

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 10 November 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.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Labour and Industry), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.07 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

While this Bill relates to the Metropolitan Water Authority Amendment Bill in respect of drainage it also contains an important feature concerning rating.

In that regard the Bill makes provision for new methods of rating which will provide additional flexibility in setting levels of rating and charging to take into account the requirements of the community. This is done by means of regulations made by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister after the Minister has had consultation with the authority.

Methods of making fair and reasonable charges for water services have been studied extensively and studies currently are being made here in Western Australia. The charges obviously must be set at such levels that the authority has enough income to provide the water services that the community expects and is willing to pay for.

For the average domestic consumer, the way in which the amount of his water services bill is calculated is relatively simple. It appears the Perth community now generally accepts the principle of paying for both services and use of its domestic water supply. It is a fair and equitable arrangement, and with the introduction earlier this year of the flexible methods of payment of bills and billing of the owner rather than the occupier further advantages result.

It now may be generally appreciated that the supply of services of water, sewerage and drainage

over the Perth metropolitan area must take into account many factors in calculating equitable charges. Dozens of possible combinations of service charges and allowance and usage charges are applicable.

The charges based on valuations levied after the general valuation of 1980 highlighted several existing inequities, and as a result the Minister formed a working party to share the task of finding fair and reasonable ways of making charges. Studies by the working party and the authority are continuing. This Bill provides flexibility to implement acceptable findings.

The authority has a responsibility to advise the Minister as to the aggregate charges tailored to the revenue requirements necessary to meet the needs of providing water services.

In the past the Minister and the Cabinet have accepted the responsibility of setting the aggregate amounts of charges levied. This process will continue, but the Bill provides that this be flexible by the use of regulations required to be approved by the Governor.

The remainder of this Bill makes necessary legislative provisions to take into account the improvements in legislation relating to water services provided under the amendments contained in the Metropolitan Water Authority Bill. Therefore, the Bill repeals the drainage provisions of the principal Act.

It is sufficient to say here that the whole matter of drainage is one of the most inadequate features of the existing Act, unsatisfactory both to the Metropolitan Water Authority and to local authorities alike. The proposals contained in two Bills before the House are the result of long discussions with local authorities as well as an analysis of the role of the authority itself.

In a piece of legislation as complex as the principal Act, which this Bill is to amend, there are what might be called inherited problems of legislation which must be very carefully reviewed to make certain that a change in one portion does not make another portion inconsistent. That is the major reason that drafting to modernise this legislation has taken longer than had been hoped.

As an example of the problems the principal Act caused, members are referred to the proposal for the definition of "drain" to be replaced with a new term "property sewer". It is well known to everyone what is meant by a drain. It is simply a way to carry off surplus water such as after heavy rain. But in the year of 1909, when the principal Act was formulated, a drain was a way to carry sewage, which by definition could include faecal matter, urine, and liquid wastes, whether dom-

estic or otherwise. That definition of "drain" continued in the present legislation until this day. This Bill provides the opportunity to bring the situation up to date by making the distinction between a property sewer as defined in this Bill and a drain as defined anew in the companion legislation.

It is interesting to note that the words "drain", "drains", or "drainage", occur about 200 times in the principal Act. They occur in many different sections and also with different meanings from our present meaning. Therefore, we cannot simply amend the word "drain" and hope that all the 200 uses of it fit the amendment. Instead, we must have a careful analysis of the present laws and the desired laws, and this must take time to accomplish.

I point out that a companion Bill which seeks to amend the Metropolitan Water Authority Act is to follow, and I will seek to have it discussed concurrently with this Bill at the second reading stage.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Robert Hetherington.

METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Labour and Industry), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.13 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is designed to update two important provisions of drainage and works. It consolidates these matters and provides also for more equitable arrangements with regard to land, entry onto land, the rights of the landowner or occupier, and several other issues which I will cover.

It had been hoped to present to Parliament during this session a Bill which would completely update all the provisions for metropolitan water services. However, this has not been possible due to the complexity of legal and drafting aspects, and this Bill represents those portions of legislation that cover several important issues.

The attention of members is directed to the proposed definition of "drain" as compared with that currently in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act. The purpose of this

amendment is to define a drain as simply something that is used to carry away surplus water rather than confusing the term with sewage disposal as it has been used since the 1909 legislation was originally enacted.

At present, many other major aspects of drainage are either not dealt with or are dealt with inadequately in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act. Consequently, in the companion Bill, the part dealing with drainage is to be repealed and associated changes are proposed to other sections. This provides the opportunity for a completely new and comprehensive approach to drainage.

An arterial drainage scheme is to be prepared in consultation with local councils and appropriate authorities. As the name implies, this arterial drainage scheme or plan is intended to show, in time, the lines of arterial drains that thread through the metropolitan area. It will include drainage catchments, lakes, swamps, wetlands, rivers and streams, existing and proposed drains, as well as lands that will benefit from drainage and that contribute to the need for drainage, and the existing and the proposed drainage system.

The arterial drainage plan may be thought of as a set of maps which show, for the metropolitan area, the general way the drainage works naturally and with man-made drains. It is not in any way a statutory scheme in the sense of a town planning scheme. In fact, a great deal of the success of the plan will come from the fact that the authority can work with local authorities, potential and actual developers, private landowners, and town planning, environmental, and other bodies in planning what the drainage system should be.

The arterial drainage plan is intended ultimately to show all the matters contained in the legislation. At present, it exists in part in the form of overlay maps, in the vesting of metropolitan main drains in the authority and of other drains with local authorities; but for some years it is likely to remain a dynamically evolving plan being developed in a co-operative way by the authorities involved.

Attention must be given realistically to the way that drains are built and managed as well as being designed merely as lines on maps, and the legislation deals with this also. In the first place, if practicable, drainage courses will be declared.

The idea of drainage courses and provision for their declaration is introduced for the first time so as to assist in forward planning. A drainage course may be thought of as being like a road reserve, whereby notice is given in advance of the

possible use of a swathe of land for drainage. Where practicable, existing topography and watercourses may be used as drainage courses.

The Bill provides that notice be given of a proposal to declare a drainage course, and for negotiations and objections. Problems may occur in the declaration of drainage courses, as they usually do in forward-planning and in reserves of land. Provision is made for negotiations with owners and local authorities to overcome such problems as far as practicable.

Procedures are provided where some arterial drains or portions of them are to be declared main drains, in which case it is the responsibility of the authority to maintain them. In order for the authority to be able to do so, certain powers are given to it to control blocking of a main drain, or pollution of it, and connection to it, and other similar powers detailed in the Bill.

The scheme will still allow for some drainage control and rating by local authorities. The authority can rate for drainage only for drainage areas served by existing main drains or proposed ones.

In order to ensure that the rights of an individual or local authority are protected, the authority cannot declare a main drain unless it is in a drainage course, an easement, or reserve, or has the agreement of the owner or occupier. The proposal also must be advertised, and provision is made for objections.

The authority may recommend, and the Minister may propose and, after having regard to objections, may declare a drainage area. A drainage area is one that benefits or will benefit from, or contributes or will contribute to the need for drainage services. Therefore, a drainage area is one for which drainage charges may be required.

The difficulty of framing legislation about drainage in a metropolitan area such as Perth is that it must provide for the present situation as well as plan for the future. It must take into account the responsibilities and the work done by local authorities as well as by the authority or its predecessor, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board. It must take into account the topography and the natural watercourses, and the role these play and have played in drainage. It must take into account financial aspects, such as headworks charges for major development proposals as well as the drainage charges and rates paid by owners of small blocks of land. It must take into account the possible community benefits of drainage, which may apply in these modern days even to people who do not own land in an area, but who may drive through a

subway, for instance, on their way to or from work and expect the road not to be flooded.

