that move; and I would be prepared to wager a considerable sum of money on whether the Government would support this.

Over the last few years, we have seen Government members seeking political advantage by giving up their salary increases for a short period in an endeavour to show the community that somehow they are exercising some constraint in regard to the money taken from the public purse. These figures reveal that it is only a transitory advantage credited to the State by a few members giving up increases for a few weeks compared with the funds that are required to accommodate new members in the Legislative Council—if I were able to mention the new members in the Assembly I would do so.

The Government undertook to provide for the increase to take effect with the new Parliament which is to be elected whenever the Premier chooses to call an election. It is fortuitous that at the time of this debate we should receive a copy of the extract of questions and answers on Tuesday in which the Chief Secretary, in answer to a question by Mr Berinson, gave the figures for the electorates in this State. Because of the ruling—and I will have to make another speech I had not intended to make—I will refer only to the figures for the Legislative Council.

It is interesting to see that the smallest seat, Lower North, has an electoral enrolment of 6 270, and the largest seat, North-East Metropolitan—a Labor-held seat—has an electoral population of 82 812, a discrepancy factor of more than 13:1. The total number of voters enrolled in the State is 729 832. If we had one-vote-one-value as the member for Morley suggested—and I fully agree with that—we would have—

Mr Sibson: A lot of people would not agree.

Mr PARKER:—seats which would be quite fair even by the Government's standards of what is a fair size for a country electorate. The member for Bunbury interjected, and he represents a seat which forms part of a Legislative Council province and contains 8 253 electors. That figure is reflected in the figure for the province which comes into the area—South-West Province. In contrast, the member for Kimberley, who represents a far more remote and far larger area of the State than does the member for Bunbury, and whose Assembly seat forms part of the North Province, represents 14 584 electors, according to the figures presented last Tuesday by the Chief Secretary. If it can be said there is some disadvantage in a member's representing country constituencies and therefore a need exists for some recognition of that fact, how can it be said

there is a greater disadvantage—to a factor of about 80 per cent—in a member's representing the electorate of Bunbury or the upper House seat which includes the seat of Bunbury than in a member's representing the seat of Kimberley or the upper House seat which corresponds to it? There is no logic in that argument.

Mr Court: Under your principles would you put Port Hedland into the seat of Kimberley?

Mr PARKER: No, because if we had one-vote-one-value, the seat of Kimberley would be reduced in size and it would be closer to what it was before the gerrymander which took place last year.

The figures reveal that with 729 000 people on the roll, if one-vote-one-value existed and 57 seats were to be filled in the lower House after the next State election, the quota for each electorate would be 12 700 with a factor downwards to about 11 000, and a factor upwards to about 14 000.

Mr Sibson: What would happen in Murchison-Eyre and Gascoyne?

Mr PARKER: Those seats would be absorbed into the neighbouring seats.

Mr Sibson: But what would happen to them? What sort of seats would they be?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! I remind the member for Fremantle that the Chairman has ruled it is not possible to speak about various individual Assembly electorates. The member must relate his remarks to the Legislative Council.

Mr PARKER: I was careful on each occasion I mentioned an Assembly seat to relate it to the fact that the member for Bunbury's district, for example, is part of South-West Province, the member for Kimberley's seat is part of North Province, and so on. The member for Nedlands' seat is part of Metropolitan Province, and if you want me to continue with the same charade, I am happy to do so.

Mr Sibson: What about Murchison-Eyre and Gascoyne?

Mr PARKER: They are part of the most gerrymandered seat—Lower North Province—which is one-thirteenth of the size of North-East Metropolitan Province.

Mr Sibson: How much is the seat of Bunbury?

Mr PARKER: It has 8 200.

Mr Sibson: How is it gerrymandered?

Mr PARKER: The member's seat is only half the size. I know it is difficult for him to understand these things, particularly numbers which run into four figures.

Mr Stephens: Be patient.

Mr PARKER: I recognise it is difficult to get these things through to the member for Bunbury, but I point out that the upper House seat in his electorate has 26 338 electors. By comparison, North-East Metropolitan has 82 812 electors—a factor of 4:1 in favour of the area represented in the Legislative Assembly by the member for Bunbury, and in the upper House, by his colleagues. Absolutely no justification at all exists for that, particularly when one considers that the area represented by the member for Bunbury is not dissimilar in size to the area I represent in the metropolitan area. The area of the seat represented by the member for Bunbury is not much different from the size of the seat I represent or those represented by a number of metropolitan members. However, the member for Kimberley and the two members for North Province represent an area so much greater in size with nearly double the number of electors as the area represented by the member for Bunbury and his upper House colleagues. I regard that as an extraordinary position.

The Government used to say the justification for the absence of one-vote-one-value was the fact that these sparsely populated electorates were much more difficult to represent, and the electors needed to have some relationship with their member. The Government has destroyed its argument by the gerrymander put through last year which has created a situation where one of the biggest seats, in terms of electors as well as area, is Kimberley and its upper House counterpart, North Province. At the same time seats like Darling Range and Kalamunda and their upper House counterpart, West Province, are so much smaller. That is the fact of the matter. The Government has destroyed any internal logic, such as it was, contained in its argument.

The quota for Assembly electorates would be 12 700, with a corresponding quota for Council seats, depending on the number of seats in that House. If we had one-vote-one-value, it would not result in any major changes in the distribution of seats except that the Kimberley electorate and North Province would become less gerrymandered. I remind members that the former member for North Province (Bill Withers) described the gerrymander in that area as being the worst in the western world. The seat and the province would become smaller and easier for the members to represent. Seats like that represented by the member for Bunbury would become bigger in terms of numbers of electors, and slightly bigger in terms of population, but probably not as big as some metropolitan seats.

Mr Sibson: There is a good reason. If you could do that you could make it a Labor seat.

Mr Bryce: So you have gerrymandered Bunbury.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr PARKER: With respect to the member for Bunbury, he will soon see us make Bunbury and its neighbouring seat a Labor seat in short order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! I remind the member for Fremantle of the previous request.

Mr PARKER: I am responding to the member for Bunbury.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I suggest the member for Fremantle does not do that.

Mr PARKER: If you suggest to the member for Bunbury that he not interject, I will be quite happy not to respond to him.

Another factor revealed by the answer given by the Chief Secretary in respect of enrolments for Legislative Council provinces—which, coincidentally, happened in its totality to be the same number of enrolments for the Legislative Assembly districts—is that 729 682 people are on the roll. Recently I was reading *The Advertiser* from Adelaide in the library, and I discovered that the number of people eligible to vote for both the lower and upper Houses in the South Australian election on Saturday week is something like 846 000. For some time Opposition members have pointed to the discrepancy between the State and Federal electoral rolls in relation to the number of people enrolled for the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. We have a discrepancy of about 50 000 between those two rolls.

As the Premier proudly said—and I share his pride—the population of the State of Western Australia now slightly exceeds that of the State of South Australia, and yet about 120 000 more people are entitled to vote for the Legislative Council of South Australia than are entitled to vote for the Legislative Council in Western Australia.

I am not suggesting that the figures will ever be exactly the same, even though the total population is similar, because the nature of the population may be different in terms of the number of migrants, the age distribution, and things of that nature. However, I suggest that 120 000 is quite a dramatic difference and is worthy of comment and note.

Mr Bryce: That is a big figure, is it not?

Mr PARKER: It is a matter of very serious concern which gives rise to our wondering whether the system for the election of members of the Legislative Council—and, incidentally, members of the Legislative Assembly—is adequate, and whether the mechanisms are sufficient. We have pointed to that on several occasions; and we have talked about the need for electoral censuses, and so on.

South Australia and Western Australia have virtually identical populations although the States are not completely identical in terms of distances, communications, and so on. However, it is a serious matter that the number of electors in the two States is so different.

If we had Legislative Assembly districts with 12 700 voters each, and commensurate sized Legislative Council provinces, we would have a democratic State for the first time in its history. All members would be able to represent their electors adequately, because the member for Kimberley and his upper House counterparts can represent 14 000 electors adequately, and therefore the members for Darling Range, Bunbury, Mundaring, Dale, and Kalamunda could represent 12 700 people adequately—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): I am sorry to have to keep reminding the member for Fremantle that he should limit his remarks to the Division before us. If he wants to discuss the electoral position, he must relate it to the Legislative Council, which is the matter under discussion.

Mr PARKER: I have made my point in that respect.

In relation to another matter, the member for Mt. Hawthorn has advised me that he asked either the Treasurer or the Speaker a considerable time ago about the cost of the celebrations earlier this year for the 150th anniversary of the Legislative Council.

Mr O'Connor: He asked the Speaker, and I thought a reply came back.

Mr PARKER: According to the member for Mt. Hawthorn, no reply has been received. Looking at the Estimates for the Legislative Council, I am finding it difficult to work out the cost of that exercise. It may be that the Treasurer is not able to answer this at the moment; and if he is not, he should undertake to obtain the information and provide it to the Committee so that we know the cost of the 150th celebrations for the Legislative Council which took place in February of this year, and during a few weeks before and after that.

While I am talking about the cost of things in the Legislative Council, I will raise a couple of matters, one of which I hope will be of some con-

cern to you, Mr Deputy Chairman, as well as to us, and which relates to the number of staff available to the Legislative Council.

According to the Estimates before us, during the 1981-82 financial year the staffing costs of the Legislative Council were \$146 702, which compared with the Legislative Assembly cost of \$147 668. The Legislative Assembly was in front by about \$900, an insignificant amount.

For this year, by contrast, the staffing cost of the Legislative Council has risen to \$215 000, compared with the estimate for the Legislative Assembly—I am sorry to mention the Assembly, but I am doing it for comparative purposes—of \$185 000. The Assembly consists of many more members; and in one year it was about \$900 in front of the Council. Now we have the situation in which the Assembly will be \$40 000 behind the Council.

Part of the reason for this, I suggest, comes under item 1 of the Division, provision for new appointments, \$46 000. I do not know what the new appointments for the Legislative Council involve, but possibly the Treasurer can tell us about them. Interestingly, when one compares that with the vote for the Legislative Assembly, one finds there is no provision for new appointments in the Legislative Assembly.

I understand that it was close to being agreed that the Public Accounts Committee, which has been in desperate need of research staff for a considerable time and which has been using an officer on secondment from the Treasury, would obtain the services of a staff member on the Legislative Assembly staff. I understood that was the way in which things were developing; and I thought the Under Treasurer had agreed to that and the secondment from the Treasury took place so that things could be got moving fairly quickly. Everyone on the committee was grateful for that; but when the time came for the Budget to be drawn up, no provision was made for a staff member for the Public Accounts Committee—a person who would serve the committee, but who would be an employee of the Legislative Assembly. There is no provision for that in the Assembly vote; but we find that there is a huge increase in the staffing level in the Council vote.

I do not know the reason for that. It may be that ample justification can be provided for the increase in staffing levels in the Legislative Council; but I suggest, in view of the comparative importance of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly—everybody would agree that the Council is of far less importance than the Assembly, and the Constitution makes that clear—it

is extraordinary that the Council should be so well served by staff to serve 32 members or, shortly, 34 members, when there is no provision for increased staffing levels in the Legislative Assembly.

I know that one of the aspects of the increase in the vote for the Legislative Council—I do not know what item number it comes under—is the appointment of the secretary, research officer, or executive officer, or whatever his title is, of the so-called QANGO committee. It is a very good idea for the extra staff member for that committee to be an employee of the Legislative Council.

Mr Pearce: They seem to be acting as a QANGO themselves.

Mr PARKER: If that is good enough for the Legislative Council, I cannot understand why such a provision has not been made for the Legislative Assembly.

I have more specific matters to raise when we deal with the items; but I suggest that the Legislative Council appears to have received far more favourable treatment in terms of the staff members ratio compared with the Legislative Assembly. That is somewhat of a travesty considering the relative size and relative importance of the two Chambers.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank members for their comments in connection with these issues. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the facilities of the House and I do not intend to justify the present position by referring to what pertained in the past. However, when I first came into the House approximately 24 years ago we had one room outside the Chamber where all the members congregated, because they had nowhere else to go. Where the patio is now, *Hansard* worked in a corrugated iron building. Therefore, members will see improvements have been made, but it is necessary that we continue to upgrade facilities and the best way to do this is through the Joint House Committee. All members should lean on the members of that committee in an endeavour to put forward their points of view.

Mr Bryce: The Joint House Committee is so preoccupied with such petty matters week in and week out that it does not look at some of these important matters.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Joint House Committee has effected some improvements, such as the purchase of electric typewriters.

Mr Parker: Perhaps we should set up a separate *ad hoc* committee.

Mr O'CONNOR: A committee has been formed and it is made up of the members for Perth and Welshpool and a couple of Government members. They looked at various matters such as electric typewriters and the like in an endeavour to improve facilities.

