Legislative Council

Wednesday, 20 October 1982

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

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

LOCAL COURTS AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and read a first time.

OFFENDERS PROBATION AND PAROLE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 28 September.

THE HON. J. M. BERINSON (North-East Metropolitan) [5.08 p.m.]: This is not a major Bill by any means; at the same time, it offers three or four substantive amendments to the Offenders Probation and Parole Act and each of those, in the judgment of the Opposition, is sensible and worth having.

In particular, the Bill is welcome for the amendment which will avoid in future the need for persons in breach of parole to be brought before the particular sentencing or supervising court. The Attorney General made the point that this has significant potential advantages in terms of economy and ease of administration, and that must be right.

Indeed, this is the sort of amendment which, having been presented, leads one to wonder why it was not done a long time ago. I do not say that in any sense of criticism; on the contrary, it is simply said to remind myself as much as anyone else that many such cases must exist in the range of legislation for which this Parliament is responsible and it would not do any of us any harm to look for further opportunities of this sort.

That having been said, I need add nothing further than to make it clear that this Bill has the support of the Opposition.

THE HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [5.10 p.m.]: I noticed in his second reading speech the Attorney General referred to the power sought in the Bill to require offenders to receive education, as contained in clause 10 which seeks to amend section 20B. In his second reading speech the Attorney General said—

> More than 30 officers of the Probation and Parole Service have now been through the Holyoake Institute training course on alcoholism, so the service is in a good position to provide the support necessary to those participating in the programme.

Has any consideration been given to using the Holyoake Institute services without sending approximately 30 officers along for a crash course which I suggest would not make them authorities in handling people with problems related to alcoholism?

Recently, with a number of my colleagues I visited the Holyoake Institute and was impressed by the way in alcohol-related problems are handled. When considering education, it might be a good idea to look at existing services, rather then set up a separate service.

I hope the Minister's intention, as referred to in his second reading speech, is that the approximately 30 officers who underwent the course will be able to advise and counsel and I hope it is intended the Parole Board should use existing facilities. At various levels the Government subsidises these services and this would be another practical way in which to utilise services which exist already within the community. The Bill has a number of very good points. It refers to the rate of imprisonment as mentioned in the Dixon report. The report from the Parole Board referred to the Parker committee which was set up in 1979 and made a number of recommendations, including a reference to an ad hoc report by the Law Reform Commission. Those reports recommended that a number of amendments be made to the Offenders Probation and Parole Act. I wonder whether those recommendations are under consideration and, if so, is it likely the Government will introduce further amendments to the Act?

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [5.14 p.m.]: I detect the hand of the Chief Probation Officer, Mr Vodanovich, in the Bill. Since his appointment to that position, he has displayed a remarkable ability to understand the problems of his officers and the difficulties they have in relation to rehabilitation.

I assure the Hon. Peter Wells that Holyoake is only one of the institutions which Mr Vodanovich would have recommended his officers to observe. They would have been to the Alcohol and Drug Authority and a number of institutions to determine what is offered in the way of rehabilitation. We must get away from the idea that one institution has the answer. We must not think

that either Holyoake, Serenity Lodge, or the ADA has the answer to a particular problem. Each would go a considerable way to solving a problem, but all institutions must be considered. Mr Vodanovich is aware of this situation, and has done a magnificent job in terms of providing different treatment for different people.

Holyoake would be only one institution in which his officers have encountered difficult problems. In fact, I suggest to the Hon. Peter Wells that if he contacted officers of the Salvation Army he would be told that officers from the Probation and Parole Service contacted the Salvation Army to determine what that organisation has to offer. The probation officers attend such places to determine how they work.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: They went for training at Holyoake, that is what the Minister said.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: It was not training to be counsellors; it was training to understand what goes on in such places so that when people are referred to the service officers with appropriate expertise and training can select the right place to which they can recommend to the judiciary that offenders should be sent to obtain the correct benefit.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Your Government has closed down most of these places, hasn't it? Isn't it a desperate problem to find a decent place?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I am not aware of that. When I was responsible for these institutions I did not close down any; in fact, I opened them.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Your Government closes them down with a flourish.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I ask the member to inform me later which institutions have been closed down. I will take up the cudgel from the back bench on his behalf if he can provide me with a list of the institutions closed down by this Government. I will take the matter very much to heart because, as he would know, this area is of serious concern to me.

I commend Mr Vodanovich for the work he has done. It may not be appropriate for the Minister to do that because Mr Vodanovich is an officer of a department under the control of the Minister. I have made these remarks sincerely and with a view to having them recorded in *Hansard*. Mr Vodanovich has done a tremendous job for the Probation and Parole Service of this State; we were very lucky to have procured his services. I am sure my words will warm the heart of the Hon. Neil McNeill.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [5.18 p.m.]: I thank honourable members for their support of the Bill. Any Bill dealing with probation and parole matters is important, and this Bill is particularly important because of the provisions it contains, to which reference has been made by members. Not the least important provision will incorporate the alcohol education programme with community service orders. Previously this course could not be followed; we had to rely on people to voluntarily attend the alcohol education programme. While it will be necessary for an accused person to consent to a community service order, a certain number of hours out of the total of between 40 and 140 can be made up by an accused attending the alcohol education course.

I think Mr Williams answered some of Mr Wells' questions. These institutions for alcoholics are varied and diverse, as the Hon. Peter Wells would know. In a sense, they cater for different kinds of people in different situations of alcoholism and even drug addiction.

I do not know whether the member has visited Serenity Lodge, Rockingham, but it is another of the institutions like Holyoake, except that it has a slightly different emphasis on different situations. Serenity Lodge deals with people strongly motivated to lift themselves from the depths into which they have sunk. At Serenity Lodge patients are treated in a fairly harsh way, and the lodge is manned only by volunteers.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Does the Bill state that these alcoholics could be sent to Serenity Lodge?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I will come to that point. The patients are treated in a fairly harsh way, although by using the word "harsh" I am not criticising the lodge. The methods it uses have been successful and other institutions have been successful using different methods for different situations. Perhaps the patients at other institutions are less motivated. The Alcohol and Drug Authority prescribes drugs and so on for certain treatments, but drugs are not prescribed at Serenity Lodge. Different treatments are used for different situations.

As I have said, Mr Williams in part answered the questions raised by Mr Wells. All these people coming under community service orders and the like cannot be sent to institutions, and they all do not need to go to institutions. In some cases alcoholism may be a partial cause of a person committing a crime. In other cases it may be the complete cause, but that does not mean necessarily that the accused needs to attend an institution. The alcohol education course as part of a com-

munity service order may be all that is needed. The object of sending probation officers to the Holyoake Institute was to give training, as Mr Williams suggested, in the basic background of treating alcoholics. It is not intended to allow probation officers to substitute themselves for the Holyoake Institute; all that has been done is to have these officers acquire a knowledge of the treatment of alcoholics at Holyoake, which deals with alcoholics in a more intimate way than similar institutions.

Probation officers are stationed throughout the length and breadth of the State, and often are stationed in places where it is not possible to send offenders to an institution. The officers will conduct the courses which the probation service has formulated. The course comprises lectures, films, and various activities, and is designed to try to wean people from alcohol and to help them to realise what a plague alcohol is to them. Offenders will be encouraged to realise the trouble alcohol causes to them.

The comments made by the Hon. Joe Berinson were appropriate. It is a distinct advantage to be able to avoid the enormous cost of moving a person from, say, Karratha, to the supervising court in Perth. An offender may have had his sentence imposed in Perth, but has travelled to Karratha or Wyndham to reside. For him to be brought back to the supervising court on each occasion that it may be necessary creates an enormous and unnecessary cost.

The necessary administrative arrangements will be made to ensure all necessary papers and information are before the appropriate Courts of Petty Sessions in local areas before which offenders appear. I am assured by the Crown Law Department that appropriate arrangements will be made. I have corresponded with the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate in an endeavour to ensure we adopt the right procedures and a proper record is kept of cases in which the supervising court will not be involved. A role still exists for the supervising court in relation to other matters dealt with by the Act which we are not amending by this Bill.

I thank Mr Williams for his comments about Mr Vodanovich. I share the member's opinion of the fine work Mr Vodanovich does; he is a dedicated public servant. At present he is the Chief Probation and Parole Officer, and is about to have his title changed to director. I assure the member that his comments will be passed on to Mr Vodanovich.

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 the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 30 September.

THE HON. P. G. PENDAL (South-East Metropolitan) [5.27 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion, and to commend the Government for deciding once again to bring down a balanced Budget. Today in many circles the idea of balancing a Government Budget is regarded as somewhat old-hat economics. I do not subscribe to that view; like many others in this House I support the concept that people ought to spend within the discipline of that which they earn, and that in doing so they ought not to put themselves at risk financially or in any way put their assets in hock.

For those who may regard the Government's bringing down a balanced Budget as a simple feat, it is worth reminding them that this Government is one of the few Governments in Australia to have achieved a balanced Budget this year. Certainly, if this Government's performance this year is considered with the performance of Governments in this State during the last eight years under the current Premier and his predecessor, it must be accepted that their record of financial management is good. Certainly I believe it is unequalled by any other State or the Commonwealth. Members would know that this year the Commonwealth is largely in debt, and the New South Wales Government has budgeted for a deficit as has the Queensland Government.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Do you have the figures for those States' deficits?

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I do have them with me. Tasmania has budgeted for a deficit and South Australia has, in fact, budgeted for a surplus. The Victorian Government apparently has managed to have two bob each way. I am told in economic terms it has a deficit because it has borrowed an advance from the cash management account. Therefore, in economic terms it is a deficit but legally and technically the Victorian Government has balanced its Budget because the payments and receipts have balanced. It seems a little

Irish to me that a Government can have a deficit and a balanced Budget in the one financial year. Suffice it for me to say the bulk of Governments in Australia have been forced into deficit and the fact that this Government has not should receive the commendation of all taxpayers in this State.

I have raised the following matter in this House on a number of occasions: To the Commonwealth's single-mindedness towards the creation of a national crimes commission. A constructive interview took place as late as last Monday on "Nationwide". In that programme's search for information as to whether the Commonwealth was right or wong in determining to set up a crimes commission, an eminent American lawyer, previously a man who held Australian citizenship, was interviewed in the United States. He is Professor Norval Morris who is recognised internationally as a criminologist and is currently a professor of law at the University of Chicago. He was asked—as an ex-Australian citizen, as one who had considerable experience with Australian law enforcement and with the Australian legal system, and as one who was recently appointed as a special assistant to the United States' Attorney General—his opinion of the value and effectiveness of creating a national crimes commission in Australia.

He said—

> The sort of way I would go into it would be a suspicion that the whole idea of a Crime Commission is a mistake—

I acknowledge that is a tentative statement, but it is a statement from an eminent person who knows his field thoroughly and his opinion is that the idea of a crimes commission is a mistake. He continued—

> —that what it probably is endeavouring to compensate for is either the prohibition of the use of, or lack of skill in the use of, undercover techniques against certain crimes.

I understand that he was referring to undercover techniques in relation to telephone tapping and other forms of electronic surveillance. He continued—

> And the crimes that seem to require undercover techniques are drugs, police corruption, corruption in office, the links between gambling and politics—those types of crimes are very hard to investigate by traditional police interrogation.
>
> I think if you want to catch corrupt police—you can—I think if you want to catch corrupt politicians—and suspicion has focussed—you can—but not by Crime Commissions.

Surely the statement that one can do all those things but not by crime commissions is of significance. He continued—

> What I suspect is needed is collaboration between police forces and perhaps the establishment of a National Police Training Academy in Australia.

It is perhaps not without some coincidence that as recently as 10 days ago a decision was made to establish a national police training academy in Western Australia. However, two points that arise from Professor Morris' comments are of importance.

Firstly, Professor Morris says that in his view a national crimes commission would not do the job and, secondly, any suggestion of a national crimes commission would be seen to be aimed at compensation for the lack of undercover techniques with which we arm law enforcement officers. I put it to the House that, in fact, any serious effort by the Commonwealth to crack down on organised crime in Australia would simply never succeed while the Commonwealth continues on its present headlong rush towards the establishment of a national crimes commission. With reference to the point made by Professor Morris, I refer members to the Listening Devices Act which was passed by this Parliament only four years ago. Members who have been here longer than I will be aware that that Act, which allows for the electronic surveillance of people, is in fact the very undercover technique to which Professor Morris refers. That is no secret because it is an Act passed by this Parliament.

What is of significance in the current debate—and it has been pushed by the Commonwealth of Australia—is that under section 4(3) of the 1978 Act there is provision for listening devices to be used or surveillance techniques to be used by the members of the Western Australian Police Force, officers of Australian Customs, or a person employed for security reasons by the Commonwealth of Australia. It is significant that this Parliament was prepared to allow electronic surveillance techniques to be put into the hands not only of the State Police Force but of Australian Customs and security agents of the Commonwealth of Australia. But the State having done that, the Commonwealth of Australia has repeatedly refused in any way to allow telephone tapping to be carried out by the State police.

I have made tentative inquiries and I have been told that the Commonwealth has not refused State police access to telephone methods; it is merely that it will not give a refusal, but it has the same effect. Therefore, the State Police Force is

hampered in the conduct of any serious fight against organised crime because the Commonwealth refuses to allow the State Police Force access to telephone tapping. If the Commonwealth is at all serious in wanting to crack down on organised crime—and its sentiments are to be applauded—it must offer to the State the very co-operation it claims the States are denying to it.

It would be interesting to know who, in the Federal bureaucracy, is withholding a decision to give the State police access to telephone tapping. In a report of the Australian Federal Police which was published in May this year, Sir Colin Woods, the Commissioner of Federal Police said—

> It is not surprising in these circumstances that the police find it hard—

It does not say which police. To continue—

> —to accept denial of powers to intercept communications which are widely available to police forces overseas.

One can assume from that comment that it is not the Commissioner of Federal Police who is standing in the way of allowing greater access to Police Forces in relation to telephone tapping. I am aware that the only force in Australia that has access to telephone tapping is in the Commonwealth sphere.

It is obvious there are inconsistencies in suggestions by the Commonwealth that it is serious about cracking down on organised crime, particularly as it has refused to delegate powers in regard to telephone tapping.

I now express some mild disappointment at item 128 on page 59 of the Estimates where reference is made to the existing Heritage Committee. The committee was allocated $162 000 last year and this year the allocation has been reduced to $46 000. I ask the Leader of the House, if it is his intention to respond at the end of the Budget papers debate, to tell me why there has been a dramatic fall in funding to the Heritage Committee. I would suggest that the time has come when the Government should seriously consider—and more seriously than during the last six or seven years—the question of setting up a heritage commission. Some members in this Chamber are more familiar than I am with the activities that have taken place since 1974 regarding the creation of a heritage commission.

I am the first to acknowledge that there are serious problems—grave problems—in trying to come to grips with an equitable system by which the public purse can obtain property owned by private individuals, which should be maintained and preserved for posterity. The National Trust, with a limited amount of funds, and certainly a limited charter so far as the law is concerned, does a good job in difficult circumstances. I acknowledge that the Government this year has increased the National Trust's allocation by about 10 per cent. That is a pretty modest amount by any standard; in real terms it is a slight cutback, and is running a little below inflation.

Let us put aside for the moment the practical difficulties of placing preservation orders on private property—and I have already acknowledged these difficulties exist. The other historical difficulty has been the marshalling of sufficient funds to be set aside for the time when a property which is in need of preservation and restoration comes onto the market; finance often becomes difficult to obtain. Most members would agree that a real problem arises when we are talking about the retention of historical buildings and sites. Perhaps the Minister for Cultural Affairs might like to consider a suggestion for the funding of a heritage commission: that of funding such operations out of the proceeds of the instant lottery for which he received parliamentary assent recently. If I remember correctly, using the figures he gave at the time, about $1.25 million will be set aside for cultural affairs and a further $1.25 million for sporting activities. That is a total of $2.5 million raised annually for cultural and sporting pursuits which will not come out of the taxpayers' pocket.

Many people applauded what the Minister did on that occasion. I am suggesting to him that, as he will work out the distribution of funds he might like to set a healthy precedent and earmark perhaps 10 or 15 per cent of the $1.25 million for a heritage fund. I refer to the report of the special committee on the proposal for a Western Australian heritage commission in section 138 on page 43 where it says—

> In these circumstances the provision of a substantial Heritage Fund would be unnecessary, but the Commission should have at its disposal a modest fund from which it could make grants for the acquisition or restoration of cultural property, the encouragement of voluntary effort, the publication of local historical material, research and similar purposes.

Clearly, a need exists for a "modest fund" as they call it to be set aside, and perhaps the instant lottery is the means by which it could be achieved. I have already acknowledged the practical difficulties which are inherent in trying to gain access for the State on a permanent basis to properties which ought not to be lost to the future.

I want to turn to a third matter which has been brought to my attention by a group of my con-

stituents who, in the normal course of events do not have a great deal of political or electoral clout because they are small in number. I refer to the beekeepers and the honey processors and packers, several of whom live in my electorate.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Not much clout, but plenty of sting.