These possible benefits, as well as possible recharge of aquifers by surplus water and the preservation and management of wetlands, are all factors that must be considered.

The present Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act does not take these factors into account in sections relating to drainage. Therefore the companion Bill makes provision to repeal entirely the part dealing with drainage so that these new provisions can come into effect.

It is believed that the comprehensive new approach taken by this Bill, particularly as regards the idea of and approach to an arterial drainage scheme, will overcome the difficulties of what has often been a most contentious issue. Extensive discussions were held with local government officers about the intention of this approach, and with the correct and necessary co-operation, this approach will work effectively.

The Bill provides for the authority to carry out works in three categories. Firstly, major works include the construction of dams, wastewater treatment plants, and other defined works; secondly, general works include construction of mains for water supply, mains for sewerage, pumping stations, and other specified works; and thirdly, exempt works which are more in the nature of routine maintenance and repair work. The three categories will ensure appropriate public notices, attention to the rights of local authorities, individual landowners, and occupiers, as well as more efficient administration and operations in the field.

Major works require wide public advertising and notice being served on affected local authorities and landowners. Provision is made for comments and objections and, where practicable, alterations to meet those objections. The approval of the Minister is necessary, and the authority must report to him on the objections and whether they have been met.

General works require more limited notification—in this case, to the local authority and any landowner likely to be adversely affected.

Again, objections and comments can be made. If they cannot be met, or if the authority desires to deviate from the publicised plans beyond specified limits, the approval of the Minister is required.

If the Minister considers that a proposed general works may be of sufficient general interest, he may direct the authority to advertise and otherwise treat it as a major work. For exempt

works to be constructed on private land, the owner of the land must request the authority to do the work. In matters of routine maintenance and repair, the Bill makes the entry provisions applicable as they are for all entry onto private land.

A new part is given to the important matter of entry. The provisions are modelled along the lines of the provisions of the State Energy Commission Act. Except for emergencies and where it is suspected that the requirements of the Act are being violated, prior notice must be given to the owner and the occupier.

The authority is empowered to gather information about engineering matters and to carry out investigations of a general and a specific nature. It may investigate underground water resources. In all works empowered by this legislation, the authority must ensure, so far as is reasonable and practicable, that as little as possible inconvenience or detriment results.

If there is some damage after entry or works, provision is made for the authority to make good the damage. If it cannot be made good, provision is made for compensation.

The authority may now enter into agreements in its own right with owners of land, so as to obtain or use portions of land. It may also lease land if it has no immediate use for it.

This Bill therefore ensures there are ways other than through the resumption powers under the Public Works Act for the authority to have land vested in it or acquired.

Concern has been expressed that sufficient new general valuations may not be available for the entire area served by the authority in order for it to calculate equitable rates. It will be appreciated that the Valuation of Land Act provisions are directed towards valuations for different district shires or council areas. For each one of these, general valuations may be in different stages of completion at a time of the year when the authority must consider all 26 such areas or districts.

Provision is made for the circumstance where insufficient complete general valuations are available for the overall purposes of the authority. The Minister may then empower the authority to use in the next rating year the valuations which are shown in the current rating year. Provisions made under that circumstance ensure continued limitation of annual increases of amounts charged and continued provision for payment by instalments and other measures approved by Parliament in the last session.

Although this Bill does not cover all the matters which the Minister had hoped it would, it is considered practicable to give to the authority

some of the more general powers in the specification of its broad functions in such a way as to ensure recognition of the broad responsibilities and duties of the authority.

Mr President, in commending the Bill to the House, I seek leave also to have it and the preceding Bill discussed concurrently at the second reading stage in accordance with Standing Order No. 246.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Robert Hetherington.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [5.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes amendments to the Local Government Act in two areas—in respect of sale of land by municipal councils, and the conduct of municipal audits.

The power already in the Act for a council to sell land is proposed to be amended in two ways. The first proposes to remove the need for councils to obtain approval to sell land to State Government agencies. Members will recall that the Act was amended recently to allow councils without approval to lease land by private treaty to State Government agencies, and the extension of a similar power to sale transactions reflects the Government's policy of reviewing the need for approvals as an ongoing process.

The second amendment proposes the introduction of a power for councils to sell or otherwise dispose of land which they hold under a trust. This amendment was initiated as a result of a problem encountered by the City of Stirling, which wishes to dispose of some land held by it under a trust for recreation purposes to an organisation proposing to develop an aged persons' home. Council obtained the approval of its electors under the existing provisions of the Act to vary the trust but was unable to proceed further as there is no power to transfer land held under a trust.

It is proposed that the proceeds of the sale of any such land shall be applied by a council for the purpose for which the land was held immediately before its sale. Where the land is disposed of

otherwise than by sale, it is intended that the person to whom the land is to be disposed will be required to execute a declaration of trust declaring that he will hold the land for the purpose for which it was held by the council immediately before its disposal.

The second area of amendment proposed relates to municipal audits and is intended to facilitate the transfer of these audits from the public to the private sector. At present, only 11 of the 139 municipalities in Western Australia are audited by private auditors, with the balance audited by the Auditor General.

The Bill proposes the establishment of a local government auditors' board which will have authority to register persons as local government auditors and to cancel such registrations. It is intended that councils be free to appoint as their auditors persons who are registered by the board to be constituted under regulations made under the Act.

Although it is intended that local government audits be generally transferred to the private sector, provision is made in the Bill for audits to be carried out by the Auditor General where a council is unable to obtain the services of a private auditor under reasonable terms and conditions.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

CEMETERIES AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [5.29 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains a minor amendment to the Cemeteries Act as a consequence of an amendment proposed to the Local Government Act to transfer municipal audits from the public to the private sector. The Act presently requires the accounts of cemetery boards, including those for which municipal councils act as trustees, to be audited by the Auditor General.

In view of the changes proposed to be made to the municipal audit system, it is necessary to make complementary changes to the provisions of the Cemeteries Act relating to audit. The Bill provides that, where a council of a municipality is the

trustee of a cemetery, the person who is the auditor of that municipality shall carry out also the audit of the cemetery board.

In other cases the audit will remain the responsibility of the Auditor General.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

PETROLEUM RETAILERS RIGHTS AND LIABILITIES BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [5.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is introduced to define the rights and liabilities of persons occupying land for the purpose of selling motor fuel by retail.

In April 1975 the Trade Practices Commission considered clearance notices and authorisation applications concerning transactions between the major oil companies, including the Shell Company of Australia Limited, and their respective service station operators. The franchise arrangements or lease agreements then existing commonly required the reseller to deal only in the particular supplier's brand of petroleum products. They provided also, *inter alia*, for controls over other goods and services in which the reseller might trade.

The commission decided to hold a public hearing into the Shell Company of Australia Limited's authorisation applications and on 9 December 1975 delivered its determination dismissing the applications for authorisation of the restrictive contracts concerned. The applications of the other major oil companies were later evaluated by the commission and were likewise dismissed.

The commission's position on subsequent agreements—that is, those in force after 30 June 1976—had the effect that lessee dealers should have the right to purchase up to 50 per cent of their supplies from other than their landlord suppliers. Regrettably, the definitive determination of the Trade Practices Commission was not then enshrined in legislation by the Commonwealth and, in spite of attempts by this and other State Governments, the Commonwealth has shown a complete disinclination to enact legislation in

what is seen by State Governments to be a matter of vital national importance.