It is important that standards be maintained, but we must recognise at the same time that it is essential to exercise restraint and remain within the Budget. I do not object to these sorts of matters being brought to my attention and they will be considered again in next year's Budget.

I assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the points he raised will be considered by me. Although some members may feel the Joint House Committee does not do all it should, I indicate that the members of the committee work hard and they are consistently in touch with me about various problems within the House.

I indicate to the member for Fremantle that the cost of the Legislative Council's anniversary celebration was \$15 000. In fact the celebration cost more than that, but funds were raised through the sale of wine and other activities.

Mr Parker: What area is that costed against?

Mr O'CONNOR: It is costed against the Treasury.

The reason the cost of an assistant for the Public Accounts Committee was not shown in the Legislative Assembly budget was that, because a full-time person was not required, a Treasury officer carries out the work as and when required. If that system does not work satisfactorily, we could include the sum in the Legislative Assembly budget at a later date.

I have had discussions with the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and with Treasury people to ascertain the best way to deal with this matter. It was indicated that a full-time person was not required and, to ensure we do not overspend in this area, it was decided a Treasury officer would fill the position on a part-time basis.

Mr Parker: What about the large increase in the staff of the Legislative Council?

Mr O'CONNOR: Two additional people have been appointed in the Legislative Council. One has been employed in connection with the QANGO committee, and the allocation for those appointments is \$46 000. If the member wants any further information, I shall be happy to try to obtain it for him.

The other provisions related to an expenditure of \$13 000 to cover additional award increases; \$10 000 to cover the full year's cost of award increases; \$5 898 to cover other increases; and an

anticipated saving through change of staff or staff turnover of \$6 600, making a total of \$68 298.

I am aware members opposite are not in complete agreement with us as to the province boundaries of the Legislative Council. However, we have debated that matter extensively in the past and we will not achieve a great deal by debating it further now.

It is essential that we continue to improve the standards and facilities of the Parliament, particularly bearing in mind that standards have been very poor in the past. The extension to the building agreed to by Sir David Brand provided better facilities for members and we also now have electorate offices.

Mr Bryce: Have you been to the Parliament House in Sydney? Have you seen the new building there?

Mr O'CONNOR: No, I have not seen the new Parliament in Sydney. Queensland has a new Parliament also and the facilities there are extremely good.

Mr Bryce: I have not dared to suggest that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I agree it is essential that we continue to improve our facilities and maintain a high standard in the Parliament.

Item 2: Other Staffing Costs—

Mr PARKER: The Treasurer has explained that the \$46 000 appropriation in item 1 was for two new staff members in the Legislative Council. I would appreciate it if the Treasurer could give me the details of the second staff member, as he was not able to do so previously.

In 1981-82 the vote for this item was \$6 000. In fact \$10 838 was expended in that year and this year the amount budgeted is \$25 000.

Bearing in mind that the two new Council officers and what one might call the "permanent officers" are catered for in item 1, might I inquire of the Treasurer, firstly, why was the figure of \$6 000 estimated for 1981-82 exceeded by almost \$5 000; and, secondly, what is the reason for more than doubling that allocation to the Legislative Council for the forthcoming year?

Mr O'CONNOR: The increase provides mainly for higher payroll tax which will amount to \$3 500 based on estimated salaries for the coming year. An additional \$5 000 was to enable an officer to attend a programme of attachment at the House of Commons. The balance of the increased provision is attributed to transfer of expenditure from item 4 which is services and contracts.

Item 4: Services and Contracts—

Mr PARKER: The 1981-82 estimate of expenditure on this item was \$29 000, but \$38 000 was expended. Could the Premier give me the reason for that large overrun when this year's estimated expenditure is \$30 000? The Treasurer has just indicated the reason for the decrease this year compared with last year's actual expenditure to the effect that a portion has been transferred into item 2. Which aspect of services and contracts has been transferred to item 2, and what does "services and contracts" now contain?

Mr O'CONNOR: We have a decrease of \$8 409 in the allocation this year, and this reflects the reduced printing requirements of \$3 500 for 1982-83. The \$5 000 covers travel, laundry, advertising, and other staffing costs.

Mr Parker: What is the reason for the \$10 000 overrun in the 1981-82 period?

Mr O'CONNOR: I cannot say offhand.

Mr Parker: Could you get the information?

Mr O'CONNOR: Certainly.

Item 8: Standing, Select and other Committees—

Mr PARKER: Last year the vote for this item was \$96 000 and only \$15 000 was expended which, I guess, is commendable. However, this year the vote is for \$50 000. Bearing in mind we already know the executive officers of the committees are catered for in the staffing budget, one can assume only that the \$50 000 relates to such things as travel costs, recognising the extensive travelling undertaken by the Hon. Sandy Lewis and his committee when busying themselves to see various aspects of culture and sport throughout the Commonwealth and, indeed, other parts of the world. Would the Treasurer indicate what the \$50 000 is provided for?

Mr O'CONNOR: Although only \$15 000 was expended last year, this year's allowance is for additional committees expected to be appointed; we have budgeted for what we anticipate will occur. There may even be a Select Committee this year. It would be unwise not to prepare ourselves in advance.

Mr Parker: Are you going to support my call for a Select Committee on the industrial arbitration legislation?

Mr O'CONNOR: Not necessarily. As I said, it would be unwise not to have an amount set aside for possible committees.

Division 2 put and passed.

Division 3: Legislative Assembly, \$303 000—

Mr PARKER: Most of the points I wanted to make about the Legislative Assembly I managed

to make when speaking about the Legislative Council.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): I noticed. That is quite an admission.

Mr PARKER: It shows I am able to deal with Standing Orders reasonably well. It seems to me that the Legislative Assembly is treated less favourably than is the Legislative Council, and that seems to be a remarkable position. The Treasurer already has indicated that the Legislative Council has a vote to cover likely Select Committees, but I notice no budgetary allocation has been made for Select Committees appointed by this House. As well as that there does not seem to be any allocation for the continuation of the dairy industry Select Committee, which commenced last year and is continuing now in the form of an Honorary Royal Commission. There may be an allocation somewhere and perhaps the Treasurer could advise me where it is.

No provision is made for the appointment of new staff to the Legislative Assembly. Further, no provision has been made for the Legislative Assembly to set up committees and if, as the Treasurer suggested, the Legislative Assembly were to appoint a Select Committee, we would find a substantial deficiency in the vote for the Legislative Assembly.

The Assembly does appear to be treated in a far worse way than the Council. It seems that if the Council wants something, it merely asks for it and gets it; if the Hon. Sandy Lewis wants a trip around the world, he gets it. If the Legislative Assembly wanted to do something, it could not do it because no money is available.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government considers that one House is treated the same as the other. If there are overruns in these areas, they are covered by the Treasury, as has occurred in the past. If Parliament decides a Select Committee is necessary, any overrun is covered by the Treasury. The Legislative Council has no more right than has the Legislative Assembly to appoint a Select Committee. The member for Vasse was appointed chairman of a Select Committee which has been appointed an Honorary Royal Commission. I understand it is covered by Treasury funding.

Mr Pearce: It should appear somewhere in the Budget.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will find out where it does appear. I repeat: Any overruns are covered by the Treasury.

Division 3 put and passed.

Division 4: Joint House Committee, \$3 061 000—

Mr PEARCE: I wish to raise a petty matter. Last Wednesday my brother, who is the President of the Shire of Wanneroo, came up to Parliament

House to have lunch with me and a third party in order to discuss a number of matters, so it could be considered a business lunch. My brother has been to the House before so I did not think to warn him that people must dress for the occasion.

My brother was removed from the dining room under the direction of the head steward because he was not wearing a coat. He had to stand in the corridor until a coat was brought to him from the nether regions, and it appeared that the coat had resided in those nether regions for a very long time.

The President of the Shire of Wanneroo came here well dressed with a casual open-necked shirt; his clothes would have allowed him to go anywhere in Perth. He was forced to add to his light-coloured casual gear a coat which was black and scungy and which, in the words of the member for Victoria Park said made him look like an unemployed scarecrow. Forcing him to wear that coat lowered the tone of the parliamentary dining room.

This matter has been raised before, but the dress requirements around this place are reaching the stage of absurdity. It is not necessary to wear a tie into the dining room, but one must wear a coat. In this Chamber we do not have to wear a coat provided we enter the Chamber wearing one. It can be taken off and hung on a hook provided we have on a tie.

Mr Brian Burke: In the Legislative Council they are allowed to wear safari suits.

Mr PEARCE: Yes, they can dress up like Jungle Jim, as the Chief Secretary does quite often.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! I regard the comments the member is making as more appropriate for the annual general meeting of the Joint House Committee. I will not stop him continuing his remarks, but I ask him to draw them to a hasty conclusion.

Mr PEARCE: I am entitled to discuss the responsibilities and decisions made by the Joint House Committee.

Mr Sibson: I keep a very nice red coat in my room.

Mr PEARCE: The member's green coat is rather better known, particularly in New Zealand.

In this general debate I am entitled to complain about decisions made by the Joint House Committee. The dress regulations established by the

Joint House Committee were, regrettably, confirmed at the annual general meeting held only a week or so ago. An effort was made then for a rather more modern and up-to-date approach to be taken, but I regret to say that one of the net outcomes of the gerrymander in this State is the very heavy imbalance of conservative members in the Legislative Council, which means that the Joint House Committee, as with every other joint arrangement around this place, is heavily stacked with conservative members from the other place. One would think these people have shares in a company manufacturing coats by the way they vote on those occasions. The Western Australian climate, and the attitudes and lifestyle of Western Australians, make it ridiculous for us to enforce regulations that require coats to be worn.

The regulation covering our dining room has caused embarrassment to dozens of members' guests, and members themselves.

Mr Sibson: That is the fault of members. They know very well what the regulation is. As I said, I have a coat in my office that anyone can use.

Mr Parker: I have seen in the dining room the President of the Legislative Council have guests who were not wearing coats. It doesn't worry me, but he is the arch supporter of the present regulation.

Mr Brian Burke: It should be that people are allowed to use the dining room so long as they are neatly and tidily attired.

Mr PEARCE: We should not have these 19th century rules. It is unfair that dining room staff are required to enforce these rules.

Mr Sibson: That is by unthoughtful members.

Mr PEARCE: I did not intend to carry on with this matter, but interjections have been made. We have discovered in the past that dining room rules are flouted even by Ministers, but that is not taken up because we have not felt that the dining room staff should be required to enforce the rules in the case of Ministers flouting those rules—that would put dining room staff in a difficult situation.

At one time the rule was that members could not invite guests to lunch or dinner when the Parliament was sitting, but that rule has been relaxed. However, when that rule was enforced, this Minister for Police and Prisons was often seen with a guest who should not have been invited at that time. Other Ministers can be put in the same boat. I have sat at tables where some people have made a complaint to the head steward about that breach of the rules, but other people at that table have said quite rightly that it was unfair to lay the charge of enforcing the rule on the staff of the

dining room, or the head steward, when the person breaching the rule was a Minister or a senior officer of the Parliament. The dining room staff would have been placed in a most invidious position. However, that is a minor point.

Mr Court: What about cigarette smoking?

Mr PEARCE: I do not smoke cigarettes, but the rule prohibiting cigarette smoking seems to me to be a fairly silly one.

Mr Coyne: I think it's a good rule.

Mr O'Connor: It is a good rule.

Mr PEARCE: Dining rooms all over the world have non-smoking rules because many people object to being subjected to cigarette smoke while eating their meals.

The interesting point about our dress rules is that there are no such rules for women. I suppose a woman could go topless into the dining room.

Mrs Craig: I wouldn't.

Mr PEARCE: If the Minister did, probably I would lodge a protest with the Joint House Committee.

Mr Brian Burke: I think that is a bit of an affront to the Minister.

Mr PEARCE: As the Leader of the Opposition interjected earlier, the requirement ought to be merely that people are attired neatly and tidily. It is ridiculous that a man can go into the dining room wearing a coat, but not a tie.

Mr Hassell: It is very difficult to have rules that work with people with your attitude, because your attitude is that rules are there to be evaded or got around. You should get on with just carrying them out.

Mr PEARCE: This Minister should be the last person to talk about others breaking rules. What about discretionary enforcement? His attitude to gambling and other such things in the community—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! That remark is entirely inappropriate. I ask the member to confine his remarks to matters relating to the Joint House Committee.

Mr PEARCE: I was defending myself against the suggestion by the Minister that I do not obey rules.

Mr Hassell: You made statements earlier on which you didn't back up with any facts.

Mr PEARCE: Is that why the Minister became involved in this issue? Why does he not cast his attention to Liberal Party's fund raising functions.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! The member will resume his seat.