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: One of the difficulties these people have is they believe their export capacity is being seriously hampered by some rather peculiar restrictions applied by the Australian Honey Board under the legislation enacted by the Federal Parliament. Two problems face them: The first is that a person who exports honey via the Australian Honey Board—and that is the only way one can channel honey out of the country before it gets to the buyers' hands on the other side of the world—does so through an agency system in the importing countries. The agents are appointed by the Australian Honey Board. The board authorises these agents to impose a commission of up to 3½ per cent. So the agents receive the honey, impose their 3½ per cent commission, and then act as sellers. Clearly, anyone who is buying honey to distribute it on a wholesale basis is disadvantaged to the tune of 3½ per cent.

My constituents believe the time has come when although the Australian Honey Board should be retained, the agency system ought to be discontinued, and the honey price allowed to find its own level. This would allow people involved in the industry in WA to open up a whole new ball game for themselves. I have evidence from West German and United States importers that they would take a great deal more of our honey if they could buy it on the open market. They are happy to buy it through the Australian Honey Board, but not from the agents appointed by the board in West Germany and the US.

It has been suggested to me that the WA industry is losing something in the order of $1 million a year in export earnings. The West Germans will not buy that $1 million-worth of honey because they are forced to use the board's agents who are in the honey market themselves and get the 3½ per cent advantage over their competitors. I have taken up this matter with the Australian Honey Board, and I have been told that if any of the packers and processors in the honey industry have evidence that the board's practices are preventing the sale of Australian honey overseas, those people should give the board the details.

The board has been made aware of the details, and I repeat that the information is available to me from one of the largest honey importers in West Germany who came to Parliament House some time ago to give personal testimony that this situation exists and to explain why West Germans will not entertain the idea of buying extra Western Australian honey. They are not silly enough to buy it when they are being disadvantaged to the tune of 3½ per cent.

A group called Western Commerce Corporation which operates from California has written to one of my constituents, and I will read a couple of passages from the letter because it tells the same story. Unless the Government or someone does something about this situation we will continue to lose fairly lucrative markets. The letter from Western Commerce Corporation says—

> Currently, as you well know, Sunland is their exclusive agent in the United States. In our opinion, the Australian beekeepers are disadvantaged by this arrangement.
>
> First, Sunland as a broker in the United States is able, by its control of Australian honey into the U.S. market and by its domestic position in the sales of Chinese and Mexican honey, to exert an enormous influence over the U.S. market and leverage one exporting country against the other. For example, suppose Sunland is offered an excessive amount from Australia and China. It has the choice of telling the Australian Honey Board that it should lower its prices or Sunland will not market their honey until it has lowered its prices. The result is that the Australian beekeeper is forced to reduce his prices at no expense to Sunland, if they want to sell in the United States. In some cases, Sunland may even make more on Australian honey . . .
>
> Second, there are importers in the United States that would purchase from Australia were the product available by or through importers other than Sunland.

I will end on this note: Even a country like China, which can hardly be said to have a free enterprise economy, sells its honey products on the world market, and is a large processor. Other countries do the same. Australia is the odd man out and carries on with the rather cumbersome agency arrangement which does not permit our honey processors and packers to get a fair share of the world market.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [5.59 p.m.]: I take this opportunity of making some comments in regard to the tabled papers because they are terribly important to the area I am privileged to represent—the south-west region.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I take this opportunity to inform the House of the growth of the south-west area, which has been not less than spectacular over the last 10 years. A great diversity of activity can be found in the south-west, which is its very strength. The Government's proposed expenditure for this financial year will augment the development already occurring.

When I took out some figures to make an assessment of what has been happening in the south-west I was suprised to find that not only is the south-west the most heavily populated region outside the metropolitan area—which I knew—but also it is growing at an exceedingly fast rate. This can be illustrated in several ways.

Between 1976 and 1981—the years in which a Commonwealth census was conducted—the region's population grew from 84 250 persons to 97 834 persons, a rise of 16.1 per cent or an average per annum growth rate of 3.2 per cent. Some centres within the south-west region experienced an extraordinary growth rate. Waroona experienced a growth rate of 24.8 per cent in those five years, the Shire of Murray increased by 21.3 per cent, the Shire of Capel increased by 24 per cent, the Shire of Dardanup grew by 22.1 per cent, and further south the Augusta-Margaret River Shire experienced a growth rate of 18.7 per cent and the Shire of Busselton 15 per cent. Those figures can be better understood if we consider the 12 months between June 1981 and June 1982. The regional population rose from 97 834 to an estimated 106 380 persons. That represents an outstanding growth rate of 8.7 per cent in 12 months.

Members should bear in mind that the Australian population growth rate at present is in the order of 2.2 per cent and the figure for Western Australia is in the order of 3.2 per cent. I say "in the order of" because I am not sure of the accuracy of the figures for the last 12 months, but the correct figures would be very close to those I have given. Therefore the south-west region is an extremely important one, not just to the State but also to the entire nation.

Another yardstick of the development of the region is the number of private dwellings constructed, and I will refer to the five-year period from June 1976 to June 1981. In that period the number of private dwellings rose from 31 233 units to 38 694 units. That represents a growth rate of 23.9 per cent. We can take a closer look at these figures by considering some of the centres within the south-west region itself. An outstanding growth rate occurred in the number of private dwellings constructed, especially in the Mandurah area where the number of units increased from 5 382 in June 1976 to 7 828 units in June 1981, a growth rate of 45.4 per cent. Other areas also experienced outstanding growth rates in the number of private dwellings constructed in that five-year period. The Augusta-Margaret River Shire had a growth rate of 32.3 per cent, the Shire of Waroona 32.2 per cent, the Shire of Dardanup 28.9 per cent, the Shire of Busselton 27.1 per cent, and the Shire of Murray 23.6 per cent.

Reasons can be found for this growth in the south-west corner of the State. One is that the area has such a magnificent climate. People like to live there; many people retire there. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, the area has a great diversity of industry and each industry attracts its own kind and its own work force which all adds up to various service industries establishing to serve the population of the entire area.

The growth of the area has been encouraged by a deliberate Government policy to promote, wherever possible, industries of all kinds and sizes. We often hear it said today that there are small businesses and big businesses, but I do not hold with that. We have businesses, full stop. Whether they are large or small matters not as long as they have the opportunity to prosper and are encouraged to do so. Let us face it, in the main big businesses start off somewhere as small businesses and grow—that is the whole idea.

Obviously the figures I have mentioned illustrate that the south-west has a number of growing businesses. I am not so naive as to suggest that all is well in the area and that all businesses are prospering. It has been the history of businesses of all kinds over the ages that some prosper and others, for various reasons, fall by the wayside. Some industries and businesses are experiencing real difficulties—there is no denying that.

The Government has taken steps to encourage and promote businesses so that they prosper and so that new ones start up. Small Business Advisory Service Ltd. has played a very important role both in the south-west and in the State generally by assisting all businesses which are termed "small businesses".

The Hon. J. M. Brown: Does it provide financial help?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It has a capacity to advise businesses where to seek financial assistance. It does not supply finance itself but gives guidance and direction so that businesses may obtain finance.

The south-west has a number of natural resources which with Government assistance are being expanded. I hesitate to use the word "exploited" because it can be misinterpreted and

it is not my desire to have people believe these resources are being exploited. We need a continued development of our natural resources.

The Collie coalfields have been prospering under the drive and initiative of the Government; Collie has never been better placed than at present and it has an ongoing future of great security. The State Energy Commission, with its programme of updating the power generation capacity of the Muja power station, is testimony to the Government's policies. Furthermore, in a few years I believe the negotiations currently in progress will see the advent of probably the biggest power generation plant in Western Australia, which will be based at Bunbury. The plant will use Collie coal; there is no question about that; it will use natural resources from the area. This will generate not only power but also tremendous employment opportunities both directly and through the industries that will use the power generated by the SEC system. All this will add to the strength of the south-west region.

I must take this opportunity to encourage the people of the south-west to have confidence in themselves and their industries. The mineral sands industry based in the Capel Shire and the Busselton Shire also has an effect on Bunbury, because the Bunbury port is the outlet to the international markets. The mineral sands industry has been a feature of the area for perhaps 20 or 25 years and has been the means of employing directly in the order of 300 to 500 people over the years on a fluctuating basis according to the needs of the industry at different times. A resource industry such as the mineral sands industry, like the iron ore and gold industries, is dependent very largely on world markets and conditions. It is my judgment that the mineral sands industry has served the south-west region well; it has managed to meet every challenge and the changing times and circumstances of the world markets. It continues to meet all challenges.

Presently the industry is under challenge from a number of quarters and I find it passing strange that an industry which is a proved ongoing industry, with a good local track record over perhaps 25 years, should be challenged by a number of people for whatever reason they may have. I implore the people of the region to stand up for themselves and their industries. The vast majority of people in the south-west region, particularly those in the Bunbury, Capel, and Busselton areas, recognise the value of the mineral sands industry. I am sure they will not be put off by the challenge mounted by a very small group of people hoping that the industry will be stifled. It behoves the people of the south-west to stand up not only for the mineral sands industry but also for all the many other industries in the region.

It amazes me that in these troubled economic times, when most people are concerning themselves with maintaining industries and employment opportunities, we find that other people should take the time to undermine the confidence and to sap the energies of an industry which can provide the wherewithal for people to gain meaningful employment. Moves are being made to engage people from the Eastern States to serve the cause of the people who want to restrict the mineral sands industry. I deplore that action; I do not believe it is justified and I hope the people who are doing it are recognised for what they are by the people of the region and seen to be almost saboteurs of the Australian economy.

I do not believe we should have development at any cost. All industries, especially our resource industries, are subject to conditions of extraction imposed on them by the local authorities in the various areas. The industries have to conform with the requirements of the Mining Act and the Mines Department regulations, as well as a whole host of other things.

The EPA also has an input; it intervenes in the public interest. In my view the EPA is the best of any similar organisation in Australia. It has served this State well since its inception and it is continuing to do so.

All the industries of the south-west have the added protection and expertise of the Public Works Department engineers and, the officers of the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Department; therefore, adequate provision is made to ensure that whatever is done is done in accordance with reasonable practice in all the circumstances without having detrimental effects in any direction.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Would not the same thing have been said about Wittenoom until the full extent of the disaster struck?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I do not know if it would have been said about Wittenoom at all.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: We had all these departments in those days.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: If a problem arises in any industry in the light of changing circumstances or better technology, certainly the problem must be corrected; I am the first to acknowledge that. If something was wrong with the mineral sands extraction industry or the coalmining or goldmining industry, I would be the first to say, "Let us do whatever has to be done." Until it has been proven that a change in direction is needed in this regard, I do not believe it is

necessary for people to undermine the confidence of soundly-based industries and to weaken a certain avenue of employment.

I now turn to the forest industry of the south-west. The Forests Department is charged with the responsibility of managing our forests and timber in perpetuity. There has been a change of emphasis recently with regard to the rate of harvesting our indigenous forest hardwoods, and the emphasis has turned to the softwood industry; I applaud that. I am on record as saying that I hoped when the Commonwealth Softwoods Foresty Agreement Act terminated, the State Government would take up the matter and provide sufficient funds for the ongoing protection of forestry.

Thankfully, in the papers which we are now discussing in this House the Government has indicated its intention to do that and the Forests Department's plan for pine production has been underlined for financial assistance. The softwood industry has its own problems; again it is a case of meeting demands. I am aware that some of the people engaged in the softwood industry, especially the millers and the transport operators, are finding the markets are not to their liking. I believe this is only a temporary phase, but it serves to underline again the precarious nature of the industry. The determination of everyone associated with it, is apparent in the general support given to the industry in thinner times through to times of improved production. The forest industry has been exceptionally beneficial to this State. It is not as labour-intensive an industry as it used to be. At present no more than 7 000 people are either directly or indirectly in the wood industry. When I say "the wood industry" I refer to not only the timberfellers but also the people working in the mills, the transport operators, the wood processors and so on. Many people are involved in the wood industry and we must not confuse ourselves by suggesting that it refers to 1 000 or 2 000 people. The industry means more than that to the community.

The Hon. J. M Brown: Do you share in the concern over closer relations with New Zealand in the softwood industry? That might make the temporary phase you referred to a permanent one.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Yes, there is concern that the softwood industry of other countries—not only New Zealand—could affect our own production. That poses a very real threat to the industry, but there is nothing new in that. We trade on the world market, as do other countries. That is a challenge we must meet; we must ensure that our production is able to meet the particular market thrusts of the times. We have the expertise and competence within the industry to weather that challenge. I am mindful of the development of the forestry industry particularly in regard to the Donnybrook sunklands area, which is roughly a triangle from Busselton to Nannup to Margaret River. I do not intend to go into that matter now, but it will have a big bearing on the future of softwood production in this State.

The Department of Agriculture with Government assistance will soon establish a research station east of Busselton. I cannot recall the actual area involved, but it comprises something like several hundred hectares and this will be of enormous benefit to agriculture in the south-west high rainfall area. I applaud the Government for supporting this request of the Department of Agriculture.

I am very glad to mention the prospect of a new courthouse and Government offices at Bunbury. This problem has caused a lot of people concern for several years, but I am pleased to note that the Government has had provided $350 000 in this financial year to commence initial work on a courthouse and Government offices. The Government is to provide approximately $6 million for this purpose. Obviously, the initial work will have to be done first to prepare for such a complex and under the Budget provisions of this year $350 000 has been made available to start the operation. I commend the Government for this. I recognise that it is long overdue, but there are reasons for that and the people of the south-west understand those reasons.

I remember an election six years ago when following the declaration of the poll it was suggested to me that if something were not done in regard to two things there would be a public response. Those two things were, firstly, the renewal or replacement of the Bunbury courthouse, and, secondly, the arresting of the fly ash from the Bunbury powerhouse so that clean air would be available to the local people. I am especially pleased to report that those two matters have been catered for under funding provisions over the years.

Many things have been provided under the funding provisions of the current Budget. I am especially pleased for the professional fishermen of the south-west who have needed a jetty or landing facility in the Bunbury area. The Budget provides $127 000 for the upgrading of the fishing boat harbour in Bunbury. I commend the professional fishermen for what they have endured over the years. I have often looked at the old jetty, which they have used for many years, and wondered how they managed to operate at all because of the appalling facilities they are obliged to use for landing their catch and servicing their vessels.

This expenditure is very necessary and it will help professional fishermen and provide facilities for boats that may urgently need to dock at various times.

Provision of $528 000 is made for extensions and improvements to the Bunbury sewerage scheme.

Another feature of the Budget with which I am happy to be associated is the provision of funds for the upgrading and extension of the Bunbury Senior High School, not to be confused with the Newton-Moore Senior High School of the same city. Bunbury has two high schools. The Bunbury Senior High School has a fine record of scholastic ability and attainment over many years and it is regarded as a very competent school. The school needs major alterations and improvements, and provision of these funds will enable it to be adequately serviced to meet its needs.

Problems will occur during the transition period when 11 classrooms will be temporarily housed in the city. The Bunbury City Council and other organisations are doing what they can to assist the school to meet its challenge, and I thank them for that.

The Bunbury Regional Prison is of major importance to the State but especially to the south-west region as a link in the chain of institutions which serve Western Australians well. A further $262 000 has been provided for the continuing work in this area.

The Bunbury Harbour is exceedingly important to the whole region. The inner harbour, as it is referred to, had a very hesitant start years ago because of natural impediments to its establishment, such as basalt rock. Finance, of course, was another problem, but the problems have been overcome and further works are needed. An amount of $600 000 has been provided in this financial year to meet that need.

I refer briefly to the fragile coastal area of the lower south-west which has caused considerable concern to Government, local government, and private citizens for many years. Geographe Bay, which is adjacent to the town of Busselton, is a very fragile coastline area; indeed, the whole south-west coastline is fragile. I commend the Public Works Department for its work over the years. That department is very efficient; it made a thorough study of the problems of the region. Recently I made a submission to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment seeking that special attention be given to the Geographe Bay area and the coastline from Cape Naturaliste to Cape Leeuwin.

Recently a coastal management co-ordinating committee was established to co-ordinate departmental activities and to ensure no unnecessary overlap and waste of effort in money occurred. It was brought into being to make the best possible use of the coastal reserves, whether they be port sites, fishing facilities, recreation areas, tourist attractions, conservation areas, or the like. The committee is charged also with the responsibility of meeting management problems and avoiding expenditure on remedial measures.

Over the years the Busselton Shire Council has spent a considerable sum of money to protect shore lines and public buildings, to provide maintenance, and to protect private property. The shire has been supported by the Government, through the Public Works Department, in the funding of this work. It therefore makes good sense that this matter should be given ongoing consideration.

The committee will be effective in saving a great deal of money which otherwise would be spent on remedial matters. Local committees have been set up in a number of areas such as that from Mandurah to Bunbury, in Esperance, and in other areas.

The areas included in the Busselton Shire and the Augusta-Margaret River Shire are deserving of special attention because of their fragility. The protection of those areas has cost millions of dollars over a number of years. I would like the Government to continue its work to save the local people a great deal of money and trauma. I wish to refer to a report in the *Busselton-Margaret River Times* of last week. It was reported that the Busselton sewerage works programme had been reduced from $350 000 to $100 000. That report was incorrect.