The consequence has been that very few lessee dealers of petrol stations have taken advantage of the purchase rights determined by the Trade Practices Commission, presumably because they have felt insecure and practical difficulty was involved in exercising that right.

Accordingly, this Government has decided to introduce legislation to put beyond doubt the rights and liabilities of lessee dealers in petroleum retailing. The legislation introduced is innovative and thus will be subject to testing as to its effectiveness.

While it is fundamentally based on the structure of similar legislation enacted in Victoria it seeks to overcome the several constraints in that legislation which seem to have made it ineffective in practice.

The legislation seeks to protect the respective rights of the lessor and lessee and provides machinery for the resolution of disputes between the parties. Penalties to a maximum of \$5 000 are provided for offences committed by any person who fails to comply with any provision of the legislation.

It is emphasised that this Bill is not designed to be a legislative catch-all in the complex area of petroleum marketing. It seeks not to control oil company involvement in the total marketing process beyond the provisions of section 10 of the Commonwealth Retail Marketing Sites Act. That section limits the number of sites which oil companies may own and operate as retail sites. It does, however, seek to create an improvement in the bargaining power of the lessee dealer in his negotiations with his landlord supplier and better to provide for the freedom of choice which is an essential part of the private enterprise system.

The legislation is designed to promote competition and give greater freedom to the exercise of independent business judgment by resellers.

A desirable effect which it is believed may be achieved by this legislation is better competition in respect of product price resulting in a lowering of the wholesale price to retailers which will, in turn, be passed on to motorists.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 3 November.

THE HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [5.35 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government and the Treasurer for balancing the State's finances once again. It is indicative of the great job that our Premier and Treasurer is doing in this State; he is carrying on the fine job of the previous Premier (Sir Charles Court).

When reading the Estimates for the present financial year, I noted that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has a budget provision of \$7.107 million. Part of this budget is to be spent on kangaroo eradication and the kangaroo shooting industry, in particular.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House a film titled "Goodbye Joey" which was made in Canberra. Some two or three weeks ago this film was brought to the attention of the people of Western Australia by an article in the *Daily News*.

I do not wish to bore the House by reading the whole article; therefore, I seek leave of the House to have it incorporated in *Hansard* because I will refer to it in my speech.

Incorporation of Material

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

'Film will shock the world'

Eight professional kangaroo shooters sit around a campfire near Queanbeyan, brewing billy tea and exchanging yarns.

The scene, set in bushland just south of Canberra, has a faintly comforting all-Australian air of mateship and harmony with the bush.

But, as the cameras roll, the shooters rack their minds for treasured tales of the cruellest things they have heard done, or done themselves, to kangaroos.

They talk of the "kicks" they get from slitting open a kangaroo while it is alive to rip out the heart and feel it thumping in their bloodied hands.

They have tested the life of a kangaroo by seeing how many limbs and parts can be axed off before its agonised death.

And they have driven by Land-Rover alongside kangaroos, decapitating them with

machetes to see them run 60 metres "before they realise their heads are missing".

The shooters' fireside yarns make one scene of a documentary—"Goodbye Joey"—that may soon, perhaps with some censoring, be brought to our TV screens.

It is believed that Channel 7 has begun negotiations to show the 95-minute documentary.

But the film, originally made for the export market, will be sold in its gruesome entirety overseas.

It is the work of Peter Cunningham, a former ABC cinematographer and film-maker for the Defence Department in Canberra.

Mr Cunningham said he began the film as a money-making enterprise, but it took only a couple of weeks to put him off eating hamburgers and small-goods forever.

He said: "I always did have some sympathy for animals but I wasn't a hardline or even softline conservationist.

"But the kangaroo industry is the most disgusting and covered-up situation I've ever heard of.

"This is a documentary that will shock the world."

Mr Cunningham leaves Australia soon to sell the film to Japan, England, the U.S., Canada, Germany and Sweden—among them nations that have bought kangaroo meat.

The documentary includes comment by former Deputy Prime Minister Dr Jim Cairns, Victorian secretary of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union, Mr Wally Curran, and RSPCA Victorian president, Dr Hugh Wirth.

Dr Cairns said he believed kangaroos, "like nature and Aborigines", were savagely mistreated and neglected in Australia.

He said laws and regulations governing the treatment of kangaroos were inefficient, partly through lack of interest by enforcers.

And he says on film that he believes governments are heavily linked to the industry in Australia.

He said: "The treatment of animals and nature is the most important issue for us—it is the only issue that counts.

"There are increasing signs that people interested in commerce are beginning to see the great significance of conserving what they have been exploiting.

"That has to happen to animals as well."

Dr Cairns disputes the headlines that scream about kangaroo plagues in Victoria.

"Some areas of Australia have a sufficiently large number of kangaroos to be a problem to pastoralists," he said.

"But this is certainly not the case in Victoria. I have no doubt that there is no plague here."

Wally Curran, a meatworkers' union representative for 25 years, takes a surprisingly conservationist attitude to the supposed plagues of kangaroos.

"Sure, some roos do create problems for farmers," he said.

"But I know that some people create problems for farmers, too—but you don't go out and shoot them.

"We all have to learn to drop our destructive ways and start to appreciate and look after beauty and nature.

"The kangaroo is a magnificent animal."

Mr Curran believes that the illegal slaughter and trade in kangaroos is bigger than most imagine. He said the Woodward Royal Commission may have cooled the market, but it would flourish again when beef prices rose.

"It is my view that there is a large amount of roo meat still being kept in freezers to be released into the local or export market at the first opportune time," he said.

"It can only be stopped if the laws are made clear and they are enforced by tightening up inspection points, establishing ways of proving types of meat and giving the public the right to sue companies for selling falsified meat.

"So far the laxities of law have been something disgraceful and a lot of people have a lot to answer for."

Mr Curran said kangaroo meat was dangerous and unsuitable for human consumption, no matter how it was killed or handled.

"The people in the trade are fly-by-nighters," he said.

"They've got a gung-ho mentality, just in it to make a fast hundred thousand dollars, or even a million.

"And believe me, there is big money in it."

Even if kangaroos were harvested as a commercial venture, with strict supervision

and controls, the range and danger of exotic diseases were so prevalent that the meat may not be fit even for cats and dogs, he said.

"No one can tell me that roo meat can ever be as good as beef," he said.

"They are riddled with hydatids and salmonella."

He said the attitudes to meat inspection in Australia suggested that if an unscrupulous person wished, he could get anything into the local human food chain.

He cited a "near miss" in northern Victoria earlier this year when a farmer fed his pigs with the carcass of a cow that had died of anthrax.

"It was only the quickness of the vet in diagnosing that the pigs got diseased that stopped dozens of them being sold into the market," Mr Curran said.

A farmer's letter to the Melbourne rural publication *Weekly Times* this year has been promoted by wildlife groups to show that callousness by shooters sometimes goes hand-in-hand with the money machine.

The letter argued against an RSPCA appeal for shooters to stop and inspect shot kangaroos to make sure they were properly killed.

The farmer said: "This is ridiculous . . . if they stopped, the first kangaroo shot would be the last one shot for that night. The rest would escape to the safety of the scrub."

Debate Resumed

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: While on this subject I think it is appropriate to mention that Mr MacKinnon, in his capacity as the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, introduced into this House legislation to cover the harvesting of kangaroos. No doubt he will listen closely to my comments.

The film which was made in Canberra depicts the shooting industry as a vile and cruel operation. Last Wednesday evening I had the opportunity to watch excerpts from the film on "Nationwide".