Mr Parker interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! Members know full well it is relatively unusual for the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of Committees to rise to his feet, and that he does so only when provoked by unusual occurrences. Members know also that when the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, or Speaker calls for order members are expected to remain silent. Members know also that when he rises to his feet it is highly disorderly for a member to continue to interject, as the member for Fremantle just did. If I ask members to stop interjecting or to stop shouting across the Chamber and to proceed with the debate on the matter before the Chair, I expect them to do so. I call the member for Gosnells.

Mr PEARCE: I had not intended to debate this matter for a lengthy period, but many interjections have been made. It is ridiculous in this day and age, in a State like Western Australia, which has the climate it has, to have the requirement that people cannot use the dining room of this place unless they wear a coat.

The general tone of dress standards in the community is quite acceptable. Guests of members often wear acceptable clothes, but are not allowed to use our dining room until they are fitted with someone else's coat, which makes them appear to wear a shrunken shroud. That situation lowers the general tone of the whole place. It never ceases to surprise me that certain people formulate a rule and require all others to stick by it rigidly. It is about time we had a more modern and progressive attitude towards these matters.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: If members refrain from interjecting, they will find that I am on my feet for a short period.

Mr Young: That's blackmail.

Mr PARKER: I support the remarks of the member for Gosnells. Tonight it is good enough for me to stand in this place to speak without wearing a coat, but if I went to the dining room, I would be asked to leave. It is acceptable that I stand in this, the Parliament of Western Australia, without wearing a coat, but I cannot go to our dining room dressed like this.

The member for Gosnells pointed to other absurdities inherent in our rules. So long as I am a member of Parliament, I will abide by whatever rules are laid down for this Parliament; for the three years I have been here I have done just that. However, I have invited people to lunch, but have

forgotten to tell them that they must wear a jacket. I must admit that I sometimes forget because, quite frankly, that rule is not uppermost in my mind!

About 18 months ago I invited someone to lunch. He is a respectable member of the community, who arrived straight from his place of employment dressed neatly in a shirt, tie, and trousers; but when he arrived, he was asked to leave. We went through the process to which the member for Gosnells referred of obtaining someone else's coat. At that time I said to the Secretary of the Joint House Committee that although I would abide by the rules of this place, I would not have my guests subjected to such indignities. Since that occasion I have had one or two of my guests fail to wear a jacket, but they have not been dealt with as the member for Gosnells suggested others have been dealt with.

It is about time members ensured that their guests do not suffer any longer the indignities that they have suffered.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is difficult to reply because this is a matter for the Joint House Committee. I advise the members who have spoken that they are not the only ones who have had such difficulties. I have invited people to be guests in the House for lunch, but they have not worn a tie so I have taken them to a restaurant.

We ought to have a standard of dress which is in keeping with the requirements of this House, but this is a matter for the consideration of the Joint House Committee.

Item 8: Electorate Offices—

Mr STEPHENS: I thought Electorate Offices were called parliamentary offices now. An allowance of \$372 000 was made in the vote for 1981-82 and the actual expenditure was \$232 495. An estimate of \$352 000 has been made for 1982-83, which is in excess of what was actually spent in the previous year. Can the Treasurer indicate the reason for this considerable increase?

Mr O'CONNOR: Sixty electorate offices have been set up, which was not the case last year, and the sum of \$66 000 has been set aside for electric typewriters in electorate offices. The additional sum of \$40 000 has been set aside for new offices.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On matters of facilities for members, I find this Premier much easier to deal with than his predecessor. I think that is a good thing. However, I think it appears to be time to look realistically to the facilities available in members' offices. For example, no allowance has been made for photocopying in electorate offices and I do not believe the staffing facilities are ad-

equate. In some cases the payment of staff is not commensurate with the work that has to be done.

We have problems in many areas where members cannot do their jobs properly without the facilities they need.

If we look to Division 5—Joint Printing Committee—we note that the Chief Hansard Reporter earns more than a member of Parliament. I do not deny that the Chief Hansard Reporter is worth that amount of money and works hard, but I would say that all members of Parliament work hard also—at least most of them. It seems odd that people who work in positions such as the Chief Hansard Reporter, and similar positions, actually receive more money for doing their job than do members of Parliament.

The assistants in electorate offices are not paid as much as they should be paid and there are areas in which the facilities available to members are deficient. We should have electorate offices that can provide the service that people come to expect from them. I hope the Premier will continue to entertain sympathetically the requests that are put to him on this matter.

In the scheme of things the expenditure in electorate offices is not really great in terms of the services members are able to give to their electorate, but they are certainly major items which should be considered.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I have held discussions on these matters with members of his party and my party. The secretaries at the electorate offices have received a considerable increase in the last few months as a result of pressures put upon the Public Service Commissioner and it was felt there was justification for those increases. However, it is still felt by some that there has been some unfair treatment. If we continue in the co-operative way we have been operating, we will achieve the things we require. Electric typewriters are used in most business offices and it is pleasing that they are now in our offices.

Mr Pearce: I give you credit for that.

Mr O'CONNOR: It was a matter under discussion and with co-operation we will endeavour to keep things that way.

Division 4 put and passed.

Division 5: Joint Printing Committee, \$562 000—

Item 2: Other Staffing Costs—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Recently, the Legislative Council sat through the night into the next morning and as a result the Legislative Assembly, answering a perfectly proper request from the

Hansard staff, decided it would adjourn almost immediately upon meeting.

It seems to me that we ought to be able to make other arrangements with perhaps supplementary staff or more suitable hours of meeting so that we do not have a situation in which the *Hansard* staff has to be under such pressure firstly, but secondly in which it is not possible for one Chamber of the Parliament to meet simply because the facilities have been overstretched. It seems to be not beyond the scope of Government in 1982 to be able to make auxiliary arrangements so that when this does happen in the future a supplementary staff will be available.

Mr Sodeman: When has this happened before?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is the only time we have not been able to sit, but I can remember many times when the *Hansard* reporters have been absolutely wilting at their pens and I can remember times when the House has been adjourned after a discussion about the effects on *Hansard* staff. I can remember occasions, too, when the meeting time of Parliament has been adjusted backwards to take into account the rest period needed by *Hansard* reporters.

This may occur only once, but once is sufficient to alert people to the need to eliminate the chance of its happening again.

Division 5 put and passed.

Divisions 6 and 7—Joint Library Committee, \$145 000; Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations, \$266 000—put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.14 to 7.30 p.m.

Divison 8: Premier's Department, \$2 434 000—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I want to raise one or two matters that I think are very important and in times of financial stringency certainly they are questions that need to be addressed. I am referring to what the Opposition these days labels as the Premier's public relations juggernaut.

I notice that in 1982 the Premier's Department had five public relations officers costing in 1981-82 a total of \$136 343 and in 1982-83, \$149 000. It is clear to us that what perhaps was a good idea—and that was the notion that the Government needed to be able to convey information to the public generally, and to specific interested groups precisely—has outgrown itself and has become something of a political mentor. I cannot see why the Premier, engaging and good natured as he is, needs the assistance of five public relations people. It is symptomatic of what is happening throughout this Government and throughout its departments. Never before in the history of this

State has any Government been paying so many professional public relations people as is this Government.

It detracts from a Government to have public relations people so thick on the ground with so broad an attitude about whether the picture being painted is one that actually reflects the substance. If one is an astute watcher of the Premier's public performances one will see that the picture painted by the public relations people is different from what he is. He does not change, but because of the public relations people who paint a picture of the Premier, the people in Western Australia would have seen that, in the last three weeks, he has entered his aggressive phase. They are writing all sorts of things that do not fit into the Premier's demeanour.

Several questions must be raised: firstly, the need for these public relations people; secondly, the work they are doing; and thirdly, the cost to the State of the army of public relations people that the Ministers and their departments as well command. While it does not apply to the Premier's Department, it is certainly true that, while the Minister for Fuel and Energy has a very expert public relations backup, some of those statutory authorities for which he is responsible are seeking in their own right highly paid professional public relations people who demand salaries in excess of \$34 000. I really think it is time this Government rethought the dimensions of its public relations needs and the dimension of the burden that those needs impose on the community.

It is all very well to say we must have someone who will make sure that those who want information have access to it readily. I do not believe it is the case—in fact, I believe it is indefensible—that we should have such a plethora of public relations people as to raise serious doubts about the political nature of the work in which they are involving themselves.

Let me be more specific so that members are not under any misapprehension of what I am talking about. I refer specifically to the guru of the public relations people who resides in the Premier's Department and for all intents and purposes works on a basis that is mainly political. I understand this public relations guru, Mr Leggoe, is a man who sought the Chief Executive position in the Liberal Party in NSW and that he is also responsible for *State Report*. Members who have seen *State Report* will be aware that it has really degenerated. It does not even pretend now to be factual as it was previously. It is filled with political matter that would more easily find its home in a publication paid for by the Liberal Party. That is the truth and that is what the people are say-

ing—even those professional public relations people who comment on *State Report* see it as propaganda sheet.

Without wanting to labour the point unnecessarily, the Opposition is concerned about the size and cost of the Press corps now attached within the Government in this State. At a time when people do not have jobs, we should not be adding supernumeraries to the crew in the way that appears to have been done in the case of the public relations corps commanded by the Government. We are seriously concerned that the public relations people working for the Government are, in many cases, involving themselves in the political aspects of the work that they do and not confining themselves to what is the justification put forward for their endeavours to disseminate information quickly and impartially.

We are also concerned that this Government really has become a captain of its public relations corps. The Government appears to lose its identity and Ministers go through changes in their images within the public consciousness, certainly as conveyed by newspapers and television.

I do not know why the Premier has entered this new aggressive phase. The Opposition does not really mind—it has nothing to do with it—but if it is something the taxpayers are paying for in the way of salaries for the public relations people it does not think it is proper.

We say quite sincerely all Governments in times of stringency should look to those areas because in the long term, and the immediate term, these rebound on the instigators. *State Report* has done nothing but harm for the Government. If it was intended to match *Economic Outlook* which we put out and pay for, it has failed dismally because people are aware of how the money is being spent. I say that quite sincerely in respect of *State Report*. I hesitate to guess whether *State Report* might not have got off the drawing board, particularly in its present form, had the Premier had the opportunity to rethink that proposition.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition must realise that I can look after PR for myself as well as anyone else. I do not know what he meant by "aggressive attitude". I attack each item and issue as I see it. If I think it necessary to attack the Commonwealth aggressively, I will do so. I have done that on a number of occasions recently. It is necessary to have a PR operation to ensure that the State is served properly. We have to sell Western Australia in the best way we can. The *State Report* issue mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition is one for which there has been a great deal of demand, and an increas-

ing demand in recent times. I will be watching expenditure in each of the areas referred to, and I will make sure we do not have to spend any more than is necessary.

Division 8 put and passed.

Division 9: Executive Council, \$10—

Progress

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Williams.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 27 October.

MR GORDON HILL (Swan) [7.43 p.m.]: It is no coincidence that the Government has introduced this legislation in October 1982, just as it was no coincidence that it introduced similar legislation in October-November 1979. On the latter occasion the legislation was introduced just prior to the 1980 State election, and now this Bill is before us just prior to the 1983 State election. Clearly, as many of the Opposition's speakers have said, this legislation is designed to be provocative and to result in industrial disputation which may, the Government thinks, give it some advantage at the time of the election; but, as the Leader of the Opposition said last night, the Government will rue the day it introduced this legislation because the situation the Government foresees will not occur.

In 1974, the Heath Government in the United Kingdom was brought down because of its destructive policies which caused industrial disputation in the community. If the Government in Western Australia believes this legislation will give it some advantage in an election campaign, it will soon find out that that is not the case. The people of Western Australia will not be fooled; they realise who will be to blame for any disputation that may occur in the future.

This legislation is undoubtedly the work of right-wing elements in the Liberal Party—the faceless men of the party. It is an example of the prevailing political stance of the leadership of the party in Western Australia—perhaps more appropriately, the people behind the leadership of the Liberal Party in Western Australia.

It is a sad state of affairs when any political party in this State goes to the extreme that the Liberal Party has gone in bringing forward this legislation. The real leaders of the Liberal Party in WA are people like Denis Horgan, Bill Mitchell, Bill Hassell, and Clarko the Minister for Education.

Mr Bryce: And Crichton-Browne.'

Mr GORDON HILL: And Crichton-Browne and others—the extreme right-wing element of the Liberal Party in this State. The evidence can be seen in the Minister's second reading speech which clearly is not the writings of the Minister, but rather of someone who is taking an extreme right-wing political stance. The speech is full of unsubstantiated claims; it talks of coercive behaviour, but does not substantiate the allegations in the speech. It is full of rhetoric and extravagant language which serves only a political purpose.

Members of the Australian Labor Party and the union movement are not the only ones who believe this legislation is rotten and designed to bring about confrontation and disputation before the 1983 State elections. That view also is held by the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and other employer organisations; it is held also by the Australian Road Transport Association and by *The West Australian*. I would like to quote some of the comments contained in *The West Australian's* editorial on 18 September 1982 as follows—

THE PEOPLE of WA have good reason to wonder what the State Government is trying to achieve with its amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act.