The shire has been advised that its borrowings on the Government's behalf need be only $100 000, rather than $200 000. That leaves a balance of $250 000 which will be available from internal funds and it was erroneous for the newspaper to quote that only $100 000 was being provided. Had the people from the newspaper made the appropriate inquiries to the Minister or one of the local members, that fact would have been pointed out.

Other allocations for Busselton from the Budget include the sum of $85 000 for drainage works in the district and a further $55 000 for the relocation of the Public Works Department depot.

One of the great features of Busselton is the Busselton jetty. It is an interesting edifice to maintain. It is an interesting structure because of its importance to the tourist industry. It also is

held dear by the local people, and the Government has provided $20 000 for its maintenance.

The last item to which I wish to refer and which is probably the most important as far as Busselton is concerned—especially when we bear in mind that Busselton is a seaside resort—is the provision of a marina. Many people have been agitating for this and local people have been active in their support of a practical solution to the problem. I am pleased to note that the Government has provided the sum of $9 000 this financial year for investigations associated with the proposed marina. I feel that other developments will occur in time.

Many people like to go to the seaside resort of Busselton, to enjoy its coastline. The area does not have an adequate haven for sea craft, but if a marina were provided, people could spend more than four or five months of the year in the area and enjoy the locality much more.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. N. F. Moore.

THE HON. N. F. MOORE

Birth of Daughter

THE PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths): I wish to place on record our congratulations to the Hon. Norman Moore and Mrs Moore on the birth of their second daughter.

Members: Hear, hear!

The PRESIDENT: I ask you, Norm, to give your wife our sincere best wishes and we offer our best wishes to the little one also.

ACTS AMENDMENT (RESERVES) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 October.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [8.05 p.m.]: It is with some apprehension that I will endeavour to speak to three Bills at the one time, particularly as they are of such an extensive nature.

As a member who has had a great deal to do with the Land Act and the Department of Lands and Surveys, I agree with the principles contained in these three Bills. However, I do have a few reservations. Perhaps I should not use that word —perhaps I should say I have a certain amount of apprehension.

The first objective of the Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill is to enable reserves to be created for a defined purpose rather than restricting them to the specified classes listed in the Act.

Members who have referred to section 29 of the Land Act would note that traditionally, the Department of Lands and Surveys has always recommended to Government a specific purpose under which land will be vested. The list in paragraphs (a) to (p) of section 29(1) is rather interesting. The first purpose is for the benefit and use of the Aboriginal inhabitants. The second is for railways and various transport matters; others range from the purpose of churches and chapels, sites for schools, State forests, sites for towns, residence and business areas, town halls, mechanics' and miners' institutes, tramways, telegraph stations, post offices, museums, public gardens, experimental farms, agricultural colleges, to temperance institutions. This is the sort of detail specified in the Act.

Whenever a Minister and his department recommend an area for reservation they must find a classification within that extensive list. This has become a little cumbersome as is indicated by a recent amendment which was made to this section of the Act to enable the vesting of land to build the McNess housing trust, 1930-48.

It is the intention of the Bill to do away with those classifications and make it possible for reserves to be created for any specified purpose. I am a little nervous about this. I hope the Minister and his department will be vigilant in respect of this matter because it is important the public should know what land is reserved and for what purpose—particularly if they happen to own land adjacent to that being vested.

One certainly would not want to learn of a specified purpose being for the use and benefit of the Minister for Public Works, because after all he could do anything—he could even build a sewage farm.

It is of concern to the general public that they keep up with the actions of the Government. Traditionally action of this nature is required to be published in the *Government Gazette* following proclamation. I wonder how many members of the public read the *Government Gazette*. One would think that a member of Parliament would automatically read the *Government Gazette* because it is almost the bible of government. However, I would be bold enough to say that the average member of Parliament would not see a copy regularly, let alone know what is going on.

One wonders how the general public can be expected to keep up with what the Government is doing with regard to the classification of reserves. I wonder whether more requirements should be introduced to notify those who own neighbouring land, or have a declared interest, that an area is

intended to be vested as a reserve or that the purpose of a reserve is to be changed.

A further intention of the amendment is to empower the Government to impose conditions and limitations in reserve areas and for it to be able to enforce a working plan. I do not think the Government has ever had any difficulty in asking those in whom land is vested to supply a working plan when required. Nevertheless, the Act contains no such requirement, and we are now providing that requirement and in addition, providing power to revoke a vesting order.

In some ways, this is rather frightening, because many of the bodies in which this land is vested may have put a considerable, amount of work and money into the land only to find their land could be confiscated by the Government. The amendment purports to protect the rights of third parties, such as lessees and licensees, but that still leaves unprotected those in whom the land is vested.

It could be argued the Government will not revoke vestings lightly and that if it decides to revoke a vesting, the people in whom the land is vested must have acted in such a way as to lose the land. Nevertheless, I wonder whether this provision is adequate.

A few moments ago, we saw a party of boy scouts in the Public Gallery. I am fairly certain reserves have been vested in that association, and no doubt, it has expended a considerable amount of money in constructing halls and other facilities. If one takes this legislation literally, in future that association will be unprotected in that the Government will be able to revoke the vestings. Had the land been vested in the local authority and then had been leased to the scouts, the scouts would be protected.

The Parliament must look closely at the various ways in which land is vested before accepting these amendments, because I am sure many organisations will be apprehensive at the ability of the Government to revoke their vesting and thus endanger their investment. For example, I am sure the Hon. H. W. Gayfer will look carefully at reserves held by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. However, I am sure that most of that land is leased, so CBH, being a third party, will be protected.

Last year, some 527 reserves were set aside, giving one some idea of the number of reserves which must be in existence. After all, Western Australia has been governed for 150 years and if we are still setting aside more than 500 reserves each year, one can realise the number of reserves which must have been created during that time. Obviously, there will need to be great trust between the Government and those in whom the land is vested; much of the land, of course, will be vested in the third tier of government; namely, local government.

One of the objectives of the Bill is to alter the method of setting aside "A"-class and certain other reserves. Under the present Act, if an "A"-class reserve is being reduced in size, or totally declassified, the proposal must come before Parliament. However, an opinion by the Crown Law Department to me as Minister about 18 months ago was to the effect that perhaps actions of previous Governments and Ministers were wrong in that additions to, and the creation of "A"-class reserves also should be brought before Parliament.

Previously, it had been thought that if one were actually creating an "A"-class reserve and thereby increasing the amount of land set aside, one would be complimented on so doing, rather than being required to bring the matter before Parliament. This procedure probably was in order when relatively unlimited quantities of land existed in Western Australia. However, times change and today, vacant Crown land is becoming scarce.

I was lobbied by various local governments which were concerned that vacant Crown land within their shire boundaries would be given "A"-class reserve classifications for flora and fauna or other such purposes, instead of its still being available for closer settlement; namely, agriculture. Indeed, the local authorities wanted the land classified as such but the Act did not permit such a move.

One must be careful when classifying "A"-class reserves; like a knighthood, it must not be assumed automatically that bestowal is acceptable.

Too often, Ministers for Lands have been embarrassed by some of the proposals brought before them. For example, I recall when I had to admit to Parliament an "A"-class reserve was under one foot of bitumen outside the university at Crawley. Obviously, it was ridiculous that land ever should have been an "A"-class reserve. At one stage, it was a flower garden which later became a grassed median strip; still later, it got lost in a truncation. It shows how stupid some of the "A"-class reservations have been in the past.

Often, a private individual can give the Government some land, provided it is classified as an "A"-class reserve; so, the land automatically is so listed. However, from that point on, the land is protected, and nothing can happen to it without Parliament's approval.

From a perusal of the last annual report of the Department of Lands and Surveys, I note five "A"-class reserves were created without the matters being brought before Parliament. I would have to admit that perhaps similar recommendations were made to me, as Minister. Occasionally, on examination of a recommendation, I felt due consideration had not been given to the recommended status. On examining the files, one would find the recommendation arose as a result of some minor report which might have said, "This small and insignificant piece of land in the wheatbelt is typical of vegetation of the area." In no time, another department—perhaps the Department of Conservation and Environment—would have submitted a recommendation for "A"-class classification. It would take only a minor officer in the Department of Lands and Surveys to set matters in train, and before the Minister knew what was happening, among the 50 or so recommendations he made to the Governor each week would be a recommendation for an "A"-class classification.

I believe all "A"-class reserve recommendations should come before Parliament; we should examine them, and allow the public to examine them.

Yesterday, the Hon. A. A. Lewis accused two Government Ministers of illegally creating a national park. I saw how embarrassed one member on the front bench looked. Of course, the honourable member was referring to Crown Law advice regarding the practice of creating "A"-class reserves without bringing them before Parliament. In addition, a conflict appears to exist between the National Parks Authority Act and the Land Act. The Land Act provides the ability to create "A"-class reserves. However, the National Parks Authority Act provides ways in which one can declare a national park, apart from those laid down in the Land Act. We must look closely at the procedures involved in the creation of "A"-class reserves and at allowing the Minister to continue to do so. After all, considerable conservation and environment studies have taken place over the last 10 years. We have been through the green book and the red book stages of the conservation through reserves committees; a committee of knowledgeable men have gone through those reports and made recommendations. However, at the same time we find "A"-class reserves being recommended by the Department of Lands and Surveys without the same sort of input, whether it be from local government, the public, or anyone else.

The Bill asks members to authorise all previous "A"-class reserve proclamations. Perhaps there is a need to re-examine the whole situation of reserves. I appreciate that would represent a large task. I do not know whether it is one which necessarily should be carried out by a Select Committee of this Parliament, or by some other means. However, I believe that in future, the total list of "A"-class reserves should be examined by Parliament to ensure we are doing the right thing and so that Ministers no longer will be embarrassed by the Main Roads Department or some other authority suddenly discovering it has buried an "A"-class reserve under bitumen.

I would like to see the reclassification of all reserves; indeed, that was the purport of one of the suggestions made last night by the Hon. A. A. Lewis. He suggested all reserves should be included in one of 11 classifications. We in this country have a dislike of being thought of as second-class citizens, and I suppose that philosophy is reflected in our reserves. Everything must be "A"-class; we do not see many "B"-class reserves. However, many of our "A"-class reserves just as well could be set aside as "B"-class reserves, and still be adequately protected.

Members will appreciate that a "B"-class reserve cannot be altered without the tabling of a report in both Houses of the Parliament within 14 days of the proposed change in classification or cancellation. I believe we could protect adequately many of the areas needing protection in this way, and the classification of "A"-class could be reserved for premium areas such as national parks and areas of great significance.

In his second reading speech the Minister said that additions to "A"-class reserves must be tabled in the Parliament but he did not specify whether the establishment of a new "A"-class reserve must come before the Parliament for approval. I hope in his reply to the second reading debate he will tell us the intentions of the Government. If only provision for changes and additions must be tabled in the Parliament, the Minister could simply proclaim a new reserve even in the case of an area which is adjacent to an established reserve, without bringing the matter to Parliament. To be consistent, new reserves should be treated in the same way as alterations and additions.

The same situation applies in regard to State forests—the Minister can add to State forests without much difficulty, yet Parliament must authorise any exchanges of land within State forests. Exchanges of land are frequently minor in comparison with additions to the forests.

The Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill will amend the Parks and Reserves Act. Perhaps members may not appreciate that land vested

under the Land Act is managed under the provisions of the Parks and Reserves Act. Presently the bodies that are responsible for vested land are able to sell, by licence or otherwise, gravel, sand, and the like, provided that any profits from such sales are put back into the development of the reserve.

Within the last 18 months or so two cases of this type occurred on the south coast. In one case a local authority wished to utilise a deposit of black marble which was thought to have some value, particularly to the Japanese. It was suggested that the marble could be mined and an "A"-class flora and fauna reserve developed by and vested in the local authority. The local government body co-operated in supplying working plans and it sought the Government's permission to mine. As it happened, the marble was not suitable for the purpose envisaged, and nothing happened. However, it is rather interesting that public concern forced the local authority to seek the advice of the Lands and Surveys Department and the Department of Conservation and Environment. A very satisfactory arrangement was negotiated between local government and Government in regard to that reserve.

The amendment in the Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill will legalise any such transactions. Those bodies in which land is vested would have to obtain permission to mine and they would have to prepare a working plan for the development of the reserve. If these procedures failed, the Government would be able to revoke the vesting order. It is rather interesting that during the period this system has operated—100 years or so—there has not been a need to introduce an amendment enabling the revocation of a vesting order.

Such a situation nearly arose on the south coast in regard to a pit which was used by the farmers to collect lime sand to correct soil conditions on their land. When the coastal strip became a flora and fauna reserve, the pit remained in use. Unfortunately the local authority allowed road builders and others to use the pit, and the public became concerned about it. I am happy to say that before too much time had elapsed, to use a colloquialism, the local authority came to heel. The pit was restored under the guidance of the Department of Conservation and Environment and, as far as I am aware, the whole situation is now satisfactorily settled.

The legislation lays down a requirement for the preparation of a working plan by those in whom land is vested. There must be tens of thousands of reserves, and perhaps if the matter goes along sensibly, Government and local government can stand the pressure of these requirements. However, it could happen that we need a host of environmental experts in the future to develop suitable plans. I am not necessarily saying that the provision is wrong—in fact, as the Hon. A. A. Lewis pointed out, we need to know more about our reserves. Nevertheless, currently local government accepts a great deal of responsibility for reserves other than those with which it is directly associated, and I am referring to recreation reserves, cemeteries, road verges, and that type of area. For instance, the coastal strip is not really the concern of local authorities, but the ones concerned have been willing to accept the vesting of those areas and to carry out the necessary conservation measures. Obviously this must add to the cost of local government, and therefore, to the ratepayers.

I hope the fact that a vesting can be revoked will not dishearten local government. We could see responsibility for all the reserves cascading back onto the Government. I am not sure that we could manage them as well as the local authorities do if we were suddenly to find ourselves responsible for hundreds of them.

I can see a few problems which may arise when the working plans have to be put into action. Where a reserve is set aside for conservation and the body in which it is vested is interested in conservation, and its purpose is conservation, then certainly there should be no problem in carrying out working plans where they are necessary. However, let us consider the situation in the Kimberley where 80 per cent of our coastline is vested for the benefit and use of Aborigines. I am not suggesting that the Aborigines are not good conservationists, but I am suggesting they may not wish to invest a lot of time and money to conserve that vast coastline. Perhaps it could be argued that so much of our coastline should not have been vested in those bodies anyway, but that is the obvious trend today.

The policy of successive Federal Governments—whether Labor or Liberal—has been to vest national parks such as Ayers Rock in Aboriginal groups or authorities. Under this legislation we will expect such bodies to prepare conservation working plans and to carry out the work involved.

I feel that I have sufficiently covered the Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill and I do not wish to spend too long on the Land Amendment Bill which relates to the granting of easements for the provision of services; that is, for such services as pipes, cables, electricity transmission lines, and conveyor belts. I think that matter has been covered already but I would like to again express reservations about it.

For many years I have been concerned about what the State Energy Commission and, at times, the Main Roads Department, are doing to our rural landscape. When travelling in country areas one is very aware that more and more trees are being felled, particularly when one sees many trees which have been bulldozed and left to lie in paddocks. When the SEC is extending powerlines, it endeavours to obviate the danger of falling limbs, and so many trees are bulldozed. Perhaps we are made aware of this because most powerlines are installed very close to roads. I remember when farmers were being accused of felling many trees in the south-west just before the clearing bans were proclaimed, and we found afterwards that it was the SEC which was bulldozing strips adjacent to the main roads. The provisions of this amendment could lead to even more destruction.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: They say they like the poles to be noticed!

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Is that the reason? The Main Roads Department is responsible also for felling trees, but not to the same extent. We all know what happens when roads are widened, and we see this with Albany Highway at the present time. I know we must have progress, but it is disturbing to see the few remaining trees being removed and the road verges being destroyed for road widening.

Admittedly, some new trees are being planted. I think the MRD planted 10 000 trees for the 150th anniversary celebrations. The department felt that was a great achievement. I happened to be Minister at the time and I said that I had planted more trees on roadsides myself, so I considered the department should have the ability to plant many more trees. We seem to have conflicting opinions about whether trees should be planted on road verges. One body of opinion suggests that the native vegetation and wildflowers should be left as they are. Unfortunately, the application of fertiliser and the spread of pasture plants from adjacent farmlands will probably affect many of our wildflowers and, therefore, the more trees we can plant the better.

The third Bill under discussion relates to the reorganisation of the Department of Lands and Surveys into two separate departments. While the Bill does not actually seek to do that, it contains provisions which will enable that to be done. As Minister, I gave this matter a certain amount of attention and I was rather surprised to read in the Minister's second reading speech, that the Public Service Board initiated a review of the departmental organisation. It would have been more correct had it been said that the Minister asked the Public Service Board to have a look at the consequences of splitting the department in two.

Obviously the duties of the Surveyor General have changed considerably over the last 150 years. The position of Surveyor General was one of the five senior positions created at the time of the foundation of this colony. He has always played a major part in the development of this State. Over the years the duties of his department have changed considerably.