I would like to make the point that I admire the "Nationwide" team for the balanced way in which they presented the subject. They heard both sides. I took the trouble to obtain a transcript of the segment from the ABC.

The professional kangaroo shooting industry in Western Australia is a small and efficient operation which is essential to the pastoralists, and some pastoralists in my electorate have expressed concern about it. The harvesting of kangaroos is carried out also in farming areas, but I am speaking only of how it affects my electorate.

Allegations were made in this programme stating it was general practice for people involved in the kangaroo shooting industry to be cruel when killing animals. I would like to say publicly that this is not the case.

The people involved with the making of the film, Peter Cunningham and his wife, Lynette Guilfoyle, I believe have been misleading and mischievous; or they are being promoted by such people as the Animal Liberation Society.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: A very good organisation!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: These people have stepped into an area they know nothing about. I believe the Animal Liberation Society is supporting them and I have evidence that the canned pet food people have their hand in the matter as well. I challenge them to come clean. If the canned pet food industry is involved, it should say so; if not, it should deny it.

I want to refer to some of the ludicrous claims which were made. One of the more gruesome claims made by the President of the Australian Wildlife Protection Council on the "Nationwide" programme was that the animals' limbs were chopped off and that they were shipped interstate on semi-trailers and kept alive so that the pet meat was fresh. He claimed that ex-Government meat inspectors said it was cruel and it went on every day. I refute that totally. I have made inquiries throughout the shooting industry and I have never heard such nonsense as the suggestion that a professional kangaroo shooter would transport a kangaroo live so it could arrive in a fresh condition. It is beyond the realms of possibility to suggest that this would go on.

I quote Mr Cunningham from the "Nationwide" programme—and I am happy to table this document—when he stated—

... when you go out to shoot an animal, you know, are you going to aim for the smallest part of the animal or the largest part,

It goes on—

Now if you aim for the head, there's a better chance that you're going to miss that animal than if you aim for the largest part, which is usually the top of the leg or the hip. Now, I suggest in some cases, in a lot of cases, that the shooters don't aim for the head, which is the most humane area to kill it, they aim for the hip, the animal goes down and it can lie, and I quote the words of a professional 'roo shooter, "it can lie in that state for up to a week".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a lot of rubbish. If you hit it in the hip it would damage the greatest amount of meat. I was out three nights with shooters; they shoot in the head or the heart.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Mr MacKinnon is well versed in these matters. The person in this State who has probably more knowledge than most in this industry is Mr Bruce Teede who is one of the more senior operators. He believes the person in Government and ministerial circles who knows most about the industry is Mr MacKinnon. The Hon. Graham MacKinnon is right in saying that no kangaroo shooter, especially one shooting for a living and who is paid for the amount of meat taken off a carcase, would ever aim anywhere except at the head or the heart. I cannot believe people would say such things unless it were for some mischievous reason.

"Goodbye Joey" has been made specifically for the American market. It has an American narrator, and uses an expatriate American—an animal liberationist, May Wilson—to drive home the point that cruelty to kangaroos in Australia is not uncommon. This is not the first time this industry has been attacked by Animal Liberation Society members and people who would have no kangaroos shot. In my view the kangaroo is a good animal, and one we should be proud of in our heritage. It is also a destructive animal and it is not good if it goes unchecked throughout the pastoral industry. In the past, these people have stopped a lucrative American market by stirring up trouble and bringing this matter to the fore. This market has only just been restored.

Mr Cunningham and his wife, and the people who made the film, are being mischievous, and are trying to stop a lucrative section of the meat and skin export market by taking this film to America. It would be wrong for any further pressure to be put on the kangaroo industry. The Federal Government twice in Budgets has raised the sales tax on pet food products. In the first instance the sales tax went from 0 to 17.5 per cent, which set back the industry tremendously. This year, unbelievably, the Federal Government increased the sales tax by another 2.5 per cent so that it is now 20 per cent. Only a limited market for pet food exists in Australia and Western Australia in particular, and it is important that people should be able to get the product at a reasonable price. As soon as the price went up, people started to go to butchers' shops to buy scraps of meat that attracted no sales tax, and they fed their pets in that way. The sale of pet food has decreased and that has an effect right down the line. Pastoralists have difficulty getting people to go onto their properties to shoot the animals professionally.

It is wrong that people should enter a debate like this when they know nothing about the subject other than what they have learned from this film. These people have evidence, because I saw the excerpts on "Nationwide". If they have such information, they should take it to the appropriate authorities such as the RSPCA or the courts, and have people prosecuted. If this sort of thing is going on—and I cannot knock it because it is on film—it is not being done by professional kangaroo shooters. It is being done by a bunch of louts and fly-by-nighters. They should be prosecuted. The people making these claims have a responsibility to take the offenders to the appropriate authorities and have them prosecuted.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: The film people didn't arrange it, did they?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I have no idea, but it incenses me because the people who will suffer in the end are the pastoralists who are the people least able to defend themselves. These people are making a film willy-nilly and taking it to America when probably one per cent or less of the industry operates in this way. It is more likely to be louts or weekend shooters who give everyone a bad name. The professional kangaroo shooting industry in Western Australia is second to none.

It has two very responsible associations—the Kangaroo Processors' Association and the Kangaroo Shooters' Association. Both are headed by responsible people who know what they are doing. Their committees work hard. The shooters in Western Australia, especially those in my electorate, are very responsible, hard-working people. It hurts them to have fly-by-nighters from obscure places like Canberra come out of their air-conditioned offices once or twice a decade and make a stupid film. If Mr Cunningham and his wife want to come to Western Australia and be taken through the shooting industry, I will be happy to arrange it. It will show them that what they have on film is an isolated case.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Are they going to sell it to the US?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Certainly they are.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I agree; probably these people are considering the almighty dollar. I am probably giving them free advertising. If they are going to make a dollar, let them make a film about the truth.

The Hon. Garry Kelly: Have you seen the film?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I have seen excerpts on "Nationwide".

The Hon. Garry Kelly: Not the lot?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will pass this excerpt to Mr Kelly to read.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Have you dismissed the suggestion that it may have been subsidised by some other association?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am suggesting, Mr Wordsworth, that the Animal Liberation Society and/or perhaps the canned pet food industry might have had a hand in it. They can deny that if they want to.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: What are you suggesting? Are you suggesting they have done something improper?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am suggesting that if the Animal Liberation Society is stooping to this type of thing to stop the kangaroo shooting industry, it should be taken to task. Other methods are available. Incidentally, I do not oppose all that the Animal Liberation Society stands for. Probably it is composed of responsible people—people trying to do the right thing.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I just want to know what you are saying.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am saying that I believe it is involved in this, and that is bad.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There are more kangaroos here today than when the white man arrived.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is right.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: That is an interesting point. Although I was not able to obtain the total figure, when I spoke to the officers of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife I was informed of a planning programme that had operated over a number of years. The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon will be well aware of these figures. Approximately seven or eight years ago a forecast was made of the kangaroo population, and it is interesting that the estimate is within a few hundred of the actual population figure today. This points out that the industry is being well controlled and organised.

I will turn now to another subject, which is close to my heart: the fishing industry. In my electorate the fishing industry is at the crossroads. Over the last few years the snapper industry in particular has been under pressure because of dwindling catches. Members of this House have heard me ask questions about this matter. One such question was to the then Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife (the Hon. G. E. Masters).

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You would not get much action there.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Quite the contrary, Mr Dans. The Hon. G. E. Masters set up a study into the snapper industry after questions

were asked in this House. Figures are starting to come in from that study.