It goes on—

Good government requires a balance between ideology and practicality, but there is no trace of such a balance in the amendments.

Clearly, *The West Australian* believes also that this is just an ideological document; one not designed to be put into practice; not for the purpose of law making, but to bring about industrial disputation.

The editorial goes on—

At a time when the economy is far from healthy, legislation that could prompt massive strikes and penalise employers severely is hardly in the national interest.

The Government has, in a sense, tried to legislate against industrial reality.

It goes on—

Their scope and the size of the penalties suggest an attack not on the closed shop but on the whole union movement. It is a silly approach; trade unions are an essential part of the industrial relations system, and to try to limit their role is to step into the industrial dark ages.

If the motivation behind the Bill is suspect, its practicalities are doubly so. It flies in the face of accepted concepts of natural justice

and its penal provisions are so draconian as to be unenforceable. The idea of imposing massive fines on every member of a dissenting union is untenable.

It goes on at some length talking about the difficulties which will arise as a result of this legislation. The Government talks about the principle of the freedom of the individual; what about the freedom of an employer to employ only members of trade unions if he so desires? Those employers can be penalised by this legislation; they are restricted considerably.

In 1979 the then Minister for Industrial Relations who, at the time perhaps more appropriately should have been known as the Minister responsible for unemployment, and who is now Premier, said, in speaking on the second reading debate of legislation introduced on 16 October 1979—

The Industrial Commission is to be prevented from awarding either compulsory unionism or preference to unionists, and such provisions in any existing awards and industrial agreements will be nullified. As a consequence, no provision is necessary for exemption from union membership. This will give persons the freedom of choice to be or not to be a member of a union.

That was a comment made by the then Minister for Labour and Industry in 1979, reported at page 3621 of *Hansard*. Clearly, that is one of the justifications the Minister for Health now uses in introducing the legislation this month. If that is the case, the legislation now introduced is superfluous because, if the 1979 legislation had performed that role, there would have been no need at this time to introduce legislation to perform the same role.

The Minister had other interesting things to say in his second reading speech in 1979, and I would like to comment on some of them. With reference to the industrial relations system he said that if people who are involved in the industrial relations system—

... attempt to gain the benefits of the system without acknowledging the obligations imposed, there are two clear choices. Either they should be removed from being able to obtain the benefit which the system provides, or, if they are to remain in the system, they must face penalties to enforce compliance;

That was a comment in 1979. What double standards! Today the Premier and others are saying that, if people do not wish to belong to a union, they should not have to, they should be given the opportunity to bludge on their mates if they want

to. They do not have to contribute by paying union fees, but they can obtain the benefits of that union membership.

When he was the Minister for Labour and Industry, the Premier also stated in 1979, referring to employers employing union and non-union labour—

Similarly, provisions have been incorporated to ensure that the employment of both union members and non-unionists is not prejudiced by the unilateral action of an employer.

Again, that is one of the justifications put forward for introducing this legislation in 1982. If that is the case, there seems to be no point in repeating it; clearly it must be for political purposes.

I do not want to dwell on only one Government member's comments at that time. I would like to refer to the comments made by the current Attorney General (the Hon. I. G. Medcalf) in 1973 as justification for defeating legislation of the Tonkin Labor Government on long service leave. Again, a question of double standards on the part of a Liberal Minister. Mr Medcalf said—

I must most firmly state that I do not believe in taking industrial matters out of the hands of industrial tribunals.

Further on he said—

I do not believe that Parliament is the best place to decide industrial matters. One may ask . . .

"How qualified are members of Parliament to decide industrial matters or, indeed, how qualified are they to determine any matters?"

As far as the member for Bunbury is concerned, that is probably correct. I continue—

"... how qualified are they to determine any matters?"

Further on he says—

I believe that few members of Parliament are skilled in industrial relations, although I do subscribe to the fact that Parliament does have jurisdiction in this matter—

That is the case on this occasion, and the political pressure that faces the Government at this time is the ground swell of opinion within the electorate to oppose the Liberal Party at the next State election.

We have seen the double standards of the Premier in 1979 when he said that people participating in an industrial relations system should not participate in it—should not belong to unions in effect—and if they do not meet their

membership fee obligations they should not receive the benefits of the system. Today we have a different story. The Government is saying that people should not necessarily belong to unions and they they should bludge on their mates. What has happened to the Australian tradition of "not bludging on your mates"? That is what this legislation imposes on the people of Western Australia.

Prior to 1979, employees could opt out of membership of trade unions. They could apply to opt out by registering as conscientious objectors, in which case they were required to pay the equivalent of their union fees to a charitable organisation. If the system worked very well, why has the Government decided to change it? In the year ended 30 June 1978, 1 300 applications for exemption were made, of which 918 were granted. The remaining 339 did not proceed for the simple reason that those who decided to apply for exemption in the initial stages then discovered that they were required to pay the equivalent of their union fees to a charitable organisation. If they had to pay the money, anyway, they decided to make the contribution to the union. In subsequent years the number of people applying for exemption decreased.

I would like to make a comment about the standard of living in countries where there is not a very strong trade union movement. In the United States, in the State of Michigan, where there is 40 per cent unionism, the average weekly wage is \$285. In Mississippi, where there is only 13 per cent unionism, the average weekly wage is \$125. Clearly in that State there is no organised labour, the trade union movement is not strong, the level of union membership is not high, and the standard of living has dropped. It seems to be the intention of the Government of Western Australia to achieve that situation.

I would like to turn to specific clauses of the Bill. Proposed new section 96E suggests that the onus of proof should rest not with the complainant, but with the defendant. Whoever heard of that sort of justice? That is a fine example of justice if ever I have heard one. The proposed section will say—

... it shall be taken to be proved that a reason for that dismissal, injury, hindrance, prevention, refusal or alteration, as the case requires, was the reason that the employee or person was or was not such a member, was such an officer or was so entitled, unless the contrary is proved.

This clearly suggests the onus rests on the complainant to prove dismissal or prevention from

working. What sort of legal wizard designed that clause of the Bill? Obviously, someone adopting a political stance—it may well have been the President of the Liberal Party (Ian Warner); I understand he is a lawyer.

Mr Young: Would you like me to go through all the Tonkin legislation that contained the same clauses?

Mr GORDON HILL: Yes.

Mr Young: As a matter of fact, I will produce a few for you tomorrow.

Mr GORDON HILL: In due course, I would like to hear them.

Mr Young: I will. In fact, I can remember getting up and saying the same thing you did from the same seat.

Mr GORDON HILL: If the Minister can give me the exact cases, I will be interested to hear them.

Mr Pearce: Does that mean you have changed your attitude since you changed your side of the House?

Mr Young: It is rather a ubiquitous exercise.

Mr Pearce: You look embarrassed. That shows a bit of decency, actually, doesn't it?

Mr GORDON HILL: Clause 19—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to resume his seat. Ample opportunity will be provided to the member for Swan, and any other member, to debate individual clauses in the Committee stage. I remind the member for Swan that, as far as the second reading debate is concerned, he must confine his remarks to the general thrust of the Bill and not debate individual clauses.

Mr Pearce: If you do that the Minister for Health demands that you talk about the Bill.

Mr Bryce: And some of his back-benchers.

Mr GORDON HILL: A number of the clauses in the Bill are quite draconian and it is difficult to address myself to them without being more specific, but I shall attempt to do so.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to deny the member the right to debate the clauses of the Bill, but a more appropriate time would be in Committee.

Mr GORDON HILL: There is no point in there being an appeal provision, if the operation of an order cannot be stayed. The reason I say that is that a situation could arise where trade unionists have been required to return to work; they can lodge an appeal, but no provision is made for a stay of operation of that order if they consider it to be unjust. That position is analogous to a person being found guilty of murder in a

criminal court and sentenced to hanging and being hanged before the appeal is heard. If no stay of appeal is provided in that case, justice does not exist in that provision.

A further provision in the Bill is similar to that in the Race Relations Act of South Africa. The clause in the Bill to which I refer indicates that if anybody issues a threat or does something that can be deemed to be regarded or interpreted as a threat, he has committed an offence. At the same time, if a newspaper reports comments made by any person, and those comments may be interpreted as a threat, the newspaper is deemed to have committed an offence. That provision is similar to a provision in the Race Relations Act in South Africa. Recently a newspaper editor in South Africa was gaoled as a result of comments made in an editorial.

That sort of situation could prevail in Western Australia as a result of this legislation which is draconian in the extreme and creates an industrial police force. The Bill represents a dangerous breach of civil liberties.

The proposed amendment to section 98 of the Act is perhaps the most abhorrent provision in the Bill, because it seeks to create such an industrial police force. The powers given to industrial inspectors under that provision are similar to the powers of health inspectors under the Noise Abatement Act, where an inspector need only take the word of a third person that an infringement has occurred to be empowered to enter a house or premises.

In the case of the Bill under discussion, an industrial inspector may enter any structure, building, or vehicle if he has reasonable grounds to suspect it contains any item which is contrary to the provisions of the Bill.

This legislation, section 54B of the Police Act, and other draconian legislation introduced by this Government are putting Western Australia years behind the other States and the rest of the world. This Government has gone almost as far as the Polish military Government which is preventing the continued operation of Solidarity.

This Government would like to prohibit totally the trade union movement and it continually applies squeezes and restraints on it in the hope that it will stamp it out.

This legislation is an industrial con trick and it will be used in the election campaign. If passed, the Bill will make the industrial system totally unworkable, so it is not surprising that it has been condemned by a cross-section of the community.

The Government seeks shelter in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, but it is

very selective when quoting from that document. It refers to freedom of speech and association, but does not take any notice of the Opposition when it emphasises the section of that document relating to equal suffrage. This Government has imposed crooked electoral laws on Western Australians and is now seeking to impose crooked industrial laws on them also.

This Government believes corrupt legislation ought to be the norm. It is a Government which rejects the criticism of the Opposition in relation to electoral boundaries and accepts that people in one part of the State ought to have a far greater say in the voting system than people in other parts of the State. It is a Government which is prepared to go to any lengths to bring the State of Western Australia to its knees, if necessary, to try to create a climate for its re-election. On this occasion the Government will fail.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [8.05 p.m.]: It would be remiss of me if I did not add my strong condemnation of this piece of legislation, because members would be aware I came to this place from the trade union movement and that I was the secretary of the Collie coalminers' union for 17 years before I arrived here.

Since I have been a member of this place, I have seen many changes. I have opposed a number of measures introduced by successive Liberal Governments, which measures I saw as being attacks on the trade union movement in this State. I view this piece of legislation in the same light.

I wonder whether, in introducing this legislation, Ministers of the Crown realise the implications which could flow from it. I also query the experience of Ministers of the Crown in the industrial field.

Last night after listening to the speech of the member of East Melville—who admitted in reply to an interjection that he had never been a member of a union and who spelt out what, in his opinion, should be the rules for trade unions in Western Australia—it was clear to me that he had had no experience in industrial matters. The same could be said for the member for Nedlands, who preceded the member for East Melville in the debate. Neither of those members has had an industrial background. If we look at the front benches of the present Government, we see that is the general position.

Mr Trethowan: You can have an industrial background without being a member of a union.

Mr T. H. JONES: One needs to know the workings of a trade union and the only way to obtain that knowledge is to be involved in a union.

Otherwise it is like going onto a football field when one has never played a game of football and expecting to be able to contribute to the game. It is like suggesting that a man do a striptease act when he has never done one before. In that case, the man probably would not fit in for a number of reasons—

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. JONES: It is quite apparent I am going to be subjected to interjections. I have had a rather busy day at another place and I thought perhaps tonight I would get a free go and give the Government a few ideas about this Bill.

It is very easy for members without any experience at all to get to their feet and say what ought to occur in the trade union movement. During my 17 years as secretary of the Collie miners' union I saw dramatic changes take place, and I will explain why they took place. Previously we had one of the worst records of any trade union in the State, but there were good reasons for this, and not all attributable to the union.

Firstly, I am disturbed to understand that this legislation has been designed to attack the trade union movement in Western Australia and for no other purpose. I read with interest this morning a suggestion that the motive for the introduction of the Bill could be found in the Government's low stocks. Only time will tell whether we will see industrial disruption as a result of this legislation being placed on the Statute book.

I had discussions yesterday with representatives of a union in my area. They were concerned about strong rumours circulating that a union would be set up before the next State election. These are very strong rumours. Only time will tell whether the rumours are ill-founded, but this is the sort of thing I am hearing. Different groups of workers have indicated to me that the Government has in mind the promotion of industrial unrest prior to the next State election because it knows its stocks are low at the moment.