Originally the Surveyor General's department was responsible for laying out towns and surveying the State. Today a host of new technology is available in the form of aerial photography and the use of satellites and computers. One of the arguments advanced by the professionals in the Department of Lands and Surveys is that matters are much more technical now than they were in the past. With the advent of satellite remote sensing and position fixing aids, aerial photography, and other aids the department can play a major part in resource planning and the like, but it is being held back by obligations within the administration of the total department.

Undoubtedly a need exists to speed up the collection and recording of information. After all, one-third of Australia is under our control and our knowledge of our land mass is not extensive. Rapid upgrading is required.

I remember examining some aerial maps of the area where I farm in Esperance and discovering they were nine years old. That is ridiculous, because the situation in Esperance has changed dramatically over nine years, but modern aerial maps were not available at that time.

Large sums of money are spent on aerial photography by various organisations and businesses and that provides an opportunity for co-ordination and the possibility of covering the whole State at one time. It would be necessary to hire a U2 aircraft from America, but it is possible to photograph the whole State within a month or two with the new equipment and aids which are available. Probably it would cost approximately $1.5 million, but the Department of Lands and Surveys spends between $250 000 and $500 000 a year now on aerial photography and that does not take into account the amount spent by private enterprise.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: They are able to take much more detailed photographs today.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right. Today we have the ability to use certain filters and much more detailed photographs can be obtained. These are the sorts of things which could develop if the department is encouraged to

do so. No only do we have to do more resource planning of this State, but it must be borne in mind also that we have responsibility now for the 200-mile limit at sea and we know nothing about that area. Many of our nautical maps are those which were made by Flinders and other early explorers.

In the case of the ocean, the Navy does a great deal of mapping and on land the Army carries out this function. They both have their own mapping divisions, but much co-ordination is required. Undoubtedly the surveying side of the Department of Lands and Surveys could concentrate more on co-ordinating and correlating the information available already.

In Queensland and New South Wales the survey division of the department has been separated from it. I went to Queensland to look at the situation and saw much advantage in the set-ups from the point of view of mapping, but if the professionals are to be taken out of land administration, gaps undoubtedly will be created and these will have to be filled by the recruiting of professional surveyors to provide the necessary advice in that area.

In this State, private surveyors do most of our actual land surveying and the Government does not employ many surveyors on this work. It is argued by private enterprise that the Government should put out more work to private enterprise as far as aerial photography and the composition of maps is concerned. Private enterprise has been able to fill the needs of the mining industry and it is argued that most of the State's aerial photography needs could be catered for by private enterprise were the work to be put out to tender.

Against this we have the argument that a Government department should have the ability to carry out some, if not all, of this work. I agree the Government should have some resources of this nature. In his second reading speech, the Minister suggested that many other departments have built up surveying and map-making sections and if one group of people were responsible for mapping and surveying, they could do the work for all departments. That sounds all right in theory, but, in practice, it could be likened to the situation which pertains in relation to a typing pool: Once such a pool is created, one finds it is not practical to do all the work for all the Government departments. I am not sure whether it would be possible to have a "department of surveys" and not allow any other Government department to do surveying. That does not happen now, because when one reads the annual reports of Government departments one sees the survey fees charged to other Government departments by the Department of Lands and Surveys in the last financial year. For example, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority was charged $4 500. One can thus work out how much planning that department must do itself. Similarly, the Forests Department was charged $2 700 which represents a mere token of the work which must be going on within those departments.

Nevertheless, I do not feel departments should be prevented from having some expertise in this area. I recall when the computer committee was established with the original intention to stop departments buying expensive computers and duplicating that sort of equipment. However, I wonder whether that policy has held us back, because nowadays a small computer costs little more than a typewriter and yet all requests for such equipment must be presented to the committee. As a result, Government departments lag behind private industry in the use of mini computers.

Undoubtedly private enterprise has developed expertise in mapping and aerial surveying. The Government should make use of these groups and the Department of Lands and Surveys should spend more of its time correlating the information collected.

In his second reading speech the Minister referred to conclusions arrived at by consultant reviews being taken into account before a decision is made whether to split the department in two and prior to making a decision as to whether the private sector is able to fill some of the needs in the mapping and survey areas. The Minister went on to say—

> A final decision will be dependent on the conclusion of consultant review, a comprehensive review of the Land Act and associated legislation, the determination of an overall legal charter for the Surveyor General, and an assessment of associated cost factors.

I am not sure whether the Parliament should make the decision as to whether a department like this should be split in two or whether that is the task of the Executive. That is something this House will have to determine. We are being asked to make changes to the Act, so that the Executive Council has the ability to split the department; the Parliament is not being asked to do that.

We have not been given the information on which to base such a decision. Members of this House must make up their minds as to whether they consider it their right to make this decision, or whether they are prepared to pass the three Bills and allow the Executive Council to act after receiving the various reports and recommendations from the Public Service Board.

The Land Amendment Bill (No. 2) refers to the ability of the Minister to grant special leases for a period longer than the presently stipulated period of 21 years. Often it has been found to be the case that people with only a 21-year lease do not receive sufficient support from their bankers and others to enable buildings and so on to be constructed on that land; the holders of 21-year leases have been told often that the tenure is not secure enough for the buildings proposed. I would agree that 21 years is not long enough, and that leases should be for a period a little longer than 21 years; but whether they should be for 50 years is another question. A lease over 50 years is almost a perpetual lease; I would think 50 years would see two generations of buildings. The Minister does not have to grant 50-year leases, but once provision is made for such leases he will be under pressure from those seeking leases to have those leases for the longest period allowable.

Another provision of this third Bill is the ability to convert a special lease to freehold. That provision is good. When a person is granted a lease and develops the area under that lease it is quite ridiculous that at times the land is valued at a higher rate as a result of the development carried out by the holder of the lease. In other words, a person could, say, apply for a lease of a motel site, develop the site, and have the Government say, "Now that the motel is there the site is valuable." When someone negotiates with the Government for a lease he ought to have the right to convert it to freehold after he has carried out certain requirements. A requirement of the lease should be that the lessee be informed of what would be the price of the land when development requirements were met.

I accept that many of the provisions of these Bills should be debated during the Committee stage. However, at this point I look forward to hearing the Minister answer the queries I have raised.

THE HON. NEIL McNEILL (Lower West) [9.05 p.m.]: I must confess I feel a little timid in rising to speak to the Bills before the House; I follow a former Minister for Lands, and the Hon. A. A. Lewis, the Chairman of the National Parks Select Committee.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: How do you think I feel?

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: The Hon. A. A. Lewis made pungent comments and criticisms of the Government for its introduction of these Bills, and referred particularly to certain provisions. I must confess also that I will not try to emulate either of those gentlemen; rather, I will make some brief comments about the general nature of these Bills.

I will refer to them concurrently, as is the intention of the House. It was interesting that reference was made to the Bills being debated concurrently rather than the generally used term "cognately". Bills taken cognately are those which have a great deal in common—kindred Bills. It could be said that these Bills are kindred Bills in that they emanate from the same source, the Minister for Lands. However, they are not kindred Bills in terms of the provisions included; in fact, they are quite different in that regard.

The two previous speakers to whom I have referred, and the Hon. Jim Brown who led for the Opposition, made the point to a greater or lesser extent that the first Bill deals essentially with reserves, as its name indicates. In fact, it deals essentially with the granting of reservations, the revocation of reservations, and the machinery associated with those actions. The Hon. David Wordsworth dealt with those matters at great length.

The Land Amendment Bill deals with easements, and is quite unrelated to the first Bill. The easements are those over Crown land and reserves, matters which have nothing in common with the first Bill.

The Land Amendment Bill (No. 2) deals totally with the reorganisation of the Department of Lands and Surveys. I understand the Bill is an interim step towards further reorganisation contemplated by the Government, a reorganisation which may be brought into effect within the next year or so.

The Department of Lands and Surveys, and the matters it administers, conjure in the minds of people all that is staid, conservative and slow moving in Government services, and that is saying something. This is a general attitude which I am sure the public at large have of the operation and administration of the Department of Lands, as we are beginning to term it. A very good reason exists for this attitude; in fact, some historical justification is available for it. We must not forget that land has been, is, and will continue to be the basis of wealth—

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: And civilisation.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: —and civilisation, not just the human civilisation. The territorial aspect is important; land is common to all species as we know them. Land is the basic justification for the role that the department plays in this State, and similar departments play in every country of the world. Land is the ultimate of all resources.

For these reasons the department, and land, occupy the prime position in our society. It follows from that fact that anything which happens to land—any changes proposed in the administration of land—must be subject to the greatest possible scrutiny in order to ensure that the circumstances leading to our present position are protected faithfully and properly.

It is too late after action has been taken to find that the action should not have been taken. The repercussions of those changes are always far reaching in all manners of ways, on which I will not elaborate. In part those repercussions were referred to by the Hon. David Wordsworth in the latter part of his remarks.

I agree with the sentiments of the Hon. Jim Brown. Although the words in these Bills are important, their backgrounds and effects are more important.

After that long preamble I come to the point of giving my reasons for making any comment at all on these Bills. They are much too important to be passed without my making some comment on them. My main aim in rising was to add emphasis to the comments made by other speakers on the question of reserves. For those of us who have lived all our lives in country areas it is well known that the question of reserves is a matter for everyday conversation. I expect I share the experiences of many people who at many times have had cause to express apprehension and even dissatisfaction in regard to the existence of reserves, and vesting orders attached to those reserves.

In addition, the number of reserves that exist and the number of statutory purposes for which they exist cause concern. As time goes on, the purposes for these reserves have become lost in antiquity, and certainly the reasons for maintaining certain reserves have long been forgotten. I hesitated to use the word "maintain", because I meant to refer to the lack of maintenance of these reserves. All sorts of problems are associated with reserves, problems which I am sure most members representing country provinces appreciate. For that reason I welcome some of the amendments contained in the Acts Amendment (Reserves) Bill.

I support the provisions to cover the creation of reserves, and particularly the provision relating to specified purposes instead of a multiplicity of purposes as currently contained in the Act. Even more so I support the approach of making it possible to have reserves revoked. As the Hon. David Wordsworth said, it may be true that there has never been a case involving the taking back of a reserve or the revoking of a vesting order, but that is not to say that in the minds of many people many examples are available of the need for this course of action. I expect that course may be due to a lack of notification, if nothing else.

I support enthusiastically the provisions to which I have just made reference, and support similarly the provision for management plans to be submitted. I respect the opinion of the Hon. Sandy Lewis, and accept that with his knowledge he may well have a point of view that may not be available to others—he was the Chairman of the National Parks Select Committee. Perhaps I did not give that committee's report the study it deserved. He may well have justification for his point of view, but at present I will support the provision for management plans.

In regard to the Land Amendment Bill, which refers to the granting of easements, again the Hon. Sandy Lewis was most critical of its provisions. He was concerned for the protection and preservation of Crown land, and particularly "A"-class reserves.

I agree with the views expressed by the Hon. David Wordsworth in relation to Class "A" reserves. I believe that classifications of reserves have been granted too easily in the past, and that in this present day when demands and representations being made for various types of reserves are increasing it could well be possible, if not probable, that more and more reserves will be created. I would like to think that additional care will be taken to ensure that no-one goes overboard in the granting of reserves.

Perhaps the need for reserves now is not as great as it once was. The Hon. David Wordsworth said that in excess of 530 reserves were granted last year. Earlier in our history there would have been greater justification for granting reserves. At that time the Administration of the State would have been trying to find its feet and trying to assess the areas of land where reservations should be made. Those decisions can now be made with a great deal more knowledge and accuracy than was perhaps possible in the past.

We note in this Bill that an historical oversight has been corrected in relation to additions to Class "A" reserves.

I would like to think that not only should the revocation of Class "A" reserves come to Parliament for approval, but also the granting of Class "A" reserves.

I understand, in relation to the Land Amendment Bill, that where easements are granted they will be reported to Parliament accordingly. They will not come before Parliament to have the provisions of the Interpretation Act applied; they will

simply be reported to Parliament. I am prepared to accept that, but I am not prepared to accept that that will be a sufficient safeguard. I have in mind the comments made by the Hon. David Wordsworth in regard to the installation of the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline. From my meagre experience of easements and the problems encountered in my province when it has been necessary for the SEC to have easements over private land, I know the SEC has been reluctant to divert from its surveyed course to go across Crown land. That reluctance may be understood a little better after the introduction of this Bill, because of the documentation and legalities that are involved.

More important is the attitude of responsibility of the departmental officers, heads of departments, and perhaps even Ministers who administer some of these Crown lands, and their attitude towards public utilities in relation to the approval or refusal of these easements. It was the belief of a large number of people in the south-west that the SEC preferred to cross private land, notwithstanding the work involved and, to some extent, the cost incurred. It was thought that the SEC would rather do that than meet opposition from other Government departments. Apart from the departmental opposition there was also the fear that the application would be lost in the organisation, bureaucracy, and legalities. If the Bill does something to ease the current problems it will certainly be an advantage.

I refer now to the Land Amendment Bill (No. 2) which deals with the reorganisation of the Department of Lands and Surveys. Initial steps will be taken to separate the administrative from the professional side of operations, or vice versa. I am prepared to accept there has been an overlap in these two areas, perhaps again as a consequence of history.

My concern will be to ensure that the role of the Surveyor General will be preserved. The office which is of great historical significance and importance to Western Australia is, of course, the office of Surveyor General. Notwithstanding the changes that have taken place due to circumstances, and the changes that continue to take place in view of advancing technology, it is my belief that the position which holds the most responsibility is that of Surveyor General. In the next year or so I will certainly be watchful of what happens in the proposed changes.

Having stressed the importance of these Bills and having supported the sentiments of other members in this House in relation to the administration of land in a State such as Western Australia, it continues to be a source of some wonder to me that the ministry of Lands occupies the relatively junior position that it does. I do not know how it started or what were its responsibilities in the beginning, but we certainly know what the responsibilities have been during the last generation, responsibilities which the Hon. David Wordsworth and other members know have been essential to the administration of the Department of Lands and Surveys. All important though those responsibilities may be, there is nothing more important to most people than that piece of paper that is a title of land. Notwithstanding that, I am one of those who firmly believes that the office of the Minister for Lands should carry greater responsibility in respect of the management of that land. Many other portfolios share an interest in land. The Minister for Fuel and Energy has land responsibilities; the Minister for Works has land responsibilities; most Ministers have land responsibilities. I failed to mention the most important portfolio; that is the Minister for Primary Industry, who has land responsibilities.

There have been stages in history where the portfolios of Land and Agriculture have been combined. It would be of great advantage to have the ministry of Land upgraded in terms of Cabinet and Governmental responsibility.

I am prepared to support these three Bills the overall aim of which, as claimed by the Minister, is to facilitate organisation, which will result in a streamlining exercise. I believe this will occur because there is ample opportunity for it to happen. One thing that is equally important as the alteration of laws and regulations is a change of attitude of those who administer them. I welcome the moves and qualify that statement only to the extent that I am prepared to give a little support to the views put forward by the Hon. Sandy Lewis. I must confess I did not find him to be very persuasive last night. He has persuaded me on other occasions far more than he did last night. Some points he made are worthy of comment, and we should not just believe that the only people who can be responsible for management balance and for a whole host of other things in relation to parks and reserves are to be found in the Public Service and in the Department of Lands and Surveys itself. I do not subscribe to that view and I believe many people would agree with me.

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

CANCER COUNCIL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 October.

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [9.29 p.m.]: I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate on this Bill. In particular I address my remarks to the Hon. Graham MacKinnon and the Hon. Norman Baxter who made a very erudite, learned and comprehensive contribution to the debate and I associate myself with the comments they made in expression of appreciation to those who have been associated with this council for a long time.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott did a lot of preparation in regard to this Bill and although many of the questions she raised did not relate in any way to the Bill, some did, and I have taken the opportunity of preparing replies to all the questions she asked. The Hon. Lyla Elliott disputed the contention that the Cancer Council is commonly seen as a Government department and that this has a restricting effect on its fund raising. She referred to the year 1980-81 when the council received $143 522 in donations and $633 303 in bequests and legacies. The answer to her question is—

> The day-to-day experience of those working for and with the Cancer Council has suggested that fund raising has been inhibited by the close Government relationship. The public have given generous support over the years and even better support is anticipated as a result of the proposed changes.
>
> The figures used in relation to bequests and legacies need to be looked at carefully, because this source of income is inconsistent from year to year. For example, in the year 1980-81 used by the Hon. Lyla Elliott, one bequest accounted for $250 000.

Her second question dealt with the fact that as no beds are set aside especially for cancer patients in any of the teaching hospitals, including Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, what had become of an institute for which the public subscribed? The answer is—

> Ward C19 at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital is a specialised oncology (cancer) facility and there is an equivalent facility at Royal Perth Hospital.
>
> Western Australian standards of treatment for cancer sufferers are now amongst the best in the world. This is no less so because the facilities are not under the direct banner of the institute.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Are you saying there are special beds for cancer patients?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: Yes.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is not in line with the answer from the Minister who said there are no special beds.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I can only repeat the answer I have been given which is that ward C19 at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital is a specialised oncology facility.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The Minister for Health did not tell me that.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I make the point that the treatment of cancer in both the public and private sectors in Western Australia is of a high state of excellence.