Once again I make an appeal concerning fish traps. I carried out some research on this matter to determine whether I was the only one putting forward this plea, especially as I had been putting it forward for some years. I am happy to say that my research showed a question was asked in another place on Wednesday, 11 November 1964. It appears on page 2475 of *Hansard*. The Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to know that the question was asked by Mr Harry Fletcher.

The Hon. Fred McKenzie: A good member!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Anyone who considers the Shark Bay fishery must be a man of note! In those days Mr Ross Hutchinson—now Sir Ross Hutchinson—was the Minister for Fisheries and Mr Fletcher asked him the following question—

Will he make known departmental intentions regarding use of fish traps in Shark Bay area—

- (a) continued use;
- (b) partial use; or
- (c) abolition when?

That is an intelligent question, and one I have asked about four times in this place.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Was it answered?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I received the same answer as did Mr Fletcher. It seems there is always a deputation. The answer read—

Recently a deputation from the Fremantle Fishermen's Co-operative requested that fish traps be banned for the catching of snapper. In addition evidence submitted by fishermen to the Fishermen's Advisory Committee recently in opposition to the use of traps is being checked and analysed.

It has taken 18 years to be analysed. The answer continued—

The honourable member is advised, therefore, that the whole question of the use of snapper traps in Shark Bay is now under consideration.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Have the results of Mr Masters' studies been computed yet?

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Rome was not built in a day!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: In all seriousness, the sad fact of the matter is—and I do not care about deputations, inquiries, investigations, or anything else—snapper fishermen in Carnarvon are catching less snapper today than they did 10 years ago, and less snapper this year than last

year. We must protect the snapper fishermen—and here I am talking about the ones who operate with a line; that is, wetline fishermen.

I do not think any member would disagree with me when I say that snapper traps are bad. They bruise the fish, and they clean out the fishery. I know the Minister may say no technical evidence is available to back up my statements, but the line fishermen—many of whom have been in the business for 25 years—have a good idea of the damage being done by the snapper traps.

It is time to take some firm action to get rid of these traps. The rock lobster fishermen from Geraldton come up to Shark Bay after the rock lobster season has finished. They should be putting their traps somewhere else.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perhaps, in fairness to the Minister, you will tell the House whether the traps are in State or Federal waters.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am always astounded by such statements. If the traps are in Federal waters, I will have to stop telling the fishermen not to get hold of the snapper traps and drag them to oblivion. If they took that action, who would prosecute them—the Commonwealth or the State?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is hard to get someone to take action.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: If the Commonwealth is involved, so be it. However, as I said before, we cannot sit here while Rome burns. We must get on with the job.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Those fish traps have turned people away from buying snapper. They bruise the flesh.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The Leader of the Opposition has impeccable taste in fish. I know the type of fish he has requested to be brought down from my area. He has told me that he does not want snapper. I have always taken cognizance of his views and I have brought him first-class whiting, usually from Shark Bay! As the Leader of the Opposition says, the fish from the snapper traps is inferior. We should be selling first-grade snapper only and we must protect our snapper fishery for the people involved in the industry.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Are you saying slow-learning fish are crook fish and go into the traps?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The honourable member could look in the mirror! I am saying that the rock lobster fishermen should stay out of it unless they want to fish with a line.

I understand the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife is concerned about pressure on the scal-

lop fishery and has taken steps to close the Shark Bay scallop fishery for some months.

I understand that negotiations are taking place to close the scallop fishery from 1 November this year until 1 February 1982, and from 1 November 1983 to 1 March 1984. I commend the department for the steps it has taken; it has recognised that the fishery must be protected. Why cannot the same steps be taken in regard to the snapper fishery?

Members may be happy to know that I have no intention of mentioning the Blowholes.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: It has been fixed up.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I would like to mention the fishermen's co-operative which commenced at Carnarvon two years ago. Like so many co-operatives in this State, it floundered for a variety of reasons.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: It floundered?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A very good fish that, too.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The co-operative was taken up last year by a division of Kailis Bros. Seafoods. While I do not usually name people in this place, I would like to refer to this company because it has done a superb job in Carnarvon. A market was made available to the fishermen so that they could sell their fish. The fishermen did not have to sell all or even part of their catch through this market. A market was made available through which the fishermen can sell their fish for which they are paid on the spot. If a fisherman uses this market for all his catch, a bonus is paid at the end of the year. Not all the fishermen availed themselves of this facility, but it has brought some stability into the industry.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is going on again is it?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I understand that Mr Kailis from Kailis Bros. Seafoods will operate again in the coming snapper season. It has worked out very well indeed.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Prior to the tea suspension I was about to wind up my comments about the fishing industry. During the break I was reminded by the Hon. Margaret McAleer that she has a thriving rock lobster industry in her electorate, based at Geraldton, and I know she represents that industry extremely well.

I would make two points about the rock lobster industry: Firstly, I do not want the people involved to use snapper traps and, secondly, I do not want to see these people at the Blowholes. A brand new rock lobster industry has commenced

at Shark Bay, or Denham, and the people involved in the industry are very welcome to work this area and to expand their activities there.

I shift now to the subject of the Federal Government's placement of TV stations in remote areas. I commend the Federal Government's action of installing these stations in areas such as Mt. Magnet, Meekatharra, Cue, Yalgoo, Laverton, Exmouth, Shark Bay, and Useless Loop. These stations have been of great benefit to the people in these regions.

Only recently I communicated with officers of Telecom to arrange to have a station working in Denham in time for the people there to watch the Western Australian Football League grand final. Originally, several reasons were given that a station could not be ready in time for that game, but fortunately the fellows involved pulled out all stops and installed a portable generator, so that on the morning of the grand final everything was ready. I give full marks to the Telecom workers.

A problem confronting places like Exmouth is that although repeater stations have been constructed, the Federal Department of Communications did not take into consideration the point that 20 kilometres to the south of Exmouth is an industry run by the M. G. Kailis fisheries group, which employs in excess of 100 people. With families and travellers in the area the number of people is more like 200 over 12 months of the year. The remarkable thing is that at places such as Exmouth, the RAAF base at Learmonth, and the nearby Exmouth Gulf station, the people cannot receive a clear TV picture.

The shire brought this matter to the attention of the Federal Department of Communications, which wrote back to the shire in more or less the following terms, "If we put a repeater mast on the edge of Rough Range, just south of Exmouth, all these people will enjoy a crystal clear reception at a total cost of \$15 000 which, no doubt, you can make arrangements with the people concerned to pay."

I have written to the Federal Minister for Communications, aided by Senator Thomas from Western Australia, calling on the department to finish the job it started. A sum of \$15 000 compared with the total cost of a TV repeater station is an infinitesimal amount. It is my belief that the department has a responsibility to finish the job so that the people in these areas can enjoy a clear reception.

It has concerned me for some time that the Overseas Telecommunications Commission station at Carnarvon might not have its contract renewed in 1984 to operate the Intelsat repeater

station. The station presently employs up to 40 people and it would be wrong to shift the operation to Ceduna. I hope that in the coming weeks the Federal Minister will make a statement either refuting or confirming the possibility of this OTC station continuing.

I will comment now on internal airlines in Western Australia. No doubt members are aware a report was produced recently on the operation of the internal airlines in this State including suggestions of this operation being opened up to allow competition on these routes. Enough has been said in this House at different times about the operations of Airlines of Western Australia. I will not be so parochial as to say it is the only operation to be found in W.A.