I would commend the Government if this Bill were aimed at conciliation. Of course, this is where our whole arbitration system is breaking down. Most members would know the experience of the Collie coalfields where the industry has lost only three days' work over the last 21 years. Two days were lost because of a national stoppage and one was lost because of a problem between the union and the employers.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, no-one could deny that the record of industrial disputes on the Collie coalfields were not good between the late 1930s and the early 1950s. When I was secretary of the union we had the situation

where one company would call in the president and me to the office just before every Christmas holiday and make demands on the union. The company would say that if its demands were not met, when the workers returned from leave, hundreds of them would be retrenched. I am not hiding behind parliamentary privilege when I say this; I am quite prepared to say this outside. The Amalgamated Collieries Ltd. company, through Mr Downing and Mr Victor Johnson, would call us in and make those demands without any thought of conciliation. This went on year after year to the extent that we were forced to work through the holiday period in order to reach an agreement with the company.

It is well known that some strikes on the Collie coalfields caused chaos throughout the State. The biggest strike that every took place on the coalfields occurred in 1949 and it caused this State to be placed in darkness for many weeks. It was a nasty incident and involved a safety issue rather than an industrial matter. A horse had been unable to adapt itself to the underground conditions. Mr Speaker, you would be aware of this, having been around at the time, but some of the younger members might not know what I am talking about. Other members longer in the tooth would know that the State was in a terrible mess for several weeks.

However, in 1961, when Amalgamated Collieries Ltd. was left out of the Government contract, the union representatives and the representatives of the two operating companies—Western Collieries Ltd. and Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.—sat around a table and discussed the issues. After that, industrial relations on the coalfields improved. Only three working days have been lost in the ensuing 21 years, and very few unions, if any, could match that record.

Of course, the coalmining industry is a hazardous one with peculiarities which do not affect the general trade union movement in Western Australia.

Mr McPharlin: Tell us how that came about.

Mr T. H. JONES: I was the only industrial officer there and I went to the company and suggested we enter into a spirit of conciliation rather than have the company make demands on the union. I asked that we talk out our problems around a table before either party took action. As a result we have achieved good industrial relations as shown by just three days lost in 21 years. That is the sort of thing this Government should be doing, but by no stretch of the imagination can the Government be said to have done that with the introduction of this Bill, which will impose

more penalties on employers and workers, but particularly the workers; and this is its weakness. The Government should be trying to achieve what has been achieved on the Collie coalfields. We have proved that it can be done.

Perhaps it would be wise were the Government to introduce the idea of a separate tribunal for other industries. Some years ago the Government spoke of establishing a tribunal to look after the interests of the iron ore industry, but since then we have heard no more about it. If a dispute occurs in the Pilbara now the industrial machinery must be put into motion from down here. It would be far preferable to have a tribunal established in the Pilbara which would be on site. It would have a knowledge of the peculiarities associated with the iron ore industry and be able to nip in the bud any problem before it got out of hand. No-one on the Government side could argue against that. Even the Minister for Health, who is handling this Bill, would know of the success of independent tribunals such as the tribunal handling the coalmining industry. The people on that tribunal have a good knowledge of what is involved in this area and can deal with problems as they arise. Rather than introduce repressive legislation, the Government should be seeking to introduce more conciliatory measures to help industrial relations in this State.

The Minister used strong words when introducing the Bill and made a number of accusations against trade unions and employers, but without providing any supporting evidence. If any member can point to the evidence to support the Minister's accusations, I will pause to let him inform me of them. The Minister condemned both employers and unionists for their actions, but gave not a scrap of evidence to back up his statements.

Mr Sodeman: The Industrial Commission has quite a bit of evidence.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister did not indicate that in his second reading speech.

As I said earlier, this legislation will achieve nothing other than to cause industrial unrest in this State. I have demonstrated clearly what can occur when the right type of understanding and legislation is adopted. I take the Minister to task for this statement in his second reading speech—

Originally, the aim of industrial legislation in Australia was protection from the excessive use of employer power against the individual. Now, we are necessarily strengthening protection from the excessive use of union power against the individual.

What are the examples of this excessive use of union power? Did the Minister give any examples in his second reading speech?

Mr Young: I will give you some in Committee.

Mr T. H. JONES: He may give me some, but he should do so in the Parliament.

Mr Young: We will hold the Committee in the Parliament!

Mr T. H. JONES: Of course we will hold it in the Parliament. I have been here longer than has this Minister.

Mr Young: I know you have.

Mr T. H. JONES: I do not think anyone could call me a slow learner.

Mr Young: No way!

Mr Old: No way!

Mr T. H. JONES: I have been here a lot longer than has this Minister, and certainly know much more about industrial relations than he knows.

Mr Bridge: Certainly you will be here after the next election.

Mr T. H. JONES: I have no worries about that.

Mr Sibson: What about the Collie coalminers' union?

Mr T. H. JONES: Now the member for Bunbury will jump in.

Mr Sibson: I was going to add something.

Mr T. H. JONES: I doubt it would be sensible.

Mr Sibson: The Collie coalminers' union is a model of what we should look for in all unions. The good history of that union is almost unprecedented.

Mr T. H. JONES: For the edification of the member for Bunbury, that situation came about when he resigned from the union and left Collie for Bunbury. However, I do not deny that what he said is correct, but I suggest to him that we should try to implement legislation that would foster good industrial relations as they exist at Collie. Is there anything wrong with that suggestion?

Mr Bridge: There is nothing whatsoever wrong with it.

Mr T. H. JONES: Of course, this legislation falls far short of achieving that end. The Minister for Health interjected to say that he will give us examples of trade unions which use excessive power, but it was the responsibility of the Minister for Labour and Industry to give those examples when he introduced the legislation in the Legislative Council. That was when examples should have been spelt out, not at this stage. I do

not think the Minister would argue with that proposition, and of course he cannot. At the moment he is silent.

It serves the Government's political purposes to introduce this legislation and to condemn the trade union movement without its supplying supportive evidence. Surely that is not playing the game as it should be played. The second reading speech refers to the 1979 amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act. Members who were here at that time would be well aware of those amendments. Substantial recommendations had been made by Senior Commissioner Kelly, but the Government did not accept all of them. The Minister for Health would know that, and would know that that is why the amendments fell down. Although the Government accepted some recommendations, it did not accept them all, and that is why, after 1979, the whole system broke down.

The Minister for Health would know, as would other members, that Senior Commissioner Kelly placed strong emphasis on provisions to allow conciliation, but a recommendation in those terms was not accepted by the then Government—a Liberal Government. If it had accepted those recommendations it would have gone a long way towards overcoming the problems that existed, and still exist today.

The Minister went on to say in his second reading speech—

The principal features of the new law are—

Stronger protection of the rights of individuals to choose whether or not to join a union, free of compulsion from union, employer or anyone else;

I want it to be on record that I am opposed to this concept of unionism. If it is good enough for individuals to accept the benefits gained by unions, it is good enough for those individuals to make a contribution to those unions. No-one can argue with that principle. It is wrong in principle for anyone to go into an industry, accept the benefits applying in that industry, but not be willing to contribute to the organisation which made those benefits possible. For example, the coalmining industry has a 35-hour week, and in fact the Collie Coal Miners' Industrial Union was the first union to obtain a 35-hour week. That was in 1968.

It is completely wrong for any worker to accept those conditions without making a contribution to the achievement of those conditions. Of course, that principle cannot be argued against. Last night I asked the member for East Melville what would happen if he did not pay his contribution to the Liberal Party.

Mr Shalders: He would be out; he would no longer be a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr T. H. JONES: Is the Minister saying that a person can be a member of a trade union without paying his contribution? Would that situation be all right?

Mr Sodeman: It is a bad analogy. If he does not pay his dues, he cannot be a member of the union; it is as simple as that.

Mr T. H. JONES: But should he obtain the benefits gained by that union? If I wanted to enter the members' area at the Belmont Racecourse, I could not do so unless I was a member. All members here would know that. Could I go to any football club, walk in freely, and use the amenities available?

Mr Tubby: You can if you want to be a member.

Mr T. H. JONES: That is the point I wanted someone to make. The member agrees with me.

Mr Shalders: You don't have to be a member of a club to go to the football or to the races.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am talking about the use of the facilities of a club.

Mr Shalders: If an individual doesn't want to use the facilities of a union, he doesn't have to, and he can't if he is not a member. That is quite reasonable.

Mr T. H. JONES: But an individual should not use the benefits a union has attained. Does the Minister think that the mining companies went to their employees and said, "Here is the 35-hour week. Do you want it?" Of course those companies did not. On at least three occasions I appeared before the then Arbitration Court before that condition could become a reality in 1968. Members are aware of the process, and of the fact that it costs thousands of dollars to take a case to the commission, which requires that the right type of case be presented.

I place on record my complete opposition to the provisions in this legislation relating to union membership. No proper principles are contained in this legislation, and again I say it is wrong for any individual to accept what the trade union movement has achieved without making some contribution to that movement.

Employees would not knock back wages a union has gained for them. Anti-union people—that is all one can call them—would not knock back a \$50-a-week increase because they have not contributed to the union that has obtained that increase. Of course they will accept it with open arms. It is completely unjust and unfair that anti-

union people should obtain the benefits gained by unions.

Mr Sodeman: It is fair.

Mr T. H. JONES: How can it work? As the member for Avon said last night, no-one can say that a member of the Collie Coal Miners' Industrial Union would go underground with a non-unionist. Members opposite must understand how the trade union movement works, and must understand the thinking of men.

I am sure Mr Speaker has been a member of a union, and I am sure that as a member of a union he would not have worked alongside a non-unionist. If members opposite are honest with themselves, they will accept that this situation must prevail.

Mr Stephens: The miners might have to go underground with a chap who happens to be a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr T. H. JONES: That is a possibility too, but that is their worry. This type of legislation will provoke industrial unrest. I cannot speak strongly enough about it because I have had 17 years' experience in a union. I have had more experience in a union than has anyone in this place.

Mr Rushton: I have had more than you then.

Mr T. H. JONES: For what union was the Deputy Premier secretary?

Mr Rushton: I was not.

Mr T. H. JONES: I said "experience" in a union—as a union secretary. Of what union was the Minister a secretary? Of course, they would not have him. The Minister may have received a ticket to the Liberal Party, but he would not be acceptable to the trade union movement with his outlook and ill-founded philosophy.

The Minister should be doing something because he knows the legislation will create industrial unrest. The employers have spoken out strongly against it.

Mr Rushton: Do you think the dictatorial attitude that prevails should continue?

Mr T. H. JONES: I have never heard the Confederation of WA Industry come out so strongly against something in all my history in the trade union movement.

Mr McPharlin: When did Latter leave the mining union?

Mr T. H. JONES: He came to Perth in 1962. We had a ballot and I defeated him in 1961.

Mr Stephens: That is enough.

Mr Sibson: A very wise choice by the miners' union.

Mr McPharlin: The member has condemned me on a number of occasions.

Mr T. H. JONES: What the miners wanted to do was their business. If the ship painters and dockers' union wanted to keep the late Paddy Troy as their union leader for years, that was its business too; just as it is the business of the Bunbury people, if they wish to keep Mr Sibson there. They might wake up as the Collie miners did. That is something in store for the member for Bunbury.

In his second reading speech, the Minister said—

Like the parent Act of 1979, this is a law to strengthen and uphold the rights of individuals in the workplace. It is a law to stop standover men from usurping these rights.

Where are all these standover men? Once again we have no evidence. Do these men operate with axes or tomahawks? What do they do? I would like to know who they are. I am sure the trade union movement would like to know who they are, also.

This is repressive legislation just as the legislation to alter section 54B was. We saw the amendment to the Police Act and the amendment to the fuel and energy legislation. No-one can tell us that they were not designed to work against the trade unions—all repressive legislation!

It is time the Government introduced some conciliatory measures to bring about the situation which occurs in Collie.

Mr Rushton: You gave me the impression when I was at Collie opening a new shire office that you controlled Collie. When I commenced my speech, the microphone was turned off, and when I finished, it was turned on, and you said you controlled Collie.

Mr T. H. JONES: I said that? I said that I controlled Collie?

Mr Rushton: I think that was fairly standover.

Mr T. H. JONES: I control Collie and all the ladies, too?

A Government member: Except your wife!

Mr T. H. JONES: I hope my wife does not find out about this because I will have proceedings instituted against me in the morning. I suggest I have made a reasonable contribution to Collie in the time I have been a member of Parliament.

I was responsible for the good industrial harmony in the town and while I have been a member of this place I have been a good fighter for the town I love and respect.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Young: We all recognise it, too.

Mr Coyne: There will be a statue in the middle of Collie for you.

Mr MacKinnon: It will be underground.

Mr T. H. JONES: When I am dead?

To continue with the remarks of the Minister: He said—

However, too often, empire-building unions have resorted not only to threats but also to violence. Too often, some employers have willingly or unwillingly collaborated.