The third question asked by the Hon. Lyla Elliott was whether the Cancer Council had fulfilled the functions of the Act by closing the institute because the public subscribed funds for the purpose of establishing the institute. The Hon. Norm Baxter dealt with this point, but I have additional information. The answer is—

> It is untrue to state that the institution has closed down. It continues to function as before and the only change is in how it is managed. It is now an integral part of the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre and functions as the major focus of the highly complex radiotherapeutic oncological treatment for the State.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott commented on "the high proportion of the council's funds spent under the heading of management and general, compared with that of New South Wales". The answer to that point is—

> The Cancer Council's annual report for 1980-81 includes in its "Management and General" expenses for fund raising such as $70 388 for promotional advertising.
>
> As a percentage of income, all of the council's management including fund raising amounts to 14 per cent.
>
> The council's "Management and General" expenses include delivery of all patient welfare programmes, fund raising, general administration and rent.
>
> The 37 per cent figure used by Miss Elliott presumably includes the cost of the council's registry work—leukemia, cancer and bone tissue—as well as mastectomy rehabilitation work.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Of course it doesn't; look at the report. I especially took the figures

from the report. These things are not listed under "Management and General".

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I refer the Hon. Lyla Elliott to the point that as a percentage of income, all the council's management, including fund raising, amounts to 14 per cent, which is one of the lowest figures in Australia. The answer continues—

> With regard to research, the figures include only actual payments to researchers, which overlooks amounts committed for future expenditure. The council's expenditure on research fluctuates, depending upon the quality of research personnel available.

Miss Elliott's next question was—

> Is the Government doing enough in this important field (medical expenses, patient welfare, research, etc.)

The answer is—

> Western Australia has excellent data about those afflicted by cancer both through its hospital morbidity statistics and other sources of notification such as laboratory reports. All of this information is collated and the cancer register recently has been arranged in such a fashion that computer application can be applied. Dr Hatton is the Director of the Cancer Register. Western Australia has long been renowned for its epidemiology work, and current studies in many forms of cancer are in progress such as Dr Bruce Armstrong's study of the epidemiology of breast cancer.
>
> The Cancer Council, Public Health Department, Department of Hospital and Allied Services, and private hospitals and doctors, all contribute to the treatment of cancer and each has its own particular role to play. The important thing to realise is that in this State all of the agencies work closely together and there is no need for a separate cancer institute.

The next question asked by the Hon. Lyla Elliott was as follows—

> How many epidemiological studies have been carried out in this State by the Public Health Department or other Government Departments to check the effects of industrial chemicals and other environmental hazards on the health of workers?

The answer is that a very quick check has identified at least 12 studies of this kind. They are as follows—

> (1) The asbestos study—follow up study of Wittenoom residents and workers (on-going).
> (2) Follow up of Kalgoorlie goldminers and collie coalminers (published in *British Journal of Industrial Medicine*).
> (3) Recent mortality study of fire fighters in Western Australia.
> (4) Risk of melanoma from UV radiation exposure (outdoor exposure at work).
> (5) On-going study of neural tube defects (congenital malformation register).
> (6) Participation in national study—mesothelioma surveillance programme.
> (7) Study of vanadium workers.
> (8) Study of bakers.
> (9) Study of cat litter workers.
> (10) Brucellosis, leptospirosis and Q fever in abattoir workers.
> (11) All miners in Western Australia are regularly examined and the results are published in the annual report of the Commissioner of Public Health.
>
> In addition to the above, epidemiological studies, investigative studies, have been carried out on a large number of chemicals and their use in the work place, e.g. urea-formaldehyde, 2-nitropropane, glycol-ethers, polychlorinated biphenyls, pentachlorphenol, creosote.

The seventh question asked by the honourable member was what studies, if any, had been conducted among the population at Kwinana. The answer is as follows—

> Cancer mortality rates have been shown to be higher in industrial areas in many areas overseas not only in the United States but also in the United Kingdom and Europe. This is associated with occupational health hazards and with air pollution. There is no comparable occupational health hazard or air pollution in the Kwinana area. The cancer register will identify local increases in cancer incidence which will permit special investigation. Following the Government's move to make cancer a notifiable disease a full report on cancer incidence in Western Australia will be available early next year. What studies have been made—for example, congenital defects—do not suggest any increased incidence in the Kwinana area, nor is there any suggestion from the hospital morbidity data collection of increased morbidity in that area.

The eighth question asked how long it was before the Government acted in regard to, presumably, the Wittenoom mine. The answer is—

> The Hon. Lyla Elliott can hardly hold this Government responsible for events which took place more than 20 years ago. The Government has indicated that it would consider an application from any person affected by an asbestos related disease from Wittenoom who is not entitled to workers' compensation or other compensation and that each application should be considered on its merits.

The Hon. Graham MacKinnon dealt with this in some detail and length and in rather a more efficient way than I have.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott's ninth question dealt with an article in the Press referring to 2,4-D and she asked why the Government was not active in this area. The answer is that a quick check has identified at least 11 contributions towards research and care, and they are as follows—

(1) University of WA Department of Statistics and Epidemiology.
(2) Occupational Health Services.
(3) Cancer registry and collection of appropriate statistics.
(4) Participation in national mesothelioma surveillance programme.
(5) Monitoring of chemicals in the environment (clean air).
(6) Health education.
(7) Monitoring of food and drugs by the inspection services of the Public Health Department.
(8) Registration of pesticides, pesticide firms and licensing of commercial pesticide operators.
(9) Monitoring of exposure of workers to chemicals in factories, mines and other work places (joint health surveillance of workers with Mines Department, and Labour and Industry Department).
(10) Legislative controls of use of chemicals in the work place. (Health Act, Factories and Shops Act, Mines Regulation Act, etc.)
(11) Participation in medical boards (e.g. Pneumoconiosis Medical Panel).

The tenth question referred to newspaper articles relating to workers at Kwinana and levels of 2,4-D. The answer is—

> In expressing her concern by drawing attention to 2,4-D. levels in workers at Chemical Industries Pty. Ltd. in Kwinana, what the Hon. Lyla Elliott does not say is all the information and all the work has been done by the Government through the Public Health Department. Again it was the Government through its departments which first exposed the problem of increased radiation from the use of monazite tailings from the mineral sands industry. It is the Government again which has taken an active role in encouraging the mining companies, the local authorities; householders, etc., to engage in a co-operative effort to reduce any health risk. It is doubtful if any chemicals anywhere in the world are subjected to such a strict examination and assessment as pesticides in Australia.

This point was made competently earlier by the Hon. Vic Ferry. The Hon. Lyla Elliott asked how much testing had been carried out on the carcinogenic properties of herbicides and pesticides used in agriculture and freely available on supermarket shelves. The answer is—

> Testing for carcinogenic properties is an integral part of the evaluation of agricultural chemicals during the "clearance" procedure of the technical committee on agricultural chemicals, and during scheduling considerations by the poisons schedule standing committee of NHMRC
>
> The recommendations of the technical committee on agricultural chemicals are accepted by all Australian States including Western Australia.
>
> After those processes, the whole matter is again reviewed within this State by the pesticides advisory committee.

The final point the honourable member made was that the Government had a duty to ensure it made the utmost contribution to the fight against this killer disease. I was very pleased, as no doubt was the honourable member at the conclusion of her well-researched address, to receive an indication that she and the Labor Party support the Bill, and I thank her for that. The answer is—

> I agree with her that the Government has a duty to ensure it makes the utmost contribution to the fight against cancer and has no intention whatever of handing over the responsibility to independent bodies. It is the Government's hope that the Cancer Council will go from strength to strength with increasing community support as another weapon in the fight against cancer.

While some of the questions by the Hon. Lyla Elliott were related directly to the Bill, and some were not, out of courtesy to the great deal of research the honourable member had obviously

done in order to pose the questions, I undertook to answer the questions, and hopefully I have done so.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I thank you for at least having the courtesy to answer them. I must say it is more than we have had in respect of other Bills in this Chamber.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: 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 the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), and passed.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 12 October.

THE HON. J. M. BERINSON (North-East Metropolitan) [9.48 p.m.]: This Bill is of such limited scope that I need say no more than that the Opposition supports it.

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 the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Assembly.

DAIRY INDUSTRY AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 13 October.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [9.50 p.m.]: The introduction of this Bill highlights the somewhat of a mess in which the dairy industry finds itself currently. It is difficult for me to make much reference to this Bill, because the House knows that currently an Honorary Royal Commission is inquiring into the dairy industry, after having sat for almost two years, and it is about to bring down some recommendations for which the Government, apparently, is waiting anxiously.

The purpose of the Bill is to allow the transfer of quotas, with the concurrence of the Minister, for an interim period; and the Bill contains a sunset clause. For reasons well known to the two members of this House who are members of the Honorary Royal Commission, the transfer of negotiable milk quotas was frozen; but it has been found that, in certain circumstances, the freeze should be removed by virtue of the Minister's allowing certain transfers to take place, for certain reasons.

Apparently some people were fiddling quotas, and because of that the quota system was frozen. We now find that it is impractical to retain the freeze; and we see the need for some leeway so that transfers for genuine purposes can take place. The Bill gives to the Minister the power to authorise such transfers.

As I said earlier, the Bill contains a sunset clause which, in the circumstances, is certainly warranted. The Government may have to take action at any time when, eventually, the Honorary Royal Commission brings down a report. Many people are awaiting that report.

With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. NEIL McNEILL (Lower West) [9.54 p.m.]: As the Hon. R. T. Leeson has said, the Bill is rather strange in its nature; but it is designed to facilitate the transfer of quotas between dairymen. It is true that currently an Honorary Royal Commission is looking at certain aspects of the dairy industry within the scope of a number of terms of reference, none of which is an examination of the Dairy Industry Act. Therefore, while I am a little diffident, as a member of the Honorary Royal Commission, about touching on matters that are more properly the role of the Honorary Royal Commission, I hope to be able to steer a path rather carefully and tentatively in dealing with the Bill before us.

I wish to correct the Hon. Mr Leeson in regard to the Honorary Royal Commission. In fact, it was appointed last year, so it has been in operation for something approaching 12 months, having begun its life as a Joint Select Committee of the Parliament. Because of the prorogation of the Parliament during the last Christmas-New Year period, the Joint Select Committee was converted to an Honorary Royal Commission. As such, it will report eventually to the Government rather than to the Parliament, which would have been the case had its function and title remained those of a Select Committee.

I turn now to the Bill. In order to understand the Bill and its purposes, I want to deal with the point raised by the Hon. Mr Leeson when he referred to the "mess" in which the dairy industry finds itself. I will put a different construction on the word "mess" because, in fact, the dairy industry is not in a mess but, rather, the transferability of quota is, if not in a mess, certainly in a state of disarray or, at the present time, virtually defunct.

The importance of the quota system—and it is necessary to say this—can be gauged from the value of what is known as a dairyman's quota or a market milk quota. For the benefit of the House—I am sure most members would know of this—we have somewhere in the vicinity of 600 dairy farmers in Western Australia who have market milk quotas. The minimum quota that any dairy farmer holds is 245 litres; and many dairy farmers have quotas many litres above that level of daily production. The maximum or ceiling quota is 1 100 litres; but some dairy farmers have a quota in excess of the maximum of 1 100 litres per day.

The value currently attached to a quota in terms of its surrender to the Dairy Industry Authority is $63 a litre. Before a moratorium was placed on the transfer of quota, the market price varied from $100 a litre to $150 a litre. In that illustration, I am trying to demonstrate what we are talking about—a huge capital investment in terms of the assets of 600 farmers with quotas in excess of 245 litres of milk a day. Most of the farmers have a quota in excess of that amount, and the value of those quotas is not less than $63 a litre. That amounts to a very considerable sum of money, and it is for that reason the question of quotas is of vital commercial importance. That is one of the reasons that this Bill is necessary.

Perhaps another reason for the introduction of this Bill can be traced back to section 30 of the Dairy Industry Act of 1973, a section which provides that quotas can be transferred. It gives recognition to the opportunity of quota transfer in a rather indirect way. The section states that immediately after the coming into operation of the 1973 Act the Dairy Industry Authority established under that Act would prepare recommendations for the manner in which quotas could be transferred and then submit them to the Minister. The Minister was then to give directions back to the DIA for the basis and principles on which transfers could be negotiated. No time was specified other than to say it could be done immediately after the Act's coming into operation.

Section 30 provided also that those recommendations and directions could be given at such other times as found necessary to do so. That is not the precise wording, but that is its intent. The opportunity remained for the Minister to give directions following the receipt of recommendations from the DIA about the process by which quotas could be transferred from one dairy farmer to another. In practice these recommendations or directions virtually have been given on an annual basis, although I am not certain about that; but the fact remains that the Act permits them to be made at such times as seems appropriate.

References are made often about the spirit of the Act as it relates to the transfer and negotiability of quota, and only section 30 deals with transferability. It does not establish guidelines for the transfer of quota but simply indicates that the Minister will give directions as to the basis and principles for the transfer of quota.

It is virtually impossible to ascertain the spirit of the Act. Perhaps the spirit is that we virtually leave it to the Minister to decide and that whatever he has in mind at any time, provided he is not being inconsistent with other sections of the Act, is the spirit and the intention of the Act.

If one wanted to establish the intention of other legislation, it might be possible to go to the Cabinet minutes and find out what the Government had decided. If it were possible with Cabinet Government we could go to the Parliamentary Counsel and ascertain the instructions he had received from the Minister for the preparation of the legislation. In this case such an exercise would be most unrewarding because the intention is simply left to the Minister. That needs to be clearly understood by everyone, particularly people in the dairy industry.

We have had several Ministers administering this Act since 1973. Firstly we had a Labor Government Minister in Mr Dave Evans, and now we have the present Minister, and both have established their own guidelines in terms of directions for the transferability of quotas. Because of the various expressions used from time to time, including those in the Minister's second reading speech to the House, it seems the intentions have been circumvented by the use of certain devices by certain people in their wish to transfer quotas. I find it difficult to establish if such circumvention has taken place when we do not know the intention of the Act. We know that the Minister expresses his intentions by giving directions in writing to the DIA. Although those intentions may be well and legally prepared, they can be subject to various interpretations and definitions, and this has happened.

The DIA receives these directions from the Minister and implements policy based on those di-

rections as it perceives them. In turn this has given rise to the opportunity for the transfer of quota from one farmer to another on a walk-in-walk-out basis in which property also might be transferred, because all those intentions and the interpretations placed on them have meant that the opportunity has been given to people to transfer quota with some property arrangement whereby property is to be transferred in a *de facto* way and the property is then to be transferred back to the original owner after the quota has been purchased. That procedure has secured the endorsement of the DIA and therefore presumably is within the interpretation of the intention of the Minister's direction. This has been so for many years.

The situation which brought about the moratorium—the total prohibition on transfers—was an extension of that scheme whereby certain people wished to transfer quota or to arrange for the transfer of some quota—bearing in mind that very considerable sums of money might be involved—to provide some other little circumstance perhaps involving the leasing of some part of a property or an entire property. That seemed to go beyond the intention of the Act and what were considered to be the intentions of the Minister, and therefore it was deemed to be circumventing the intention of the Act.

However, it is difficult to know whether that is legally the situation, because to my knowledge that procedure has never been challenged. The opportunity to challenge and the opportunity to appeal against a decision involving transferability or the refusal of transferability by the DIA exists in the Act in the reference to a quota appeals committee. Among other reasons, that reference is there in the event that an aggrieved party considers the DIA has not implemented or its policy is not implementing precisely the intentions of the Minister. That person can go to the appeal committee to lodge his appeal based on the fact that the authority has not exercised its powers precisely in terms of the Minister's directions.

Again, I do not know all the circumstances under which that has happened; certainly it has not happened in those cases which of recent times have brought this matter to a head and have brought about the moratorium. I suppose this whole circumstance highlights a number of things, particularly the very great difficulty found in legislation which attempts to spell out precisely the absolute intention of the Minister or the Government. That is very difficult because once a Bill is printed and becomes an Act its intention is immediately lost sight of. All that is left is the interpretation which legally and validly can be placed on the provisions of an Act. It highlights the difficulty with this legislation inasmuch as section 30 of the Act does not spell out any guidelines at all other than to indicate that the Minister should give his directions as to the Act's purposes. All in all it is something of an object lesson for those who wish to spell out in legislation the intent of that legislation when creating this sort of orderly marketing arrangement for the control of production, which is what has happened in this industry—it has control of production exercised through a quota system. This is just another instance of the difficulties that can arise.

I suppose it might be said that if it were believed by the Minister and the DIA that the intention of the Act was being circumvented, an easy solution could be found in that all the Minister need do is to give other directions; in other words, he could set out such words as would limit the opportunity of varying the interpretations and so make his intentions much more precise. By that means he might prevent the so-called devices being employed to circumvent his intentions. The fact that he has not done this demonstrates the very great difficulty involved in doing just that. If he were to do that we would immediately have people setting out to establish what he really intended and not necessarily attempting to get around his intentions.