Recently the Federal ALP spokesman on aviation matters said that TAA should be given an opportunity to operate in Western Australia. I could not agree more with that idea, although I have one proviso; that is, TAA should be obliged to operate on exactly the same routes now operated by Airlines of Western Australia or on routes not covered by the local airline. I simply will not accept any deterioration of our services anywhere in this State.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: But it has happened; look at Wyndham.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The member is talking about bus services. If he waits a moment I am sure he will realise that this is a subject on which we both agree.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Get the Minister to agree.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The member should allow me to continue; I do not have a lot of regard for him at times, although at the moment we are good friends, but that may change at any moment.

As I said, I will not accept any deterioration in our air services. I stress I am talking about jet services. In my province I use the jet services enjoyed by the people of Carnarvon and Learmonth. I will not accept those jet services being replaced by non-jet aircraft. No-one could convince me that a commuter aircraft would be cheaper, and I give the commuter airlines their due: They have not said they could provide a cheaper service.

If TAA wants to come to Western Australia, that is fine, but I will not accept the idea of places such as Port Hedland, which presently has a jet service, being fed by commuter aircraft from Broome or Derby. At the moment people in the north of Western Australia are extremely well served, and unless TAA can offer a similar service it should stay out of the area altogether.

The Hon. Peter Dowding raised the subject of bus services from airports to towns in the north, and certainly the services at Wyndham and Kununurra are causing problems to his constituents. This is also the case in my province, at Learmonth.

It is approximately 30 kilometres from the Learmonth airstrip to Exmouth and people experience problems in travelling between those places. The onus probably rests with Airlines of Western Australia to relook at its position. Places such as Carnarvon do not warrant a bus service; in fact, one could walk into the town. Geraldton is perhaps an area which should be serviced by taxis on a regular basis, as it is now. Learmonth has no taxis. The distance between Wyndham and Kununurra is too great for people to take taxis. Kununurra is serviced by Airlines of Western Australia, and it has no need for buses. Perhaps the decision of Airlines of Western Australia was somewhat hasty. The ball is in its court to relook at the situation.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It is in the Government's court really.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: It is not the Government's responsibility at all. Airlines of Western Australia operates its own buses. It is not correct to say it is the Government's fault; the Government does not operate the buses.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: No, but it licences AWA.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Yes, I understand that, but I am suggesting the onus rests upon Airlines of Western Australia to relook at the situation.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Sure, but there is a primary onus on the Government to organise the whole transport system.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: That is not the view of this Government. I do not think the Government should tell private businesses what to do. I know what the member is trying to get at, but I simply cannot agree with him because I believe the onus rests on Airlines of Western Australia. If continual problems arise from this measure which cannot be solved and Airlines of Western Australia refuses to do something about them, perhaps the onus will rest upon the Government to look at the whole situation. It is an interesting point.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It would be crook if you got to Learmonth with two suitcases and there were no buses.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: During the ALP State conference it was suggested that perhaps

the ALP should buy a share in Airlines of Western Australia. That is an interesting point.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And a share in everything else that is going!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I do not intend to go through my electorate town by town and indicate where the money is being spent. I am very pleased that the problem area of domestic water supplies has largely been solved in the Cue, Mt. Magnet, Sandstone, and Meekatharra areas. All those towns last summer experienced problems with water quality, quantity, and availability. In its ongoing programme, the Public Works Department proposes to install automatic chlorinators and to upgrade the system, and it is to be commended for that.

In conclusion, I call upon members of Parliament to put aside their political biases this weekend because the first test match in the Australia *versus* England series is to take place. Test matches at the Western Australian Cricket Association or WACA ground are under threat—and I am not even thinking about anti-smoking advertising; I am speaking about the large number of people who attend these matches. It is our responsibility as solid Western Australians, as I sincerely hope we all are, to attend the match at the WACA and boost the numbers and so ensure that we give great support to the match that has become traditionally Western Australia's test. The test starts on Friday; Monday is a rest day, and then the match continues through to the following Wednesday, if it goes that long. We should show a lead in this regard. I know the Hon. Peter Dowding is probably not a cricket supporter, but I would even be happy to go along with him to explain to him some of the finer points of cricket on a non-political standing. I spoke to the people at the WACA today.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I don't have time to go to the cricket.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I do not normally have the time either, but I will make the time because the people of Western Australia deserve to have the test held here and we should show the lead. I urge members if they are in Perth this weekend to squeeze a day out of their electorates and attend the cricket. I am sure it will be appreciated.

I support the motion.

THE HON. NEIL OLIVER (West)
[7.45 p.m.]: Continuing the traditions of previous Governments, particularly Liberal-Country Party Governments, once again we have achieved a balanced Budget.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is terrific for the Chamberlain John Deere workers. They would be pleased with that, wouldn't they?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Give me a go. It is quite normal to get interjections from the Opposition.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: That is true, and you will get some more if you are not careful.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Members opposite have never achieved a balanced Budget and so they find it easy to interject and criticise, and that is a common attitude for them to take. For the first time the works programme has been included in the Consolidated Revenue programme and it totals \$3.3 billion. This has possibly been overlooked by members. If we separate these two items we see the loans programme and the works programme were in the vicinity of approximately \$600 million, but this year the programme will be increased by \$400 million and it will then pass the \$1 billion mark. That is good news; in fact, it is probably the greatest news this Parliament has ever received in a Budget. I have not heard any member of the Opposition draw attention to this, but I would not expect them to. It is quite a significant point. This could not come at a better time, as the economy of Australia needs an inflow of public funds into the capital works area. I commend the Government for taking this lead. It is needed and welcomed, and the private enterprise sector of our economy will pick up the challenge and respond.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: By doing what?

The Hon. P. G. Pental: This is new.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The member who is interjecting cannot understand that the people will respond to money. He just does not understand what it is all about.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Tell us what they do. Mr Pental is desperately trying to back you up.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: He might understand it personally, but he does not understand it from his party's point of view.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You tell us then.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Government is to be commended on bringing forward this programme in the early months of the financial year—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Prior to the election!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: —which some people might think is prior to the election.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Are they wrong?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: It appears the member wishes to make my speech. I would be interested to hear his comments at a later stage.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: He would do a better job.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If the Hon. Peter Dowding wants to win the election and use that to his political advantage, let him do so at an appropriate time when he has the floor in the House. I do not believe the Government has brought forward the programme because of the possibility of an early election; I believe the Government has done this in the sincere belief that it will overcome some of the problems which are confronting our economy, such as the area of employment.

If the member would like to interject again and say it is contrary to the views of the Government, let him do so.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Perhaps he would like us to cut back on Federal works and do fewer jobs.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I believe the Government should be commended for presenting a balanced Budget once again. This Government has continued the practice of the Court Government. It is a credible policy for the Government to bring forward a balanced Budget. We, together with all the people in Australia, know the policies of the Labor Party in this area. I believe a balanced Budget is the correct way in which to run the affairs of this country.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I do not believe that the members who are interjecting would understand what it would mean to have a deficit Budget.

The Hon. Garry Kelly: Which interjection—Mr Pental's?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I was referring to the interjection by the Hon. Robert Hetherington who would not know what it would mean to have a deficit Budget. If a State had a deficit Budget the people of the State would be called upon in later years to pay the consequences in order to achieve a balanced Budget. That could be achieved only by increasing charges. If that is what Mr Hetherington wants, let him state it; if the Labor Party wants the people of Western Australia to pay more to Consolidated Revenue, it should state so clearly now.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable members who are interjecting to cease their

interjections because I will not tolerate their continuation.