It is understood that the unions and employers have co-operated. If members were to ask the unions involved in the coalfields whether they were willing to have the trade unions abolished, they would say "No." If ever a union decided to deregister itself and bargain for itself, we would finish up in a hopeless mess. It is wrong to suggest that there is anything wrong with the industrial relations in some quarters where unions and employers are involved.

The Minister said further in his second reading speech—

The Government has been appalled at the examples of intimidation, extortion, and standover tactics perpetrated by power hungry unions such as the Builders Labourers' Federation and the Transport Workers' Union. Just as employees have been forced to join unions by such tactics, subcontractors, owner drivers, agents, and others engaged in the workplace have been forced to join . . .

The late W. J. Wallwork found, in a determination on the Collie coalfield when there was a dispute between the owner drivers, the Collie miners' union and the Transport Workers' Union, that the workers were subcontractors, working in the Collie mining industry. They used their trucks to cart overburden for a certain yardage rate.

Mr Sibson: They were paid holiday pay, also.

Mr T. H. JONES: They were still contractors in their own right and of course the Government cannot help shooting at the Transport Workers' Union. It has overridden a decision which has been placed in the industrial Statutes in this State.

The member for Bunbury would know that the coal industry tribunal found that the subcontractors were workers under the meaning of the Act and as a consequence were required to join a union.

Mr Sibson: It referred to the coalfield.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am giving an example of a determination which was brought down by an industrial authority in WA. It is contrary to the remarks of the Minister for Labour and Industry and shows the Minister's complete ignorance of the situation in this State. Of course workers should join unions, and that is what the late W. J. Wallwork found.

Mr Sibson: The reason was holiday pay and long service leave entitlements were not normally with the subcontractor.

Mr T. H. JONES: It was held as far as the transport association was concerned. The honourable member would recall the argument as well as I. It was an incident that occurred at the Collie coalfield because men were permitted to work on the field without belonging to a union. The member for Bunbury says they were workers under the Act.

Mr Sibson: Because of those other clauses.

Mr T. H. JONES: They were subcontractors employed in the coalmining industry. The member for Bunbury can say what he likes.

The question I would like to raise with the Minister for Health, who is handling the Bill in this place, is whether this Bill will have any impact on the operations of the Western Australian Coal Industry Tribunal Act.

Mr Young: It is certainly not intended to. If there is any doubt about that, we would clear it up.

Mr T. H. JONES: If it is found that, once this Bill becomes law, it overrides the provisions of the Western Australian Coal Industry Tribunal Act, will the Government take immediate steps to rectify the situation?

Mr Young: That would be the intention and the Government does not intend that the tribunal Act will be affected in respect of this Bill.

Mr T. H. JONES: There was no reference to this matter in the Bill and the Opposition considers that it will have an overriding authority over the tribunal Act. I ask the Minister whether I can convey his comments to the workers in the coalfield.

Mr Young: You can give them the assurance that it is certainly not the Government's intention for the tribunal Act to be affected by this legislation. We do not think it is, but if there is any doubt at a later stage, we would certainly discuss the matter and take the necessary action.

Mr T. H. JONES: I will have the opportunity to discuss this matter further in the Committee stage. I have made my points clear as have other members of the Opposition. The Government has

been warned that the legislation will not work and it will cause discontent among the workers in the trade union movement. The Government does not know what it is talking about.

The members for East Melville and Nedlands lack industrial experience to be able to gauge the feeling within the trade union movement. In order to be able to do this, one must have been a member of a trade union organisation at some time during one's life. This legislation will not work; it will provoke industrial unrest. When the Opposition becomes the Government, it will be looking towards introducing legislation that will promote industrial conciliation rather than provoke industrial unrest.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Nanovich.

House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Tenders

1820. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

Referring to his undertaking to hasten the calling of tenders for capital works, will he please provide details of—

- (a) each tender involved and its value;
- (b) the date tenders were to be called originally;
- (c) when the tenders will now be called;
- (d) in each tender, where expenditure will exceed \$100 000?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) to (d) The answer is hereby tabled.

The reply was tabled (see paper No. 528).

1824. *This question was further postponed.*

HOSPITALS: ROYAL PERTH AND SIR CHARLES GAIRDNER

Computer Tomography Scanners

1846. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) When the computer tomography (CT) scanner at the Royal Perth Hospital is being serviced, are all Royal Perth Hospital patients requiring CT scans of the brain sent to the Queen Elizabeth II medical centre for scanning;
- (b) if not, why not?

- (2) (a) Are any patients of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital referred to privately owned CT scanners;
- (b) if "Yes", why?
- (3) (a) Is the CT scanner located at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital considered adequate for all the needs of that hospital;
- (b) how old is the CT scanner at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital;
- (c) are there any plans to purchase a new CT scanner?
- (4) Is the CT scanner at Royal Perth Hospital working to maximum capacity most of the time?
- (5) Is it a fact that the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital is the university teaching hospital for neurosurgery and the centre for all elective neurosurgery?
- (6) If Government hospital patients, particularly "hospital service patients", are referred to privately owned CT scanners, who pays for the cost of the service and the transport costs?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) As far as is possible within its capacity, the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre caters for all Royal Perth Hospital patients requiring emergency brain scanning during servicing of the Royal Perth Hospital scanner.
- (2) (a) and (b) Patients are referred to privately owned scanners if scanners of both Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and Royal Perth Hospital are being serviced.
- (3) (a) The brain scanner of Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and the body scanner of the Royal Perth Hospital are sufficient for the teaching hospitals of Perth;
- (b) seven-and-a-half years; scanners can be updated from time to time, and this has been done;
- (c) there are no immediate plans to replace the scanner.
- (4) and (5) Yes.
- (6) Where appropriate, the hospital pays for the cost of the service and transport.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: LESCHENAULT INLET

Laporte Australia Ltd.: Effluent Disposal

1847. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Where is the land located which it is proposed to obtain for the purpose of disposal of effluent from the Laporte factory at Australind?
- (2) Will he provide a map which shows the location of this land?
- (3) Is it intended to change the method of disposal of effluent from the Laporte factory?
- (4) (a) If "Yes" to (3), precisely what changes will be made;
- (b) when will such changes be implemented?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) On the Leschenault Peninsula immediately to the north of the existing disposal area.
- (2) and (3) Yes.
- (4) (a) The report identifies a number of management options for disposal of the effluent, the most promising of which involves splitting the effluent, with the small quantity of strong effluent being discharged into the dunes, and the larger volume of weak effluent being discharged offshore through a long marine pipeline; detailed studies are now proceeding to allow selection of the optimum management option;
- (b) no firm timetable has yet been established, but planning is proceeding so it will be possible to construct the marine pipeline in 1985-86, if this option is selected.

The map was tabled (see tabled paper No. 529).

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Juveniles

1848. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Are juveniles under the age of eighteen years allowed to purchase cigarettes?

- (2) If "Yes", what is the age limit they are restricted to to purchase cigarettes?
- (3) If "No" to (1), what regulations or legislation applies to prevent cigarette selling outlets to juveniles?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Section 10 of the Sale of Tobacco Act provides that any person shall not sell, give, or supply tobacco in any form or cigarette paper to or for the use of any person under the age of 18 years.

WATER RESOURCES

Balingup

1849. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Will he outline the plans for the new water supply for Balingup?
- (2) Will he guarantee that the water that will be available from the new source will be fit for household consumption?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The Balingup water supply is to be augmented this summer with water pumped from the Dumping Gully Dam, the source of water for the Greenbushes town water supply. Arrangements have been made to supplement this storage to ensure an adequate supply to both Greenbushes and Balingup.

The works involve the construction of a pumping station and a chlorinator, two 225 cubic metre concrete tanks and 3.5 kilometres of 100 millimetre and 1.9 kilometres of 80 millimetre diameter AC pipeline.

- (2) Testing by the Public Works Department has shown that the Greenbushes supply complies with the guidelines for the desirable quality of domestic water. There have been some taste problems that have been investigated by the department; and action has commenced to treat the water to overcome this problem.

RAILWAYS

Collie

1850. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

When is it anticipated that the railway goods sheds at Collie will be shifted to west Collie?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

I am advised that Total West is leasing the Collie goods shed and, consequently, Westrail has no proposal for its demolition at this stage.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Retirement

1851. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

- (1) Are people who are appointed as Justices of the Peace required to retire at a certain age?
- (2) If "Yes", what is the age requirement?
- (3) If answer to (1) is "No", should not some retirement age be introduced in the interest of justice?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) To deny the community the benefit of the long experience of justices of the peace by withdrawing their commissions on the grounds of age alone would be difficult to justify.

Justices in country areas are listed for court duties only by arrangement with magistrates and/or clerks of court.

LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Easements

1852. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is he aware that the Land Amendment Bill gives the Governor power to grant easements over Crown lands, including reserves set aside for conservation purposes, to any person?

- (2) Has he discussed with his departmental heads and the WA Wildlife Authority, the possible detrimental effects on conservation reserves of the implementation of the powers contained in the Bill?
- (3) If "No" to (2), why not?
- (4) If "Yes", what steps has he taken to minimise the adverse effects on conservation reserves of the granting of easements as contained in the Bill?
- (5) Will the holder of an easement be required to compensate the WA Wildlife Authority and/or the Fisheries and Wildlife Department for extra reserve management costs which may result from the granting of an easement?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), how will compensation be assessed?
- (7) If "No", why not?
- (8) How will the WA Wildlife Authority and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife meet the extra costs which may be incurred in management as a result of granting of an easement?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Consultation with and the approval of the vestee must be obtained before an easement may be granted.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) and (6) As consultation will be required in each case, the question of compensation would be a matter for negotiation.
- (7) Not applicable.
- (8) Refer to answer to (5) and (6).

LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Easements

1853. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is he aware that the granting of an easement as contained in the Land Amendment Bill may have a detrimental effect on the environment?

- (2) If "Yes", what action will he take in instances where it can be shown that the granting of an easement in State forest will have a detrimental effect on the environment?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In the event of it being shown that the granting of an easement in State forest will have a detrimental effect on the environment it will be referred to the EPA, in line with current procedure.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Dampier-Wagerup Pipeline

1854. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:

Referring to the report that construction and laying of the Dampier to Wagerup natural gas pipeline is due to start in January, would he please table—

- (a) maps of the Crown lands showing the proposed route of the pipeline;
- (b) the number, vesting and purpose of all Crown reserves through which the pipeline is proposed to pass;
- (c) the date on which notification was given to each of the bodies responsible for Crown land through which the pipeline is proposed to pass?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (a) to (c) The information will take some time to collate and I will advise the member in writing as soon as this is available.

LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Easements

1855. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is he aware that the granting of an easement as contained in the Land Amendment Bill may have a detrimental effect on the environment?

- (2) If "Yes", what action will he take in instances where it can be shown that the granting of an easement in reserves under his control will have a detrimental effect on the environment?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) I draw the member's attention to the proposed section 134B(2)(c) which clearly provides that no easement can be granted without the consent of the person or authority having control of the land. Any proposal for an easement across reserves under my control will be examined and allowed only if the purpose of the reserve will not be unduly affected.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Walpole-Nornalup: Easement

1856. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring to the power line constructed through Walpole-Nornalup National Park, did the State Energy Commission negotiate with the National Parks Authority on the easement through the park?
- (2) If "Yes", how long did negotiations take?
- (3) Were the negotiations satisfactory to the State Energy Commission?
- (4) (a) Is the State Energy Commission responsible for maintenance of the easement;
(b) if "No", who is responsible?
- (5) (a) Is the State Energy Commission responsible for the costs of maintenance of the easement;
(b) if "No", who is responsible?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes. The route through the Walpole-Nornalup National Park was negotiated with the National Parks Authority under conditions contained within the State Energy Commission Act 1979.
- (2) Two months.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) (a) Yes;
(b) not applicable.
- (5) (a) Yes;
(b) not applicable.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

State Energy Commission

1857. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What environmental protection conditions is the State Energy Commission required to comply with when working on land which has been set aside for conservation purposes?
- (2) Who is responsible for monitoring environmental protection measures which the commission is required to comply with?
- (3) Are penalties enforceable for non-compliance?
- (4) Who is responsible for enforcement?
- (5) Have any instances occurred where the commission has failed to comply with environmental protection conditions?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), would he provide details of these instances?
- (7) Were penalties imposed?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The commission actively endeavours to avoid reserves for conservation in relation to the siting of its power generation and other facilities. However, in the event that a transmission line, for example, has to traverse such a reserve, specific site criteria for management of the particular facility are adopted in conjunction with the statutory or regulatory authority in which the reserve is vested.
- (2) The relevant statutory or regulatory authority.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) The relevant statutory or regulatory authority.
- (5) and (6) To my knowledge, the commission's performance has always been acceptable to the relevant statutory or regulatory authorities.
- (7) To my knowledge, no penalties have ever been imposed.