I accept the need for the legislation; in the present circumstances I do not know what else could be done. When the moratorium was initially applied to the transfer of quota I must confess I thought it was a little ham-fisted, because it was imposed suddenly without much regard for a number of negotiations which were in the pipeline. It was found necessary to lift the embargo for a short time so that those negotiations could be concluded. The negotiations being concluded, the moratorium was reimposed, and it continues to be in existence.

Again, it could be claimed that it was still possible for the Minister, in the light of all his experience, to attempt to spell out new directions to make transferability permissible. However, it would have been unwise for the Minister to attempt that for the reason mentioned by the Hon. Ron Leeson; namely, the possible recommendations to be made by the Honorary Royal Commission. When the commission makes its recommendations which the Government might accept they might have some considerable bearing on the transferability or otherwise of quota, so it would be pointless for the Minister to set in motion a new policy on this matter only to find that in the near future the commission recommends a quite different direction. That likewise would

make for a messy situation, to use Mr Leeson's expression.

The Bill is acceptable to me; it is probably the only way—unsatisfactory as it may seem—to overcome this difficult situation. I repeat that the introduction of the Bill is not necessary simply because there are people who wish to transfer quota and who are prepared to go to all sorts of lengths to facilitate those transfers for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the commercial advantage in so doing. A more valid reason is found in the initial wording of the Act.

It seems there was no alternative other than to introduce this Bill because of the loose wording of section 30 of the Act. I understand the loose wording was deliberate because the alternative would have been to spell out the precise guidelines under which transfers or negotiability of quota could be arranged, and this could have produced more difficult circumstances than those we have experienced in recent years.

That, particularly in this House, is the way of legislation. Once we try with our best intentions to establish statutory guidelines in Acts of Parliament, they become so inflexible as to be unworkable.

I support the Bill. I welcome the fact that the Bill has a sunset clause and that it will die on 31 December 1983, if not sooner, in the event of the Honorary Royal Commission bringing down recommendations which could resolve this situation more satisfactorily than is currently the case. This has been a much talked about subject for the commercial reasons I referred to previously, but this is not the most important subject in the dairy industry. The 600 dairy farmers in this State are not preoccupied with it to the extent of pushing away all other interests and dealing only with negotiability of quota. It is an important question to them. Farmers are not pushing to sell their quotas. Most dairy farmers are continuing to farm their quotas. This aspect has contributed to some dissatisfaction and disquiet in the industry, but it is by no means the most important problem or issue confronting the dairy industry in this State. The most important questions are those directed to us by the 600 dairy farmers concerning total production in the future rather than by those few farmers who are preoccupied with the question of negotiability of quota.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [10.17 p.m.]: I wish to record my support for the Bill before the House. It is a case of my having to support it as this is necessary for the good order and discipline of the industry and is brought about by a set of circumstances with which the Hon. Neil McNeill dealt. The Hon. Neil McNeill spelled out fairly clearly his views in regard to the dairy industry and the effect of the amendment in this Bill.

Those of us who were associated with the original legislation in 1973 will remember the trauma and the controversy that occurred in the fashioning of the legislation. It was very controversial legislation and many difficulties flowed from the Bill. It has become an Act since then and unfortunately the dairy industry has not had the benefit of the guidance from legislation that so many people in the industry look and hope for. There are many reasons that has not happened. The Bill is necessary to allow a certain feature of the industry to proceed in respect of quotas.

I am not privy to the deliberations of the Honorary Royal Commission which is, I understand, in the concluding stages of looking into the dairy industry. I look forward with interest to the report of that commission and I hope it will make some extremely worth-while recommendations and the Government will take heed of those recommendations for the benefit of this very essential industry to Western Australia. The Honorary Royal Commission has been working, I understand, very diligently indeed and with great earnestness it has examined the industry throughout Australia, and not just in Western Australia. It has had regard also for the industry in other countries and I think the commission's information in that regard will be of benefit to the industry.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [10.20 p.m.]: I thank the three members who have spoken in favour of the legislation. I certainly will not take issue with the Hon. Neil McNeill as he has a very deep interest in the subject of the dairy industry and also has great knowledge in this field. I understand he has made some fairly substantial speeches in this place at different times and I do not intend to encourage him to repeat them tonight.

The first step in taking some control of the quota system and the transfer of quotas was an embargo, which is due to be lifted on 18 November of this year; so it was quite obvious that the Minister needed to take some other measures. Hopefully—and I am quite sure this will be the case—when the Honorary Royal Commission brings forward its report it will have grappled with these problems and we may have some stability and better control of the quota system. It is an important industry. Large sums of

money are invested in the industry and the quota system is there to protect and to regulate as far as possible the dairy industry of Western Australia.

It is important to note—and other speakers have mentioned this—that a sunset clause is included in the legislation, to 31 December 1983. We hope the Bill ceases to have effect by that time, if the Honorary Royal Commission is able to submit a worth-while report and a solution to the problems we are experiencing now.

I spoke to one of the departmental officers today on this subject to ascertain what are the problems and I was astounded to hear about the way some people were able to circumvent the present regulations, and about the wheeling and dealing that is done. It left me with a clear impression that the Minister had no alternative but to take action to try to bring some control into this matter. It really was getting out of hand.

I am sure the Minister is not looking forward to having the responsibility that is implicit in this legislation. It certainly places a great responsibility on him. My understanding is that the Minister will set guidelines for the Dairy Industry Authority and in the event of applications outside those guidelines, the Minister will use his discretion, and that will be difficult. Obviously, he will have to be advised by experts in the dairy industry before he makes these sorts of decisions. I do not think the Minister is happy—if that is the right word—with the legislation, but there is no alternative.

I appreciate the interest shown by members in this matter and the understanding that they have for the problems of the Minister and the Government. We hope the Honorary Royal Commission will bring forward recommendations which will give greater stability and comfort to the industry and that the industry will progress in the future to the benefit of the public of Western Australia.

I thank members for their 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 the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Labour and Industry), and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.25 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 26 October.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: ORDINARY

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Electoral Rolls: Joint Federal and State

THE HON. ROBERT HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [10.27 p.m.]: I feel I cannot let the House adjourn without making some reference to a report in today's *The West Australian* in which for a brief moment it appears that the Australian Labor Party found itself with very strange bedfellows. If the report is correct, it indicates also that four members of the Liberal Party experienced a moment of truth when they discovered that although they might have believed their own propaganda, they tended to be called into line when they transgressed party policy. Of course, in the Labor Party that is no problem. A policy is laid down and we are expected to abide by it. We know it and we admit it. We do not pretend to go off airing and flexing our own consciences. We know we have to follow the platform of the party to which we can ourselves democratically contribute.

However, the interesting thing is that apparently four candidates in my potential new electorate of South-East Metropolitan Province, for which I will be member next year after the election and after May, suddenly found that it would be desirable to have a one-roll plan for electors. According to the Press—

> . . . they were finding—as had all political candidates before them—that there was far too much confusion among electors over the need to enrol twice.
>
> Many had enrolled for either Commonwealth or State and mistakenly believed they had done their duty for both.
>
> The candidates proposed a single register enabling electors to enrol simultaneously for both Commonwealth and State elections.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: That seems to be a good idea.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: The article continues—

> Commonwealth and State electoral offices could work from the same register, while compiling their own separate rolls, electorate by electorate, from the master list.
>
> This would save time and confusion for electors and officials and result in substantial savings in the cost of maintaining the rolls.

The Hon. Tom Stephens: They must be trying to corrupt the system.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Of course we would agree with this. We applaud the perspicacity of the four Liberal candidates in this report. It is unlikely they will be here next year; but of course they had their moment of truth because it is reported that one of the candidates after talking to the Chief Secretary (the Hon. R. G. Pike) grappled with the crowd by waving a submission pending further talks with Mr Pike. Apparently that is a case where freedom for the pike is death to the minnows!

I find it rather interesting that one of the experienced 60-year-old candidates for the Liberal Party could be so naive as to believe he could say this sort of thing in politics and get away with it. People who are going to stand for political parties should be better informed than this. The other thing that interested me was that the experience of those four Liberal candidates has confirmed, according to their public statement, what Labor policy has been saying for quite a long time—the people are confused.

After I had been to Tom Price and received a great deal of abuse—some in my presence and some in my absence—I mentioned I thought that people were confused. They thought they were enrolled, when in fact they were not. They informed me they were enrolled for the State and brought out a Commonwealth registration card. People tend to be confused, particularly those in the mining areas which have a transient population of people who come from other States; where they are more civilised in their electoral practices.

I note that the Minister today gave us the information that only two States do not have a common roll—they were Western Australia and Queensland—the States of the great gerrymanders. In Queensland the Premier (Mr Joh Bjelke-Petersen) has followed a long tradition, which was followed by the Labor Party for many years, of fiddling the electorates to suit himself. In Queensland it is possible for the National Party to be elected to Government on 19 per cent of the votes.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The Labor Party Premier Ryan introduced it.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I know where it came from and I am also fully aware, as is the Chief Secretary, that the last Labor Premier of Queensland was Vincent Gair who had, one gathers, virtually the same kind of philosophy as our Chief Secretary, and finished up leaving the Queensland Labor Party then being in the Democratic Labor Party, then the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I was not a member of the DLP as a lot of good Catholics were.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: And quite a number of bad ones too.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I am pleased to note that the Minister had the honesty and perhaps the intelligence to go straight from the Labor Party to the Liberal Party, without needing the crutch of the DLP in between. That is one of the few things that are to his credit.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is a patronising comment.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Did Labor try to get one card when in power in this State?

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I get a little tired of the comment "What did the Labor Party do when it was in power?" It certainly did nothing in the many years it was in power in the 1930s and 1940s because it did not seem to be the thing in those days. I do not find it any kind of argument to have someone quote to me what the Labor Party did or did not do in the past.

After all, if the Labor Party still had its original platform it would believe in a policy of racial purity for Australia because that was in the original platform. Things have changed. The Labor Party is a party which grows, develops and progresses. We are the progressive party in this State and have progressively advocated joint rolls for Federal and State elections. It would be helpful not only to the electors but to the electoral officers and the parties also.

The Chief Secretary will find out, when we eventually introduce it, that it is also useful for party organisation. A party can be organised on subdivisional lines where there are common subdivisions between Federal and State seats. It does simplify party organisation as well as the whole political process and makes it easier for the electors to understand.

When I was referring to the Minister for Labour and Industry the other evening I pointed

out that the Liberal Party seems to be in the hands of the *petit bourgeoisie* reactionaries. The Chief Secretary certainly fits the pattern quite well; so I suppose I will have to wait a little longer for understanding and frankness in the Liberal Party before this reform—so well advocated by four of its candidates—will be brought into being. I suppose the lack of political nous shown by the candidates will result in their not being elected, so they will not be here to embarrass their party.

In some ways it is a pity but I think we can do well without them; despite their progressive ideas. They have been whipped into line with the whip wielded so competently by the Chief Secretary.

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [10.35 p.m.]: In answer I should now proceed to wield the whip on the Labor Party.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: As usual we will be unbloodied and unbowed.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: With its usual hypocrisy—

Several members interjected.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I will deal with the matter which has been raised by the member with some facts which will illustrate my point because it involves the personalities of the Labor Party. Its members are insincere, incompetent and hypocritical. Mr Hetherington made reference to statements he made previously and I will quote from *Hansard* of 11 May 1982, page 1548 where he said—

> I can certainly inform the Chief Secretary and all his minions baying behind him, that when I knock on doors and ask people if they are enrolled, I do not inquire about their politics.

In the same debate on page 1552 Mr Dans said—

> I had enrolled hundreds of people before the system of having a JP witness the enrolment was introduced. Not once have I asked a person which political party he supported.

Very significantly, in a similar debate on the same Bill in the other place on 12 May, as reported on page 1752 of *Hansard*, Mr Jamieson said—

> If the person says straightaway that he is a Liberal supporter, one does not offer him the same sort of service . . .
>
> . . . If one gives the elector the service, one is likely to get the service from the elector. That is the sensible approach to take. However, if a person obviously does not support me, I do not persist with my endeavours to put him on the roll. One would have to be mad to do that.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Is this your answer to the argument about joint rolls, Mr Minister?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the Minister alluding to a debate in the current session of the Parliament?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: It is not the current session it is the previous session. To continue Mr Jamieson's comment—

> When one is canvassing, one goes from door to door and finds out the position; that is what canvassing is all about. It always has been like that and if anybody has been doing it in any other way, he is crazy.

The reason I make those points is I wish to illustrate the hypocrisy of the Labor Party. I do not for one moment doubt the sincerity of Mr Hetherington or Mr Dans and what they said in that debate of the last session. I do not doubt what Mr Jamieson said but these facts highlight to the House the manifest hypocrisy of his party.

When one is making a decision as a responsible Minister in a Government—which is a very responsible and competent Government—one must take into account the views of people who are the members of the other place and have regard for their sincerity. Clearly the insincerity and hypocrisy of the Labor Party has been highlighted. Mr Hetherington referred to an article which reported that four candidates made a statement which they subsequently withdrew.

The honourable member would be aware of the fact, and he certainly highlighted the point that Mr Lewis illustrated to this House yesterday when he said that the Liberal Party, unlike the Labor Party does not accept direction as a fact of life.

I would like to make the further point that we have a situation in which the Hon. Ron Thompson was emasculated by his Labor Party when he stuck to his principles and ended a magnificent career in this place—the Labor Party had no greater man dedicated to the principles of that party.—

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: It is not true.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The people of Western Australia should be aware of the sort of control this party exercises.

The four Liberal Party candidates withdrew their statements. It does not mean they will not seek to have them discussed with me at some time. The matter may be subject of a debate at another time. When people come to me they are given the courtesy of a discussion.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you deny the rolls are in a mess?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The Hon. Robert Hetherington said that this problem also existed in Queensland. When the Labor Party had gerrymandered—those were his words—electorates there and that was in the past, and that they were not like that at present. He said that it is not yesterday which counts but today. I say—after quoting the background—that illustrates the hypocrisy of this socialist Labor Party.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to cease interjecting and I suggest to the Minister that I can hear him.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I wish to quote a figure which was mentioned at the recent conference which took place in this Parliament where an eminent New South Wales leader said, and confirmed to me afterwards, that in the last election in New South Wales, Premier Wran—the current Labor Party Premier, mark the word "current"—and the President of the Australian Labor Party of the Commonwealth, in the State of New South Wales with 55.4 per cent of the vote captured 70 per cent of the seats.

How can members in this House, knowing those facts, begin to say that the Labor Party is in no way what it used to be years ago? That illustrates the hypocrisy of the Labor Party when it says that what the party did in the past is not relevant. I am saying that it is and that illustrates the very hypocrisy of the party. An additional point I wish to make is; Before the last election, "The Laurie Oakes Report", of 8 November 1978, drew attention to those facts, as follows—

> In a move which received little publicity, the NSW Labor Premier, Mr. Wran, has ensured that he will be in control of the upcoming redistribution of State electoral boundaries. Under new administrative arrangements the Electoral Office, which used to be part of the Services Department, has been transferred to the Premiers' Department. This means Mr. Wran will preside personally over a redrawing of electoral boundaries which senior ALP men are confident will keep them in office for many years.
>
> According to one labor source, "We are going to do a job". But he added, in amused parody of the Premier, "It will be a stable and moderate redistribution".

What is stable and moderate about a redistribution which gives the incumbent Labor Premier and the incumbent President of the Labor Party in that State 70 per cent of the seats with 54 per cent of the vote? That is the manifest hypocrisy of this party. The moment they get into power in this State—which, hopefully, will not come about—we will see imposed upon this Parliament the vicious, socialist control about which we all know.

In case members think this hypocrisy is confined to New South Wales, let me quote from *The Age* of 15 April 1982; I just happened to come across this article, which is headed, "Cain won't renew poll pledge on taxes". The article states—

> The Premier Mr Cain yesterday refused to renew an election pledge that State Government taxes would not be increased for the next three years.

With the Labor Opposition in this House, we have a continual parroting of Trades Hall directions.

The Hon. Tom Stephens: You should know; you were a member of the Labor Party for long enough.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: Yes, but I saw the light. We saw during the debate on the Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill (No. 2) the constant upglances by members of the Opposition to their managers in the Public Gallery. We know members of the Labor Party are subject to such supervision whenever they speak in this place and when they come up for re-election. If that is not the case, let them take on, confront, and challenge that authority which is ruthlessly imposed upon them by Trades Hall.

I say again that members of the Parliamentary Labor Party accept that sort of direction as a fact of life.

Legislative Council: Abolition

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I go on to make the point lest I forget to make any of these points in response to the fatuous presentation of the Hon. Robert Hetherington, that not so long ago, his party was saying, "Yes, we have altered the State platform of the Labor Party. We will continue to have a Legislative Council, but it will be a gutted, emasculated Legislative Council. We think the electors of Western Australia will accept that. We might be able to sell them a pup." Unfortunately, the Federal conference altered that platform and gave the Western Australian party a clear direction that Labor would retain its commitment to the abolition of the States' upper Houses; in other words, the Legislative Councils of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania would all disappear under Labor Governments.