Point of Order

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: On a point of order, Mr President, I object to the reference by the honourable member to a balanced Budget when we all know it was a fiddled Budget.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member knows that is not a point of order and I consider it an abuse of his position. I will take more appropriate action if he takes that step again.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: It is very sad the members of the Opposition wish to take this course. It is a course which I feel is detrimental to every person in Western Australia.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Just saying that you are talking nonsense is not taking any course, it is pointing out a fact.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are talking nonsense.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If we were to have a deficit Budget the only people who would pay for it would be the taxpayers of Western Australia. If a Government embarks on a policy of expenditure that is not covered in the Budget, the taxpayers will pay for it. If members on the other side of the House wish to say, "Right, we agree with this and we believe the Budget of this State should be in deficit", that is up to them.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I do not think anyone said that. What we said was that you were talking nonsense.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I hope the Opposition is never in government.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: We could not do worse than this Government.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I refer to a subject which may be closer to the hearts of the Opposition members who are shadow Ministers, and that is education.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Of course it would.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If they are critical obviously they voiced their opinion in the Caucus room in 1972-73; because the two items in this Budget that attract the greatest expenditure are health and education.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What has this to do with it?

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I am not a shadow Minister.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I thought members opposite may have brought some logic to this debate, but at the moment it has no logic at all.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: We agree.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Expenditure on education in the O'Connor Government's Budget represents 23.5 per cent of the total Budget.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: It is the highest ever figure.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Could I put it another way: A figure of \$549.5 million has been allocated to education in this year's Budget. There is not one interjection.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: We have made our interjections, but you do not note them.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: When the Government allocates such a fantastic figure how can anyone be critical of it?

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Quite easily and with no trouble at all. I will criticise the education policy in due course.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: When the Labor Party was in Government, expenditure on education represented 20.43 per cent of the Budget. Might I add that over the last six years I have heard by way of interjections in this House criticism of the Government's education policy.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: You will probably hear it again.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: At no time over the past six years has the Court Government or the O'Connor Government allocated to education less than the percentage allocated by the Tonkin Government. How can members opposite be critical? We are not talking in dollars and cents but about the percentage of the overall Budget allocated to education. If anyone could be critical of it, it would not be the Labor Party.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: No trouble at all.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Labor Party could not be critical of it.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Of course we could.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: When the Labor Party was in Government it did not perform as well as this Government, so how can it be critical?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is the point you are making?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Give me the point and I will be right.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Mr Dowding, have you made your speech on the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Members of the Opposition have no right to be critical of the current education programme because when they were in Government they did not perform as well as this Government.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: We performed as well as we possibly could, under the circumstances.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: How can members opposite allocate more money when they are not in a position—

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: This Government got the full benefit of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. P. G. Pendal: These are State funds we are talking about, you galah.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I am absolutely astounded at the sort of comments made by members opposite. Why did they not perform when in Government? Why did they not do all these things which, as an Opposition, they are critical of this Government for failing to do? Why did they not allocate to education as much funds as the present Government? The Labor Party formed the Government at that time and had control of the purse strings; it could have done something, but it did nothing. It is the easiest thing in the world to be critical, and members opposite are critical 100 per cent of the time. Over the last 12 months or so, I have listened to a real "talk-fest" from the Opposition on a whole range of extraneous matters. I should like to make a few points of my own, and make some specific statements about my electorate.

Some people may think West Province has no problems in the education area or that the students in that electorate find no difficulty in fitting into the educational system. However, the children of many of my constituents are obliged to travel over 60 kilometres a day to and from school, just as children in other country areas must travel out of the district to attend a primary school, a district high school or an agricultural school. Therefore, I commend the Government for its proposal to upgrade educational facilities within my electorate.

Previously, each Sunday evening or Monday morning students were required to travel by school bus to high school hostels. It may come as a surprise to some that the children of the Bullsbrook area studying for the TAE certificate need to live at the hostel in Midland provided by the authorities.

We have just heard from the Hon. Phil Lockyer; no doubt the children of his constituents confront these problems as a matter of course. Parents of children undertaking the TAE certificate understand the facilities may not be available within the area, and that the children must live in hostels to complete their studies. However, frequently people in my electorate are unaware of the problems that can arise; they are unaware their families will be split up by their children moving to a high school hostel to complete their TAE certificate studies. I am referring now to an electorate within close proximity to the Perth metropolitan area. Many of these facilities are available in the more remote regions but not in some of the districts closer to the metropolitan area. I do not think any other member, apart from the Hon. Gordon Masters, would be able to put a similar argument.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: We all know how close you are to the metropolitan area. You represent a small number on the basis that you are in a country electorate when actually you are part of the metropolitan area. What is your complaint?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If the Hon. Peter Dowding would care to travel from Bolgart to Perth every day, let him do so.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Probably, it would be easier for him than not going to his own electorate.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I thank Mr Lewis for his interjection. The Hon. Peter Dowding always has a good explanation for not visiting his electorate; however, his electorate is serviced by air, and he has ready access to his constituents. Although Mt. Newman is a remote place, he could reach there by aircraft quicker than I could drive to the Bolgart Shire Council offices.

Recently I did a quick calculation of the distances I travel in moving around my electorate. I was startled to find that since 1 April, I have spent over 60 hours each week in my vehicle. Doubtless, many members would exceed even that. I place no significance on that figure; it is part of life. I may travel from Gidgegannup to Beverley and back, and I may traverse all of that country in one day, because people expect it of their member. That is part of the problem of representing a semi-metropolitan, or semi-rural electorate.

I wish to recount to the House some of the pleasing things I have seen occur in education since I have been a member of Parliament. In 1977, the Kelmscott High School had the largest enrolment of any high school in the metropolitan area; I understand it now exceeds 1 200 pupils. By

1980-81, the school enrolment had reached saturation point. The people of Roleystone were concerned that their children were travelling great distances to and from school; in some cases children were travelling 40 kilometres a day, and for people living on the fringe of the metropolitan area, that is quite a distance. Inconvenience also was experienced in relation to sporting activities, bus time-tables, and the like.

A public meeting was held at Roleystone, attended by over 300 people, all of whom were anxious to see the establishment of a high school at Roleystone.

The economics and the viability of a high school in Roleystone were somewhat under challenge; but the growth in the population of young children—probably what we would call the “baby boom”—necessitated the construction of another primary school. If a new primary school had been built, within the next eight years—subject to the amount of growth over those eight years—it may have become redundant and not required by the Education Department.

It is interesting that the people of the Roleystone community understood the problem facing the Government. There was a need for two primary schools, one of which would be redundant and a waste of taxpayers' funds. Therefore, the people put the proposition that the children in years 6 and 7 of primary school should be farmed off to another school which could become a district high school, rather than build another primary school.

The Education Department saw this as a challenge. I had the opportunity of guiding the department and I said, “Why should we build two new primary schools and then finish up with one that is redundant? Why should we take away from the Kelmscott High School the great expansion making it the largest high school in Western Australia? We could provide an interim, and ultimately a new idea.” This was taken up by the first meeting attended by some 300 people, and the proposal is now contained in this year's Budget.

I do not know what terminology or nomenclature the Education Department has for the Roleystone higher education facility; but it means that instead of building another primary school we have now provided, in the Budget papers, a new facility which takes in the two higher grades from the primary sector, and then moves into a junior high school environment.

This is breaking new ground in Western Australia. In fact, it is probably breaking new ground in the whole of Australia. It has been brought

about by the nature of the geographical situation, and also by the tremendous parental and community involvement. Through their concern for their children, the people of Roleystone are embarking on a completely new endeavour in education that may develop throughout the State over the next 20 or 30 years.