HOUSING: FLATS

Granny

1858. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How much has been allowed in the 1982-83 Budget to be allocated for loans under the "granny flat" scheme?

- (2) In which particular Budget item is this amount included?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) and (2) No specific provision has been made in the Estimates for this purpose as the level of demand for these loans has yet to be established.
Loans will be provided from the commission's internal funds and balances as required.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Dealers: Unlicensed

1859. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

- (1) For what additional period have the two investigators inquiring into the activities of unlicensed used vehicle dealers been appointed, and when does this period expire?
- (2) How many prosecutions against unlicensed dealers have been instituted as a result of inquiries carried out by these two investigators since their appointment?
- (3) Is consideration being given to the methods to be followed for continuous enforcement of the legislation when the present special investigators' appointments are concluded?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), when does he expect to be able to announce a permanent arrangement for the continuous enforcement of the provisions of the Act against unlicensed dealers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Twelve months, with a review of the situation at the end of that period. One investigator's appointment expires on 17 August 1983, and the other's expires on 28 September 1983.
- (2) 33.
- (3) and (4) See answer to (1).

HOUSING: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' HOUSING AUTHORITY

Lease-back Arrangements

1860. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What are the advantages gained by the Government Employees' Housing Authority in raising funds to finance its building programme by selling houses to the Superannuation Board on a leaseback arrangement?
- (2) What is the estimated cost to the authority of the lease payments and maintenance and all outgoings on the units being leased from the Superannuation Board in 1982-83?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) The advantages of this scheme are that additional funds are made available to the authority, thus enabling further dwellings to be constructed.
- (2) The estimated cost of lease payments in 1982-83 is \$4.3 million. The estimated cost of maintenance and outgoings is \$1.8 million.

TOWN PLANNING: HOME UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Yokine

1861. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Can she confirm that on 5 October 1982 her department received a hand delivered appeal from concerned residents of Kathleen Street, Yokine, against a decision by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority to allow access to an 18 unit development at lot 70 Wanneroo Road, Yokine from Kathleen Street?
- (2) If "Yes", when does she expect to be able to give consideration to this appeal and advise the concerned residents of her decision?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) An appeal has not been received.
- (2) Answered by (1).

WATER RESOURCES: COUNTRY AREAS

Accounts: Restriction of Supply

1862. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it fact that the Public Works Department cuts off the water supply of consumers for the non-payment of accounts, rather than adopting the Metropolitan Water Authority practice of inserting a restrictor disc in the supply line?
- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) why does the Public Works Department adopt such an approach;
- (b) is an approach in line with the Metropolitan Water Authority's practice under consideration?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) According to legal advice there were some doubts as to the department's precise powers to restrict supply; although I did not necessarily agree with this, I could not take the responsibility to act against it; recently, amendments to the Country Areas Water Supply Act cleared the situation;
- (b) yes.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Heritage Legislation

1863. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) Is the final draft of the State Heritage legislation completed?
- (2) If not—
 - (a) what is the reason for the delay;
 - (b) when will the draft be completed?
- (3) When will it be introduced into Parliament?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) and (b) It is still under consideration.
- (3) When consideration is complete.

EDUCATION

Millen Special School

1864. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

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

Mr CLARKO replied:

A start will be made on classroom additions, manual arts extensions, provision of more administration and storage areas, together with carparking, covered area, a hit-up wall, and some modification to the existing outdoor area.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: WANNEROO SHIRE COUNCIL

Rating System

1865. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Adverting to question 623 of 1982 without notice, relating to rating systems, will she detail the "distortion of the truth" to which she referred?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Wanneroo Shire Council made a detailed submission to the McCusker inquiry with respect to two-component rating?
- (3) If so, how can she say that the council has not made a reasoned submission in support of two-component rating?
- (4) Is she aware that the recommendations of the McCusker report closely resemble the proposals made by the council?
- (5) Has Mr Bill Jefferies of the rural ratepayers association of the Shire of Wanneroo had a meeting with the Premier to discuss the two-component rating system?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), how does she justify her refusal to meet the elected councillors of the shire on the same issue?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) I rather would have thought that that was self-evident from the answer which I have given already.

On 12 October 1982, the Shire of Wanneroo published an advertisement on the question of secession which, in part, announced, "The Shire of Wanneroo has the answer to the rating problem in its two-component rating system but the Government has not seen fit to allow us to use that system".

The facts are that at that date—

- (a) the shire had not, and still has not, informed me in any detailed way how its two-component rating system would operate;
- (b) the Government does not have the power simply to allow the introduction of new rating systems; new legislation would be required for the purpose;

(c) on 18 October 1982 I responded to a letter from the shire about two-component rating by explaining what it would need to do before any proposal for legislative change could be seriously considered; it should be noted that that letter was sent after the date of the shire's advertisement.

My reference to the shire's having distorted the truth was about the most charitable way in which I could describe its glib announcement.

- (2) I do not know. However, the McCusker committee report does not record that any such submission was received from the Shire of Wannon.
- (3) I have not seen such a submission.
- (4) The council has not provided me with details of its proposal.
- (5) and (6) I do not know whether the Premier has had any such meeting. However, whether he has or not, I repeat that I have given the Shire of Wannon a full explanation as to the steps it should take for a proposal for legislative change to be properly considered.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HOSPITALS

Funds: Budget Allocations

697. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

I assume the Treasurer is aware that at a time when the inflation rate is running at about 12 per cent the increased operating funds this year to Fremantle Hospital is only 5.8 per cent, Royal Perth Hospital, 3.7 per cent; King Edward Memorial Hospital, 3.2 per cent; and Princess Margaret Hospital 3.4 per cent. That is by way of preface to my question which is as follows—

- (1) In light of these figures how can these hospitals reasonably be expected to honour their undertaking of service to the public?

(2) If it can be shown to the Treasurer that services to the public are being reduced by those hospitals, will he make an additional allocation to enable the services to be retained?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The Leader of the Opposition should know that the Budget does not allow for additional income into those areas. The average increase allowed in the Department of Health budget is in the vicinity of 14 per cent and is above the inflation rate. If he had checked on this matter he would have found that out.

Mr Parker: We are talking about hospitals.

Mr O'CONNOR: It does not allow for additional increases in that particular area.

Mr Young: It guarantees increases in wages.

Mr O'CONNOR: The figures given by the Leader of the Opposition are misleading—they do not include the total income that will go to hospitals.

HORTICULTURISTS: LEASE

Turner River Borefield

698. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Who are the parties to the proposed horticultural lease on the Turner River borefield?
- (2) When will the lease be drawn up and ready for signing?
- (3) Will copies of the lease be available to the public, if requested?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Messrs Delroy, Young, and Groves and the Minister for Works.
- (2) It is anticipated that the lease to be drawn up by the Crown Law Department will be available for sealing within the next two months.
- (3) No.

DEVALUATION

Government View

699. Mr TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

In his comments published in this morning's issue of *The West Australian*, he criticised the Leader of the Opposition for his comments on a devaluation of five to 10 per cent. Could he explain to

the House why he opposes this measure when it would bring such benefits to this State's major industries including agricultural and mining industries?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

While this particular devaluation would bring benefits to some industries, it would disbenefit others. What I criticised was the Leader of the Opposition's attempt to prance on the national stage and make some impact in this area. When the Leader of the Opposition commented on this matter he suggested a five per cent or possibly a 10 per cent devaluation of the Australian dollar.

Mr Tonkin: What are the benefits?

Mr Pearce: What is the disbenefit?

Mr O'CONNOR: The member is foolish.

Mr Pearce: There is no such word as "disbenefit".

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite do not even know what they are laughing about and what is more they do not care. The reason I mentioned this was that the difference between five per cent and 10 per cent in a devaluation could easily be much greater than the total Budget of this State.

TOWN PLANNING

Manning

700. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) Is it a fact—

- (a) the old tip at the corner of Goss Avenue and Manning Road, Manning, is filled and ready for development;
- (b) negotiations currently are under way with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority for this land to be vested in the City of South Perth;
- (c) the land is reserved for "parks and recreation" in the metropolitan region scheme;
- (d) the land in question comprises 22.3310 hectares?

(2) Will the Minister explore with the South Perth City Council the possibility of developing the area for organised sport instead of proceeding with the present proposal to use Sir James Mitchell Park, South Perth, for such a purpose?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) Yes;
 - (b) the South Perth City Council has approached the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority to develop the area or grant council a nominal lease to generally control the land;
 - (c) and (d) yes;
- (2) I am prepared to approach the South Perth City Council on this matter, although I suspect the Manning Road site is too far removed from Sir James Mitchell Park to substitute for the active uses proposed on the South Perth foreshore.

DEVALUATION

Consolidated Revenue Fund: Effect

701. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Treasurer:

Further to a previous question, how does he relate the so-called "disbenefits" of devaluation to the CRF Budget Estimates, and the cost of devaluation to those Estimates?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I cannot give full details. If we had borrowed overseas in US dollars or in yen, it would have a considerable effect as far as repayments are concerned, as the member knows.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: LESCHENAULT INLET

Laporte Australia Ltd.: Studies

702. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Have the studies by the Environmental Protection Authority into effluent discharge by Laporte Australia Ltd. into Geographie Bay been concluded?
- (2) If not, what further studies are contemplated, and can he give any details of the nature of the matters requiring further investigation?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The EPA has not conducted any studies into effluent discharge into Geographe Bay. The investigations were undertaken by the Public Works Department and the company under guidance by a committee chaired by a senior officer of the Department of Conservation and Environment. The authority is currently reviewing the report of these and other studies and will make recommendations to me in due course.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Contract

703. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Resources Development:

In view of the importance of the LNG project to Western Australia and Australia, and in view of the statement made by the Minister on 6 August 1981 that a sales contract was being finalised, and his statement of 20 October 1981—a year ago—in which he said "Discussions are proceeding quite satisfactorily in an endeavour to tidy up the remaining four items under consideration", I ask—

- (1) What specifically is holding up finalisation of this contract?
- (2) When can the public of Western Australia expect that this contract will be signed?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) The member is very selective in quoting information.

Mr Grill: They are your words.

Mr P. V. JONES: I accept that. If the member quotes the remaining information, or some of the information I have given him from time to time, he will be able to quote the fact that I indicated the talks and negotiations have been in abeyance for some time due to the difficulties that Woodside has been having. It is also due to the fact that, while some general discussions have been continuing on matters of mechanical aspects—if I can use that term—relating to shipping and general operating aspects, the very detailed contractual negotiations have been interfered with, or have not been able to continue at the pace we had hoped—the pace at which they were continuing in the latter part of last year and earlier this year—because of the difficulties

Woodside has had in its financing arrangements.

The member will recall that I reminded him on one occasion of comments contained in Woodside's annual report. If my memory serves me correctly, it was in April. In that report, the company said it was entering into arrangements with BHP and Shell regarding the sale of its share of the LNG. That came to nothing. If the member would like some further explanation of that, I indicate that yesterday's *The Australian Financial Review* discusses that topic. It provides some of the background.

The first discussions which were announced earlier this year did not eventuate, and I think Woodside was a little slow in grasping the reality of its position. In the discussions we had with it, the other producers, and the Japanese, the situation has been reached now where there is some understanding which can lead—as I have explained in the last two days—to a Japanese equity participation of one-sixth in the specific parts of the LNG project—of the shipping and the LNG operations—which will not affect the domestic gas phase. It will not affect Woodside's status as operator of the project, but will allow us to get back into the detailed negotiations and finalise the points which are outstanding. Even that really cannot continue until everything is locked in place.

The member asked me yesterday how I reconciled the statement I made then with a statement I made the day before, or with a statement the Premier had made. I remind him that the agreement that has now been reached—or the understanding—does not of itself constitute a final equity participation position for the Japanese. It signals the framework which is being put together.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL

Microcomputers

704. Mr TRETOWAN, to the Minister for Education:

Can the Minister indicate what progress has been made in the purchase of microcomputers in order to facilitate the teaching of computing as part of the TAFE small business courses?

Mr CLARKO replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

Requirements have been finalised, and are in passage through the Government endorsement and purchase system.

SMOKING AND TOBACCO PRODUCTS ADVERTISEMENTS BILL

Lobbying

705. Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Why is he lobbying Government members so strongly, urging them to defeat the private members' Bill currently before the House to stop the promotion of tobacco products?
- (2) Is it a fact that earlier this week he held a meeting or meetings with a representative or representatives of the tobacco industry lobby?
- (3) What undertakings did he give at that meeting and what undertakings did he receive in return?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) I do not know where the member gets his information. I have not done the lobbying to which he referred. I have had discussions with people involved with the tobacco industry; I have had discussions with doctors. The details of the discussions are a matter between those people and me, and not between the member for Mt. Hawthorn and me.