Let us recollect Whitlam's Chifley Memorial Lecture in which he called upon members like those sitting opposite and said, "You have a duty

to vote yourselves out of existence, to transfer control to a centralised Government in Canberra." We also recall Bob Hawke's Boyer lectures in which, in a more direct and stronger way, he likewise called upon members of the Labor Party to move for the abolition of State Government

Yet tonight we see the hypocrisy of members opposite. Four candidates made a point in regard to electoral rolls. However, they committed the cardinal sin of changing their minds. The Labor Party trys to hype it up and make it into a big deal. At the same time as we had Mr Hetherington making his statements—I have given members the facts and figures relating to those—we have Mr Jamieson in another place repudiating everything that was said. So, we have a clear dichotomy within the ranks of the State Labor Party, which reveals the hypocrisy of members of the Labor Party.

Finally, I make the point that the coalition parties in this State are dedicated to the proposition of retaining a bicameral system of Parliament. Lest my intentions be misunderstood, I say clearly and without any ambiguity that the Western Australian coalition Government remains opposed to a joint roll primarily because, as a sovereign Government, we do not intend to surrender our electoral laws and systems to any other jurisdiction.

Electoral Rolls: Joint Federal and State

THE HON. J. M. BERINSON (North-East Metropolitan) [10.51 p.m.]: The Chief Secretary is the Minister in charge of this State's electoral system, and it is no wonder the system continues in such a sorry mess. The subject raised by the Hon. Robert Hetherington was of very limited scope; it involved the question of joint Commonwealth-State electoral rolls.

Mr Hetherington, in his usual quiet but effective way, put an argument based on economy, efficiency, the facility to avoid confusion and, above all, the benefits of a system which would ensure that everyone entitled to vote actually would be able to vote when a State election came around. A joint Commonwealth-State roll would avoid the situation we have now where, because of the more intensive activity by the Commonwealth Electoral Office in ensuring enrolments, tens of thousands more Western Australians are on the Commonwealth roll than on the State roll. That is the reason for the difference between the numbers on the two rolls. It has nothing to do with the fatuous explanation offered by the Chief Secretary earlier during today's sitting to the effect that it had something to do with the length of time people had resided in Western Australia. That is totally irrelevant to this difference of tens of thousands between the respective rolls. It has everything to do with the greater activity on the part of the Commonwealth Electoral Office to ensure that people who are entitled to vote actually are able to vote.

In response to that very reasonable proposition by the Hon. Robert Hetherington—it was not a novel proposition designed to catch the Minister by surprise so that he could not provide an answer, if indeed there was an answer—the Minister started talking about the door-knock procedures engaged in by the Hon. Robert Hetherington, the Hon. Des Dans, and Mr Colin Jamieson, MLA as though in some way that had something to do with the subject brought to the attention of the House.

Of course it had nothing to do with the subject, just as most of his other comments had nothing to do with the subject. They were merely devices to try to avoid an argument which, really, is unanswerable.

I notice in passing that the Minister for Labour and Industry when he feels himself pressed, calls for the speech writing assistance of one of the candidates concerned, thus indicating his high respect for the individual; however, apparently he is not prepared to come to his aid when that individual supports a joint Commonwealth-State roll.

As I mentioned, the Chief Secretary is the Minister in charge of our electoral system and thereby is a man we would expect to understand the system. In fact he revealed his intense ignorance of the subject by his reference to the New South Wales election results. The Chief Secretary purported to demonstrate that the Labor Party in New South Wales had gerrymandered the system, the evidence for which was that with a popular vote of 55.4 per cent, it achieved something over 70 per cent of the seats in the New South Wales Parliament.

As the Minister must be well aware, a vote of 55.4 per cent is extraordinarily high—almost historically high—in the Australian context. The nature of our system is such that any time a party can achieve a majority vote of that proportion, its majority of seats becomes greatly magnified. We saw similar instances in the Commonwealth elections of 1975 and 1977. In those cases, the Commonwealth Liberal Government, with a vote also in the region of 55 or 56 per cent in fact achieved a majority of seats equivalent to about 70 per cent. I do not have the precise figures, but I am confident in saying that the figures in both Parlia-

ments were comparable to the New South Wales example, put forward by the Chief Secretary.

Nobody from the Labor Party, for all their distress at the results of the 1975 and 1977 elections was heard to say the result of a gerrymander. They did not say that because it was not true in the Commonwealth, just as it was not true in New South Wales.

It was a simple reflection of the sort of result which can be anticipated where we have a two-party system, a single member constituency system, and a vote to one party of the order of 55 per cent. That is why the Labor Party did not cry, "gerrymander!" in 1975 and 1977, in spite of the fact its numbers were decimated. The Chief Secretary has revealed either his ignorance or a deliberate distortion of the facts by his version of what happened in New South Wales.

The truth is that whatever the history of the matter, the Labor Party today at all levels, Federal and State, is committed to a system of one-vote-one-value to be achieved by a minimum difference between the number of electors in the various electorates. In the Commonwealth, that is achieved, by a maximum differential between electorates of 10 per cent.

That level, was introduced by a Federal Labor Government, but one hopes that the Liberal Party in this State might take a lesson from the fact that the amendment to the Federal electoral system which produced that 10 per cent differential was supported by the Federal Liberal Party. It was supported on basic democratic grounds, and why those same grounds of principle should elude the party in this State can be only a matter for conjecture.

Legislative Council: Abolition

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Finally, although again, it is not relevant to the original point made by the Hon. Robert Hetherington, but as the Chief Secretary waxed so eloquent on it, I turn to the question of the attitude of the Labor Party in this State to the Legislative Council.

We are certainly not to be counted among the admirers of the Council and I have made my position clear in that respect often enough. However, as a party, we are no longer committed to the abolition of this Council, but rather to its democratisation, and that applies irrespective of what appears in the Federal platform of the party.

The Federal platform of the party, like the State platform, is a document of general guidance, but in terms of actual implementation from time to time, the decision is left to the parliamentary parties, State or Commonwealth. In this State the parliamentary party is not committed to the abolition of the Legislative Council and that applies to the lay party in this State as well.

In case doubts exist that I am trying to avoid the issue by saying, "It is just the present Caucus that is not proposing it and it is just for the forthcoming electoral platform that we do not propose the abolition of the Council"—

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are subject to absolute direction and you know it.

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: What do I know?

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are subject to the direction of the Labor Party; it is wrong for you to deny it, and you know it.

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I accept I am bound by the platform and principles of the Labor Party, but what I have said is perfectly correct; that is, the implementation of particular parts of the Labor Party platform, State or Federal, is a matter for the discretion of the parliamentary parties.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The only argument is timing, not implementation.

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: The Chief Secretary is worried about timing and that is the very point I was about to make to him, because I could see the twinkle in his eye, as much as to say, "Now I have caught out Berinson, because he has said that the Labor Party is not going into the next election advocating the abolition of the Legislative Council." I could see the Chief Secretary preparing the accusation, "Ah, but you can't bind future Caucuses."

I do not believe the Labor Party in this State, in the Parliament or outside it, will press for the abolition of the Legislative Council in the foreseeable future. The reason for that has nothing to do with ideology; it is a perfectly practical reason. We know that it is not an objective worth pursuing, because the hurdles in its way are simply too difficult to overcome. While the Government has enjoyed the benefits of a two-thirds majority in this House based on something barely representing 50 per cent of public support, it has secured an amendment to the State Constitution which will make it not only difficult, but also, for all practical purposes, almost impossible to abolish the Legislative Council.

If this argument does not seem to be based on high principle, so be it. All political parties have to face reality and the Labor Party does that. It is of no use the Chief Secretary producing these fanciful arguments about our intention to abolish the Legislative Council when most of the members of

the party in this State are no longer interested in the abolition of the Council in principle, and when, on top of that, we have the practical situation that it is a policy simply not worth pursuing.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You were right when you said that I would save my comments for a later date. I have to do that, because I cannot speak again.

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: When the Chief Secretary speaks again at a later date, I hope he will apply himself to the basic principles of the electoral system in this State and will try to do something about the gross distortions and repeated manipulation of them to keep the Labor Party out of government and out of majority positions in both Houses at all costs.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is the view of a hypocritical political party!

The Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I hope also the Chief Secretary will try to do something about changing the system by such simple and economic methods as the introduction of a joint Commonwealth-State roll, as referred to by Mr Hetherington.

I hope the Chief Secretary will concentrate on that in preference to these fanciful, long and strained arguments which have no content so far as principle is concerned and which avoid the real issue, which is democracy in this State. We will not have democracy here while we have Ministers and Governments in charge of an electoral system like the Minister and Government we have now.

THE HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [11.05 p.m.]: I enter this debate to point out the ALP is putting forward the proposition of the abolition of all State control and the centralisation of it in Canberra. Next we shall hear the ALP say it would be more economical to have all educational matters in Australia under the control of one Federal department and it would be more economical to have all housing matters under the control of one Federal department. Members could go through each department one by one and before long no control would be left with the State. I believe, the Commonwealth should start getting out of those areas where the States can manage them better.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.06 p.m.]: I am really delighted to have heard tonight from the lips of the Hon. Mr Berinson such words of favour in regard to the Legislative Council. I did not really think I would ever hear the honourable member say such nice things about the Council and admit that he does not want to have it abolished and that, in the foreseeable future—which obviously means a long time—the Labor Party does not propose the abolition of the Council. Clearly the Labor Party would be able to frame its policies many years ahead and, in this lengthy period that we can foresee, it has no intention to seek the abolition of the Legislative Council.

That not only represents a change in policy, but also is very pleasing news, even if it is based upon somewhat unusual grounds which are that it is too difficult to seek to abolish the Council and, in any event, the Labor Party does not want to do so. Those are very good reasons.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MEAT: LAMB

Marketing Board: Price

583. The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

(1) What was the average price, after paying killing costs, for lambs—

(a) sold locally;
(b) exported;
(c) brought interstate;

for each of the months from August 1979 to September 1982, by the WA Lamb Marketing Board?

(2) What were the number of live lambs, and in which months were they moved out of the State to—

(a) interstate; and
(b) overseas markets?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) (a) and (b) I am advised by the Lamb Marketing Board that the information sought by the member is not kept on a monthly basis. The answer below lists average selling prices less killing and processing costs.

	1979-80 $	1980-81 $	1981-82 $
Lambs sold on local market	15.16	16.65	13.08
Lambs exported, price-alongside-ship/aircraft basis	10.74	12.92	11.32

(c) No lambs have been imported into Western Australia by the board. Lamb carcases have been purchased in other states for direct export. In such cases killing and processing costs were not paid directly by the board.

(2) (a) The numbers of lambs exported from Western Australia to other states are not recorded, but numbers are considered to be small.

(b) The export of live sheep to overseas markets is the concern of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry. I am advised that statistics of live lamb exports are not recorded.

STATE FINANCE: CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Wages and Salaries

595. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

I refer the Treasurer to his comments in his statement on transactions on the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the financial year 1981-1982 wherein he states that $7 million was saved on wages and salaries, and ask—

(1) In respect of which departments was that $7 million saving mainly attributable to?

(2) For each department, what was the actual saving made on the provision?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

(1) and (2) As pointed out in my statement issued to members of Parliament, provision of $76.4 million was made within the Budget for award increases during the year. However, in view of uncertainty in allocating the cost of projected wage and salary increases between departments, $26.1 million of this amount was provided in the miscellaneous services division of the Estimates. The aggregate net overruns recorded against individual departmental salary and wage votes were therefore offset against this unspent provision within the miscellaneous services division.

For this reason it is not practicable to attribute to individual departments with any acceptable precision the savings relating to wage and salary award increases which totalled $7 million in 1981-82.

HOUSING: MORTGAGE ASSESSMENT AND RELIEF COMMITTEE

Establishment

596. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Housing:

Further to question 497 of 22 September 1982—

(1) Will the Minister inform me when the rent relief committee will be established and begin operations?

(2) Is it intended to advertise the availability of assistance once the committee is established?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) and (2) Discussions with the Commonwealth are still being conducted in regard to implementing the crisis relief scheme to assist private rent and mortgage payers.

Administrative procedures will be finalised as soon as the discussions are concluded.

AUDIT ACT

Review

597. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

In view of the remarks by the Auditor General in his 1981-1982 report to the effect that in relation to the Audit Act—

. . . existing legislation does not adequately provide for modern accounting and auditing practices

I ask—

(1) On what date was the committee to review the Audit Act and Treasury regulations, established?

(2) Who are the people who comprise that committee?

(3) Who are the people who comprise the "task force" which is presently preparing material for consideration by the committee?

(4) What is the amount and basis of payment of financial assistance for each member of the "task force"?

(5) For how long will the existing legislation remain inadequate?

(6) In respect of the decision to retain Mr A. E. Tonks as a consultant—

(a) to whom or what is Mr Tonks acting as consultant;

(b) on what date was Mr Tonks appointed as consultant;

(c) what is the amount and basis of payment of financial assistance of any form to Mr Tonks; and

(d) for what purpose has Mr Tonks been retained?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

(1) Its first meeting was held on 6 July 1982. Members were nominated during the preceding month.

(2) Mr W. F. Rolston—Auditor General
Mr P. J. King—Audit Department
Mr K. E. Mann—Public Service Board
Mr R. F. Boylen—Treasury
Mr R. G. Bowe—Treasury
Mr A. M. Elliss—Treasury
Mr N. G. Kroll—Treasury.

(3) Mr A. G. Brooks—Treasury
Mr N. E. Smith—Treasury
Mr A. E. Tonks—consultant
Members of the task force also sit with the committee at meetings.

(4) Mr Brooks and Mr Smith receive their normal Public Service salaries while engaged on this work. For arrangements with Mr Tonks see (6) below.

(5) Until it is replaced by new legislation more appropriate to circumstances and accounting standards of today which have changed since the present Audit Act was enacted in 1904.

(6) (a) Representing the Auditor General on the "task force";

(b) 9 June 1982;

(c) $20 an hour based on the number of hours spent working with the "task force" which is located in Treasury;

(d) to expedite the review.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS: LIBRARY

Alexander

598. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

(1) Has he received representations from public librarians and local authorities concerning the plan for a public lending library at the new Alexander Library building?

(2) Have those representations been to the effect that the establishment of such a service would seriously affect the Library Board's ability to meet its principal obligations to the public library system and the provision of central reference services?

(3) Is it also a fact that the board is already unable to meet its present commitments to these services, and that provision of new books and other material is declining?

(4) What is the estimated cost of establising the lending service at the Alexander Library?

(5) What is the estimated annual cost of running it?

(6) Has the Government conducted a thorough investigation into the effect such a service would have on the existing public library system?

(7) If so, what were the results of that investigation?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) I have received a representation from the Shire of Wanneroo, also the Hon. Margaret McAleer has forwarded to me a copy of a representation from the Shire of Wanneroo to her, and the Hon. J. Berinson has written to me in similar terms to the representation from that shire. The same terms are also used in a letter from the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier on this subject.
Following receipt of the approach from the Shire of Wanneroo to me, I wrote to the Library Board stating *inter alia*—

If there is to be a choice, I think it would be far preferable for the board to concentrate its efforts on the provision of material to existing lending libraries throughout the State until such time as the establishment of a central lending service would have minimal effect on those services.

The State Librarian, in response, stated—

The preference you state is, of course, also the board's preference, though it would need to be amended, as far as the board is concerned, by the addition of a phrase which includes the management and stocking of the State Reference Library. Since the board took over the State Reference Library in 1956, it has always made it clear that it has two primary responsibilities, one being the conduct and development of the State Reference Library, and the other being the provision of a fully catalogued bookstock, regular exchanges and back-up services for the public libraries.

In response to the member's other questions, I am advised by the Library Board as follows—

(2) The board has received a representation from one local authority strongly supporting the plan to incorporate lending facilities in the Alexander Library building. They advise that most leading public librarians joined together to make a submission on future developments in public librarianship and expressed some support for the proposal. Only one local authority—Fremantle—has written to the board itself to express misgivings, as it was concerned at the possible effect the lending service might have on the other services provided by the Library Board.

(3) No. The board is at present increasing its commitments to local authorities. Provision for new book turnover and other material has increased from the 1980-81 level.

(4) This has not been estimated.

(5) Discussions are being conducted between the board and the Perth City Council to arrive at a fair distribution of costs, and any estimates made prior to the conclusion of these discussions would be premature.

(6) No. The board in 1979 formed a committee of public librarians and board staff to discuss the issue fully.

(7) If the service is additional to the service presently operating from Council House there will be an effect on the Council House service. However, should the new service accept responsibility for some of the borrowers presently using the Council House library, and the Perth City Council therefore accepted some financial responsibility, then the effect of the new lending library would be to promote and expand the use of libraries without any duplication of effort or expense. No study of this can take place until the discussions with the Perth City Council are completed.

APPRENTICES

Suspensions

599. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

How many apprentices were suspended under section 37A of the Industrial Training Act relating to cessation of business or financial difficulties, during the month of September 1982?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

Three apprentices were suspended under section 37A.

It should be noted that nine apprentices were also suspended on a part-time basis under section 34(4).