DEVALUATION

Consolidated Revenue Fund: Effect

706. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

I hate to keep emphasising the point, but the Treasurer really has an obligation to explain what he means when he talks about devaluation and the CRF.

Mr O'Connor: Of the CRF?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: And the CRF. That is what the Treasurer has been talking about. I ask—

- (1) Does he understand that the Consolidated Revenue Fund does not involve borrowings in yen or dollars, or anything else that a devaluation could affect?

- (2) Would the Treasurer explain what he means by the difference between a devaluation of five and 10 per cent being an amount equal to the Budget?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The question the Leader of the Opposition asked me was in connection with the statement I made following his statement that he would move to have the dollar devalued by five per cent or possibly 10 per cent. To my knowledge, there was no discussion regarding the Consolidated Revenue Fund involved in the issue.

Mr Brian Burke: In your column there is.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Leader of the Opposition asks how this affects the CRF. As members know, the State Energy Commission is a large borrower, and much of its money comes from loan funds; but we are borrowing overseas in yen and in American dollars. In this particular area, if there were to be a devaluation of the dollar, it would have some effect.

Mr Brian Burke: What did you mean by "equal to the Budget"? That is what I am trying to ask.

Mr O'CONNOR: I did not say it was equal to the Budget.

Mr Brian Burke: You said it in the paper this morning.

Mr O'CONNOR: Again misleading. What I said was that the difference between five per cent and 10 per cent—the variation between the amounts the member suggested, whether it be a five per cent devaluation or a 10 per cent devaluation; the difference in that currency—could be greater than our Budget—and it could be.

The SPEAKER: The member for Pilbara.

Mr Brian Burke: That does not make any sense.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Pilbara.

ROADHOUSE

Cape Keraudren

707. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Have applications been called for the leasing of a roadhouse site at Cape Keraudren?

Mr Brian Burke interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Brian Burke: I am sorry for doing it, you know; but I just do not follow.

Mr O'Connor: You cannot follow anything.

Mr Brian Burke: Don't be silly. You have no idea.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Pilbara.

Mr SODEMAN: To continue—

- (2) If so, what is the term of the lease, annual rental, and closing date for applications?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. A site comprising four hectares has been surveyed out of the Pardoo pastoral lease, and has been identified as Pardu location 18.

The Department of Lands and Surveys is seeking applications presently from interested parties to develop the site. A 21-year lease at an annual rental of \$500 is being offered as security of tenure.

Freehold options will be made available to any prospective developer, subject to compliance with developmental plans and conditions. These conditions are available upon request at the Department of Lands and Surveys offices.

The closing date for applications is 8 December 1982.

There has been considerable interest in the release of a site for a roadhouse-type operation between Port Hedland and Broome, in addition to the one that already exists on the road. As members know, following the completion of the sealing of the road last year, there has been a tremendous step-up in visitor traffic along the road; and a demand for this type of service has been shown.

I would have liked the site to be released earlier, but unfortunately we had difficulty in locating the pastoralist to gain the release of the land from the pastoral station.

The intention is that a service station-roadhouse will be built; and land should be available for an associated caravan

park to be developed on the same site. As I have indicated, when this development has been carried out by the successful applicant, freehold title will issue.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: WANNEROO SHIRE COUNCIL

Rating System

708. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

This relates to question 1865 which I asked of the Minister for Local Government today. In reply, she said that she was not aware whether the Premier had had a meeting with Mr Bill Jefferies in relation to two-component ratings. I ask—

- (1) Did he in fact have a meeting with Mr Bill Jefferies of the rural rate-payers' association of the Shire of Wanneroo at which he discussed the two-component rating system?
- (2) If he had such a meeting, how would he describe the Minister's refusal to meet with the Council of the Shire of Wanneroo which, after all, is the body elected by the rate-payers of the area, to discuss two-component rating?

Mr O'Connor: You had better ask the Minister that question.

Mr TONKIN: To continue—

How does the Premier account for the fact that the Minister refused to meet with the council when he, in fact, met with someone who is not representative of the ratepayers?

- (3) Will he take steps to see that the Minister is available for representations made by the elected representatives in Wanneroo?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes, I did have a meeting with Mr Jefferies. He is a friend I have known for 30-odd years. He requested that he come and meet with me. I saw him a number of times.
- (2) In connection with the Minister's not meeting with the council, there could be very good reasons for her refusal. I am happy to look into the matter, find out the reasons, and discuss them with the Minister.

- (3) I will not give an undertaking that a meeting will be held.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Subsidies

709. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

In view of the Government's commitment to assisting industrial and domestic electricity customers in northern and rural areas of Western Australia by subsidising electricity costs to those areas, is he aware—

- (a) of Opposition concern at this commitment;
- (b) of suggestions that this policy and general assistance of this type would be removed?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) Yes; I am aware of published concern at this policy which will involve some \$50 million being available from State Energy Commission income to provide standard domestic tariffs throughout Western Australia;
- (b) yes; the Leader of the Opposition indicated the following in the *Pilbara Times* on 15 July 1982—

The long term energy subsidies paid for by the State Energy Commission's domestic and other business customers would not be acceptable to a future government.

Mr Laurance: The ALP involvement with the country stops at Midland Junction!

EDUCATION: COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Mt. Lawley

710. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the likelihood of the Western Australian Academy of Performing Arts being amalgamated with the Mt. Lawley campus of the WA College of Advanced Education?
- (2) Is he aware of the great concern which exists as to such a likelihood?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) and (2) It is my understanding—and perhaps the member can confirm this—that while the Academy of Performing Arts is independent, it has a close association with the Mt. Lawley college.

Mr Davies: They are on the same block of land, and they use the same cafeteria. That is about as far as they go.

Mr CLARKO: I know there is close interaction between the two organisations. There is no proposal before me for an amalgamation. Obviously if one were put in front of me, I would consider it.

I must say I am impressed with what the academy has done to date. I have visited it; and it is worthwhile. My view is that we should expand some of the activities of the academy.

Mr Pearce: Have you seen the Liddelow report recommendation on that?

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Travel: Country

711. Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he recently issued an instruction or a request to his Ministers and/or to Government members asking that they not travel to the country while Parliament is sitting?
- (2) If so, would he give me the details, and indicate the reasons for this instruction?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I will give this information to the member when he supplies me with Caucus minutes and details from them.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Hampton

712. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in today's *Daily News* alleging a strike by some students of the Hampton Senior High School?
- (2) If so, what action has he taken?

Mr Tonkin: That is my electorate. Keep out.

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) and (2) On seeing the article in the paper, I contacted the Director of Schools; and he indicated that it had come to the notice of the department that some difficulties were experienced at the school yesterday. He said that he had made contact with the school, and that he was seeking a report from it.

I would expect, as a result of that report, to then determine whether this matter should be taken further. It is unfortunate that pupils at any school should strike, because that is not an appropriate way to resolve a matter of this sort.

The report in the newspaper indicated that perhaps this matter would be resolved internally. A situation of this sort cannot be resolved internally; it must be resolved as a result of the standard procedures which involve the central office of the department.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: South Koreans

713. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the South Koreans are in the process of finalising an agreement with the Indonesians for the annual supply of LNG at a rate of approximately \$600 million a year?
- (2) In view of the fact that the Government has given the South Koreans preferential treatment in quite questionable circumstances in relation to the Dampier-Perth pipeline construction contract, what action has the Government taken in interesting the Koreans in taking gas from Western Australia?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) Under no circumstances has a formal commitment been made yet, so obviously the member's question is irrelevant.

HOSPITALS

Radiologists

714. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister advise what action he has taken or proposes to take to end the radiology rip-off I outlined to him last Thursday during the Budget debate?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Immediately following the comments made by the member for Melville I explained to the Press the fact that the shortage of radiologists was a world-wide problem and that in Western Australia—

Mr Hodge: There is no shortage in this State.

Mr YOUNG: I had intended to go into the matter in some detail when debating the Estimates, as no doubt the member for Melville will raise the question again then; but as he wants the information now, I shall give it to him.

For the information of members, the position which has to be clarified first is the fact that the radiologists to whom the member for Melville referred are not employed by the hospital system. The payments mentioned by the member were fees for services and they were paid to private practitioners who gave those services to our patients in the hospital system.

I said that, in my opinion, the price we pay is too high. Generally speaking, radiologists receive too high a fee, but the best position has been negotiated from time to time with the radiologists through the Australian Medical Association. In other words, according to the supply and demand situation that prevails in respect of those particular specialists, we are getting the deal that we can best negotiate with them. I would rather it was cheaper and their incomes were lower, but that is the best we can do under the circumstances.

Mr Hodge: You took a very different stance when the nurses asked for a pay rise. You were not quite so easy going with them. You cracked down on them!

Mr YOUNG: The member for Melville does not really understand the difference between people who are employed and those with whom one must negotiate.

Mr Brian Burke: I think he understands.

Mr YOUNG: For the edification of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Melville, I will point out in the clearest terms what it would mean, firstly, if the member for Melville were to take the step he said he was interested in taking in respect of this matter if ever he had the opportunity and, secondly, what would happen if I were to take the step that the member for Melville thinks

I ought to take. In his statements the member for Melville has been quite explicit that I ought to go to the radiologists and say, "You are going to get a lower amount of money and, if you do not like it, you can lump it." If I did that and radiology services were cut off in the northern towns of this State and most of the country towns and regional centres—

Mr Brian Burke: If!

Several members interjected.

Mr YOUNG: If services were cut off, we know what the member for Melville and the Leader of the Opposition would say about that. I do not intend to get to the stage where I take that sort of action—

Mr Tonkin: Or any action!

Mr YOUNG: —and put the radiology services of this State in jeopardy by going head on into conflict with a group of people.

Mr Parker: Who are ripping off the system.

Mr YOUNG: They are not ripping off the system.

Mr Parker: A quarter of a million dollars!

Mr YOUNG: Members opposite should not accept the figures given to them without knowing the net sum received by the radiologists under the present situation. I say again that the radiologists probably get too much, but one cannot say something is a rip-off if someone negotiates with the Government and says, "That is our price." I believe it is too high, but the Government of Western Australia has to pay it to provide radiology services to the citizens of this State about whom the Opposition is continually carping in respect of my responsibilities.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: Rubbish!

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition says, "Rubbish!" In other words, the Leader of the Opposition is saying that I do not have the obligation to provide these services for the people of this State.

Mr Brian Burke: I did not say that. I said you did not have to pay for it in their terms. You have no backbone!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition adopts the attitude that I should simply walk down to the AMA and say, "The member for Melville does not like these prices, nor do I."

Several members interjected.

Mr YOUNG: Members opposite should let me finish.

Mr Brian Burke: Don't be so silly. Go down there and say, "You are being paid too much. Let's talk about it."

Mr YOUNG: I have just tried to explain to the Leader of the Opposition, who is as thick as three short planks, that—

Mr Pearce: It takes one to know one!

Mr YOUNG: —from time to time we sit down and talk about the matter when we are negotiating those sorts of fees—

Mr Brian Burke: With no result.

Mr YOUNG: —through the AMA. The Leader of the Opposition says, "Sit down and talk about it" and when the negotiations have been completed, he says, "but with no result." In other words, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Brian Burke: You are not happy with the result; you said so yourself.

Mr YOUNG: I said that.

Mr Brian Burke: Yes, you said you were not happy with the result.

Mr YOUNG: Well, what does the Leader of the Opposition expect me to do?

Mr Brian Burke: Talk to them.

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition says that I should talk to them.

Mr Brian Burke: That is right.

Mr YOUNG: I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that he does not understand that, when one has negotiated a situation and obtained the best deal, when one still needs the service, one must pay for it. I would rather pay less.

Mr Brian Burke: But you can't achieve a result.

Mr YOUNG: I am not going to put in jeopardy this service which is provided to the people of Western Australia by taking the sort of attitude the Leader of the Opposition would take. He would go down there in his bully-boy way, do a typical Falstaff act and say, "You can all go to hell!"

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to bring his answer to a conclusion, because it appears he is just restating the points he made earlier.

Mr Parker: He is stealing money from the people of this State.

Several members interjected.

Mr YOUNG: Very well, Mr Speaker.

EDUCATION: COLLEGE OF ADVANCED
EDUCATION

Mt. Lawley

715. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

Further to the question asked by the member for Victoria Park, I ask—

- (1) Would the Minister concede that the recommendations of the

Liddelow report go quite some way towards providing for much greater integration of the Academy of Performing Arts with the WA College of Advanced Education and, indeed, set the scene for a takeover of the academy by the college?

- (2) If the Minister is aware of that, would he indicate how far down the line he has reached in considering the recommendations of the Liddelow report with regard to that particular issue and also in a more general sense?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) and (2) I received a copy of the Liddelow report several weeks ago. I quickly scan read it and then referred it to the Chairman of WAPSEC for consideration. I am awaiting a reply and when I receive it I shall take the necessary action.