GAMBLING: BOOKMAKERS

Betting Tax

600. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER, to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

Would the Treasurer advise the House the total amount of bookmakers betting tax paid to the Treasury by—

(a) country and provincial trotting clubs; and

(b) country and provincial racing clubs;

for the financial year ended 30 June 1982?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The amounts received by the Consolidated Revenue Fund were—

(a) $59 189
(b) $313 911.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Thornlie

601. The Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Education:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the social studies office at Thornlie Senior High School has still not been completed despite repeated assurances that work would be finished by the beginning of the second term?
(2) When will the work be completed?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) and (2) The work is complete with the exception of some shelving in one unit. The shelving should be available within a week.

APPRENTICES

Suspensions

602. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) How many apprentices are currently under suspension?
(2) Of these, how many apply to—
(a) the building trades; and
(b) the metal trades?
(3) Of the number suspended, how many are employed with a view to transfer?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) As at 18 October 1982, there are 326 apprentices under suspension.
(2) (a) 63;
(b) 122.
(3) 73 of the 326 suspended are currently employed with a view to transfer.
It should also be noted that in addition there are 167 apprentices who are suspended on a part-time basis.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Licences: Payment

603. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Police and Prisons:

(1) In view of the inconvenience caused as a result of the closure of the road traffic office in Morley, will the Government make it possible for the public to pay for vehicle registrations, etc., at the police station, post office or R and I Bank in Morley?
(2) If not, why not?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) No.
(2) The Morley licensing office was closed as a cost saving measure recommended by the Cabinet expenditure review committee. The provision of any licensing facility at the Morley police station would involve further costs which cannot be justified, especially when one considers the proximity of Morley to the licensing centres at East Perth and Midland, and of the availability of postal facilities.

APPRENTICES

Number

604. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) What is the total number of apprentices currently in training?
(2) To what date does the number in (1) apply?
(3) What was the total in training at the corresponding time during 1981?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) 13 820.
(2) 30 September 1982.
(3) 14 278.

FUEL AND ENERGY: SEC

Contingent Liabilities

605. The Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Referring to question 401 of Tuesday, 24 August 1982, and question 468 of Tuesday, 21 September 1982, wherein it was shown that energy commitment for gas and coal over 21 years was $9 170.7 million, and to *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 21 September 1982, wherein it was stated that the pipeline was to cost $840 million, will the Minister advise—

(1) Is it a fact that, in each of the following, the yearly commitment by the SEC for the purchase of North-West Shelf gas is—

(a) equivalent to purchasing additional energy twice the amount produced at present by the Collie coal field;

(b) at the equivalent cost delivered to the south-west approximately, on an energy basis, three times that of Collie coal, or approximately $3.60 per gigajoule;

(c) costing the public, by one method or another, between $250 to $300 million for unsold gas per year; and

(d) making it unlikely that customers will be found at this cost?

(2) How will this unsold gas be funded?

(3) For how many years is funding likely to be necessary?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

(1) (a) The inference that North-West Shelf gas will replace coal is not correct. North West Shelf gas will be used in place of the existing gas supply from Dongara and, in addition, will primarily replace oil products currently used by private industry in the State.

(b) to (d) No.

(2) and (3) The gas purchase contract between the State Energy Commission and the North-West Shelf joint venture participants includes provision for gas not taken in any year.

EDUCATION: SCHOOL FUND ACCOUNTS

Auditing

606. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Education:

I refer the Minister to two consecutive Auditor General reports, those for 1980-1981 and 1981-1982, wherein comments have been expressed referring to the inadequate nature of accounting and control procedures in respect of school fund accounts and ask—

(1) Why has a situation been let develop whereby more than 12 months after the above inadequate state of affairs has been first brought to a Minister's attention, a second Auditor General's report is compelled to remark that the position is still "not satisfactory"?

(2) Have private auditors been engaged to audit amenities funds?

(3) If "Yes" to (2)—

(a) who are the private auditors; and

(b) what is the anticipated annual cost of engaging them?

(4) If "No" to (2), has the number of staff attached to the internal audit section been increased?

(5) For each year of the period 1977-1982, what has been the number of staff attached to the internal audit section?

(6) Has clerical assistance to all of the six regional offices been increased since the Minister's attention was drawn to the inadequate situation outlined by the Auditor General in his 1981-1982 report?

(7) If not, why not?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) Attention has been directed at improving accounting and control measures in schools and improvements have been made.

Action has been taken to develop a manual of accounting for issue to schools and this manual has now been circulated. Training of personnel on the use of the manual has commenced and a gradual improvement in accounting standards can be expected.

(2) No.

(3) (a) and (b) Not applicable.

(4) Not in 1981-82.

(5) 1977— 7
1978— 7
1979— 7
1980—11
1981—12
1982—12.

(6) Seven of the 13 regional offices have a clerical position called a regional officer and two further appointments are proposed in the current financial year.

(7) Answered by (6).

RAILWAYS

Excursion or Hire Trains

607. The Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to question 462 of Thursday, 16 September 1982, and the written answer of 7 October 1982, wherein, in relation to weekend excursion hire trains, it stated in effect that, for the 12 month period ended 31 August 1982, 9 580 train kilometres yielded $98 039 revenue for an operational cost (including Sunday operative labour) of $77 266, and also referring to page 66 of Parliamentary Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ending 30 June 1983, wherein the total gross expenditure for carrying suburban rail passengers is estimated at $18.826 million, and to the MTT annual report of 1981, page 5, wherein 1 663 031 train kilometres were travelled in that year, will the Minister advise—

(1) Since it appears that, on the basis of excursion trains, the suburban passenger trains should have an operational cost of about $9 million plus, how is the difference between $18.826 million and $9 million accounted for?

(2) What costs in the suburban system are considered to be unavoidable?

(3) In what areas do these unavoidable costs occur?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) to (3) The costs quoted by the member for the operation of suburban passenger train services and the running of hired special trains bear no relationship.
Hired special costs are calculated on an incremental cost basis, whereas the Westrail recoup from the Metropolitan Transport Trust is on the basis of full absorption costs.

608. *This question was postponed.*

TRANSPORT

Passenger: Subsidies

609. The Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to the *Weekend News* of 9 October 1982, page 7, wherein it was reported that the Minister for Transport, Mr Rushton, in talking of free transport for the unemployed, said, "That the Government was already subsidising the public transport system by more than 50 per cent", will the Minister advise—

(1) Is the subsidy estimated for the year ending June 1983 about $56.7 million, due to people using public transport?

(2) Will he make a public elaboration to his statement of "more than 50 per cent", by indicating that the subsidy is about 230 per cent above the fares received, or in excess of $1 million per week?

(3) What difference, if any, would free public transport to the unemployed make on public transport finances?

(4) Will the Government grant free public transport to the unemployed with immediate effect.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) For the current financial year, total fare revenue on Perth's bus, train, and ferry services is estimated to be $24.9 million. The estimated subsidy of $56.7 million is 127 per cent higher than the fare revenue. To elaborate, the total subsidy on bus and ferry services is expected to be 84 per cent higher than revenue from ticket sales in the current year while the subsidy on suburban passenger train services is expected to be 471 per cent higher than revenue from ticket sales. In other words, it is expected that the MTT will spend $2.84 to earn every dollar of revenue on bus and ferry services and $6.71 to earn every dollar of revenue on suburban passenger rail services.

(3) There would be two main effects. First, to the extent that unemployed people presently buy their tickets, free transport for the unemployed would reduce the MTT's revenue. Second, to the extent that unemployed people would make greater use of public transport if they received free travel, the MTT's expenses could increase especially if the additional travel occurred during the peak periods where little additional public transport capacity is available.

(4) As the Minister said in the article that the member quotes, the Government is sympathetic to the plight of the unemployed and regularly reviews the situation. Recently the Minister requested a review by the Co-ordinator General of Transport and the MTT. He will be studying the results when they are available and making recommendations to Government if appropriate. The member should know that, in the last 12 months, the MTT has provided the Commonwealth Employment Service with about 1 000 tickets a month which are issued free for use by unemployed people in looking for and taking up jobs.

FIRES: FIRE BRIGADES

Thefts

610. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Police and Prisons:

(1) Is it a fact, as has been reported to me—

(a) that money has been taken from a fireman's bag while he was at a fire call;

(b) that the board will not take out an insurance policy covering the personal effects of firemen;

(c) that a number of helmets have been stolen from metropolitan fire stations; and

(d) that a colour television set was stolen from Spearwood fire station?

(2) Are keys of department stores and industrial premises kept in metropolitan fire stations?

(3) Are such keys secure?

(4) Is the security of metropolitan fire stations adequate?

(5) Are any steps being taken to improve that security?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) (a) (c), and (d) Yes, the losses referred to have occurred over a period of time;

(b) the board's insurances do not cover personal effects of firemen.

(2) to (5) Keys are kept at metropolitan stations. Reasonable steps are taken for security of keys. Currently action is in hand to see whether improvements may be effected.

ROADS

Servetus Street and Stirling Highway

611. The Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Referring to Servetus Street and Stirling Highway, will the Minister advise—

(1) What is the width between fence lines in Servetus Street?

(2) What is the length of Servetus Street?

(3) In Stirling Highway, between Eric Street and Wellington Street, Mosman Park—

(a) what is the width between kerbs, apart from intersection, shopping centre and bus bay treatments;

(b) what is the length of roadway between Eric Street and Wellington Street; and

(c) for what proportion of this distance does the kerb width in (a) exist?

(4) What resumptions are planned in Stirling Highway to give equivalent treatment to that proposed for Servetus Street?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) to (4) The information requested is being collated and I will advise the member direct.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

STOCK: SHEEP

Agistment

149. The Hon. W. M. PIESSE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

(1) Is it a fact that some 16 000 sheep from Victoria are to be agisted in the Northam area?

(2) Is it a fact that 8 000 of the sheep left Portland last week?

(3) If so, are these sheep to be shorn and otherwise cleaned of weed seeds at the Norseman check point?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question, the reply to which is as follows—

(1) Arrangements have been made for approximately 8 000 sheep to be rested on a property in the Northam area pending sale at Northam on 29 October. This holding property has been approved by the Department of Agriculture.
(2) Yes.
(3) All sheep are inspected for declared plant seeds and for disease on arrival. They must be shorn prior to departure and any sheep not meeting wool length are required under the regulations to be shorn at Parkeston.

CRIMINAL CODE

Murray Report

150. The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON, to the Attorney General:

Is the Attorney in the position to tell me when the Murray report on the revision of the Criminal Code will be available, and particularly whether it will be available before the House rises?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

No, I am not able to say that it will be available before the House rises. At the moment it is in the hands of a department committee which is going through it. It is fairly voluminous, and although the committee is doing its best, I cannot say when it will be available; nor do I know exactly when the House will rise.

ELECTORAL: DISTRICTS AND PROVINCES

Increase

151. The Hon. TOM STEPHENS, to the Chief Secretary:

I would like to ask a supplementary question to the question asked by the Hon. Win Piesse. It is as follows—

With the addition of these extra sheep in the State of WA, would it be his intention to increase the number of electorates in the State to cope with these other sheep as part of the population?

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The question is contrary to Standing Order No. 154, and I will disregard it.

The PRESIDENT: The question is out of order.

CRIMINAL CODE

Murray Report

152. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Attorney General:

With a view to obtaining some clarification of the way in which it is proposed to deal with the Murray report as I had understood from his previous advice that Mr Murray's own recommendation would be tabled, do I take it from his answer to the Hon. Robert Hetherington's question that it is proposed to edit Mr Murray's report as a result of the departmental committee's recommendation, or is the reason for the report's being delayed simply so that the committee can consider it in advance of tabling?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

As I have explained previously, the committee is examining Mr Murray's report at his request. He wants to ensure that in all respects his comments measure up. I really do not want to go into too many details on this, but naturally, with such an important report, Mr Murray, the Government, and I, want to ensure that every "t" has been crossed and every "i" dotted.

The committee is looking through the report in order to ensure that it is all verified and that the many issues are dealt with properly. This is no reflection on Mr Murray—as I have mentioned, it is being carried out at his request and he is a member of the committee.

The report will be made public as soon as possible. It will be available for general examination and not just by members of Parliament. The Law Society and many other groups in the community wish to comment on it. I am quite certain that many bodies will be interested in it, and it will be available generally for that purpose.

NOXIOUS WEEDS

Agricultural Machinery

153. The Hon. W. M. PIESSE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

(1) Is it a fact that a secondhand tractor imported from Victoria carried four species of noxious weeds?

(2) Were the weeds seeds, saffron thistle, double-gee, artichoke thistle, and sida?

(3) If "Yes", what action is being taken to prevent a recurrence?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I thank the honourable member for notice of the question the answer to which is as follows—

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) Inspection procedures will be rigidly enforced in future for any machinery suspected of being secondhand, regardless of statements made by the transport drivers. The inspection and cleaning requirements on machinery entering the State are being re-examined as a matter of urgency.

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Joint Federal and State: Government View

154. The Hon. GARRY KELLY, to the Chief Secretary:

Why has the Chief Secretary poured cold water on his own party's candidates' very sensible suggestion for a single electoral roll? Surely filling out one card would eliminate the confusion and duplication entailed in having separate Commonwealth and State rolls?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

To the degree that question is contrary to Standing Order No. 154, I will not answer it; but in relation to the part that is proper for me to answer, I inform the member that, as I understand it, a copy of the letter which I received late this afternoon was made available to the Press. It is a matter I am studying and, when the gentleman who has made the suggestion communicates with me further as he has indicated he will, I will answer it and not before.

MEAT: LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Price

155. The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

This question relates to question 583 directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry, and is as follows—

If the Lamb Marketing Board is unable to indicate the price charged or paid for—

(a) lambs sold on the local market;

(b) lambs exported;

(c) lambs bought interstate on a monthly basis;

what more detailed figures are kept other than on an annual basis, which can be given in answer to question 583?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I will have to take note of that question and obtain the answer for the honourable member. Either the member could place it on notice or I shall provide the answer in writing.

ELECTORAL ROLLS

Joint Federal and State: "Creeping Socialism"

156. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Chief Secretary:

The Chief Secretary will recall that, in answer to a question in this House about the appropriateness of joint rolls, he indicated that those of us who suggested we should have joint electoral rolls were encouraging the hand of Canberra's "creeping socialism" or words to that effect. My question is—

(1) Does the Chief Secretary take the view of the current suggestion that we should have joint rolls as being an example of the "creeping socialism" to which he referred previously?

(2) Is the Chief Secretary taking the suggestion seriously?

(3) Is he reviewing the suggestion?

(4) What matters does the Chief Secretary propose to take into account in connection with the review as to whether we should have joint rolls?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) to (4) The reference in the question asked by the Hon. Peter Dowding and the previous question asked by the Hon. Garry Kelly is to a statement made by four candidates which has subsequently been publicly withdrawn by them; therefore, I have no opinion to offer on that. It is not my function here to give opinions.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is your current view about it?

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Federal and State: Variations

157. The Hon. GARRY KELLY, to the Chief Secretary:

In view of the fact that the Government probably will not adopt joint enrolment procedures, what steps does it propose to take to eliminate the discrepancy between the numbers enrolled on State electoral rolls and those enrolled on Commonwealth electoral rolls?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

Without going into great detail except to say my answer would be a repeat of the answer already given and recorded in *Hansard* and I do not intend to take up the time of the House repeating it, I point out that one specific answer to the member's question, amongst other questions, is this: One of the contributing factors to a discrepancy between Commonwealth and State rolls is that, under the Commonwealth Electoral Act a person must have been in the Commonwealth for six months and in the State for one month in order to be qualified and required to enrol. However, under the State Electoral Act, a person must have been in the Commonwealth for six months, in the State for three months, and in the electoral district for one month before he is qualified and required to enrol.

Any amount of elementary consideration one gives to those facts would indicate that, at any time, a considerable number of electors, particularly in areas in which transients live, would qualify under the Commonwealth requirement in Western Australia, but would not qualify—

Several members interjected.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: If members want the answer, they should listen to what I am saying, otherwise I shall cease answering. A number of electors would qualify under the Commonwealth requirement in Western Australia, but they would not qualify for the State roll.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Rubbish! That is just silly.

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Joint Federal and State: Practice Elsewhere

158. The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON, to the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is the Chief Secretary in a position to inform me how the States which do have joint rolls with the Commonwealth overcome these problems?

(2) Do they have different laws and how do they manage to do it?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) and (2) I am not here to answer questions in regard to other States within the Commonwealth.

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Joint Federal and State: Practice Elsewhere

159. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the Chief Secretary taken steps to inform himself in relation to the practice in States which have joint rolls?

(2) If he has not taken steps to inform himself of the practice, will he do so, so that his judgment about the issue can be made on facts rather than emotion?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) Yes, I have.

(2) I inform the member that the two States of the Commonwealth which maintain their own electoral rolls are the States of Western Australia and Queensland.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Now we know the answer!

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: It is my intention that that arrangement should continue.

Several members interjected.

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Joint Federal and State: Practice Elsewhere

160. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the Chief Secretary informed himself as to the efficiency with which the States other than Queensland and Western Australia maintain their electoral rolls?

(2) Is he aware of how those States are able to maintain their rolls efficiently?

(3) Is he satisfied that the procedures they adopt are applicable to Western Australia, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

(1) to (3) In regard to that part of the convoluted question which applied to Western Australia, I ask that it be placed on notice.