I say with great pleasure, but without any commendation for myself, that I am pleased consensus has been reached within a community to follow a course of action which is probably, economically, the right course of action, and which has proved to be the right course of action for the children of Roleystone. That is a wonderful achievement. It is highly commendable for a community to reach such a consensus.

Another area with which I wish to deal relates to high schools and schools generally, and the fact that they have facilities which are readily available to other members of the community. As an ex-member of the Churchlands College of Advanced Education, I am well aware of the fact that tennis courts may be made available to the local community; but in country areas, many facilities are not available. Therefore, it is commendable to learn that in this Budget we are extending to primary schools and high schools the ability to make available their facilities to the community at large.

Strangely enough, this move already is in effect in the area of Lesmurdie, which is almost in the metropolitan area. If an area has telephone communications, members of the Opposition would readily concede that it is part of the metropolitan area. It is truly an achievement that, for the first time in this State—I know of no other place and no other circumstances in which this is planned or anticipated—the library of a high school has been made available for use by the community. This is the situation now at Lesmurdie.

With the assistance of Margaret Ellis, the chief librarian, and with the co-operation of the Shire of Kalamunda, rather than tennis courts and playing fields being made available to the community, we have now reached the situation where the community within which the high school is located is able to utilise the library facilities. I commend this pilot scheme, if it may be called that, to other members. It is a first-cab-off-the-rank situation in which people in the community have the opportunity to use the library facilities of the high school. To my knowledge, such a facility has never been made available to any other community in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Hear, hear!

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: There was opposition to the scheme. The opposition now is somewhat faint, because the project has proved to be a very successful operation.

Only a couple of months ago I had the opportunity to inspect that facility. I have seen a library in a high school—a school which will take students through to the TAE level—with only 7 500 books. As of today, although the school still has not reached the level of providing TAE certificates, the number of library books is 15 000.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You can read only one at a time.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I hope politics will be put aside and the Opposition will be in total agreement with me.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The achievement is magnificent.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are in total agreement with you.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: A developing area always suffers great pressures from every direction. One pressure relates to people in my electorate who have come from the Perth metropolitan area. They gain an advantage by being able to purchase lower priced land, and therefore obtain a lower mortgage; however, the financial decision they took has proved ultimately to be to their disadvantage as a result of the higher interest rates now charged.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Caused by the Federal Government.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Higher interest rates certainly have caused serious problems to a particular class of people. People living in lower income areas of housing are generally able to benefit from the current Government programmes to assist home buyers—I would say they are more than adequately covered—but in middle income areas of housing—the higher mortgage areas—the people are under great stress. The House must understand the stress placed upon these people by the current economic environment faced by Australia.

It is easy for people to adopt a *carte blanche* attitude toward this situation, but I emphasise that the problem for these people is quite serious.

I will refer now to the problems faced by youth in my electorate, which is isolated from the Perth transport system. In particular, it is isolated from the Perth railway system. This isolation poses in my electorate an immense problem to the mothers and fathers of children reaching maturity who wish to involve themselves in activities other than

those available in their local area. They may wish to involve themselves in theatre, or attend university or other higher education facilities. They should not be disadvantaged because of where they live.

These children do not have the advantages that children have who live in areas such as Attadale, Fremantle, or Cottesloe, to name but a few. This situation places great stress upon and causes distress to the members of organisations within my community who wish to provide alternatives for these children. As a member of Parliament representing that area I find the demands placed upon me to have this problem met are almost insurmountable.

Technical methods can be introduced so that children self-respond to what is put before them, and achieve their specific aims and desires in regard to employment and other activities. The mothers, the fathers, and the children—the whole family—are faced with an unusual situation. I do not believe any member of Parliament other than my colleague representing West Province and me appreciates the pressures placed upon the families of this area.

A magnificent organisation has been established in Kalamunda to try to overcome these problems. It is called "Someone Cares", and is a totally voluntary organisation. Certain members of the Opposition took the opportunity of going to Kalamunda to observe that organisation from a critical point of view. They wished to determine whether a similar organisation would work in other areas.

The Hon. Fred McKenzie: Mr Hetherington and I were there on a day you were the guest of honour.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I well recall that the member was there. He was a member of the audience, and while I had the floor I gave due recognition to his presence because I was anxious that the aims and objectives, and achievements of the organisation would influence activities in other electorates. I trust that will be so.

"Someone Cares" is an incorporated organisation. Of course, I do not hold the registration of that name, but it has created somewhat of a gold rush situation with people wanting to involve themselves in similar organisations. I must add that that has not resulted from the activities of the previous interjector.

The organisation has proved beyond contradiction that people operating within their own environment are able to do things for the people of their community which the Government cannot do. As I have said, the organisation is totally vol-

untary—no strings attached. At its last annual general meeting a suggestion was made by a reprographer that the organisation adopt the coat of arms of Kalamunda. The meeting decided that it would not accept even that suggestion. The people of that organisation will not accept any tie with or handout from any Government body—they will stand on their own two feet. Such an attitude is commendable and should be adopted by others in our community. Mrs Kath Cook as the head of that organisation should be congratulated for the good work she does for it.

The Hon. Fred McKenzie: They do receive some help from the Kalamunda shire, don't they?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: They receive help in the form of a room 8 ft. by 6 ft.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: About three metres by two.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I thank the shire of Kalamunda for making that available to them.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: You are all heart. They have a good president.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: They also receive help with the phone rental.

Two matters relating to road works concern me. I draw attention to the upgrading of the Red Hill road which connects with the Great Northern Highway to Midland, Gidgegannup and Toodyay. This is an extremely dangerous road and I am disappointed that it was not included in the works programme in the Budget. I would appreciate a comment from the Minister as to why it was not included. I am sure members who have interjected are concerned also because Welshpool Road runs through their electorates and the upgrading of that road would be of advantage to them also.

I would like to draw the attention of members to the state of the Swan Valley which is the major producer of grapes, dried fruit, and wine in this State. I spoke about the Swan Valley when we debated the Liquor Act legislation last session. I have high regard for the wine industry and the grape growers in Western Australia.

If one wishes to promote wine, one must promote the raw material as well because if that is not promoted also it would all be to no avail. I was concerned by a recent news release of the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development of 30 October 1982. It stated in part—

Expo Vin 1982 was held in Melbourne and 10 Western Australian wine producers took part.

Further on it stated—

It involved not only the wine producers, but also grape growers from Western Australia.

Without taking into account the feasibility or making an assessment of the situation, the Opposition has said unequivocally to the grape growers of the Swan Valley without thought to the other taxpayers in WA, that immediately upon their election to Government they will give \$300 000 to the Swan Valley Wine Producers and Grape Growers Association for the installation of a pot still in the Swan Valley. There is no-one who would not commend any move to make the Swan Valley Wine Producers and Grape Growers Association a viable one, but I am aware of the problems associated with the growing of grapes and their crushing to make wine.

I am aware also that the industry has a tremendous export potential for Western Australia, not only in dried fruits but also in wine. The dried fruits are an acceptable export commodity. We have the Sunblest brand of fruit which is extremely acceptable to the consumer and we have the Sunmost brand also. The Sunmost people have challenged the Swan Settlers Co-operative Association Pty. Ltd. and said that if it does not adopt the Sunmost label they will inundate the State with Sunmost to the detriment of Sunblest. However, they were most unsuccessful. The Sunblest product is on the shelves alongside the Sunmost product in other States of Australia.

The wholesalers of dried fruits are aware of that fact; and if that is not private enterprise working, I would like to be contradicted by members of this place.

However, the Labor Party is prepared to put at risk \$300 000 of the taxpayers' money by promising that it will provide that money to the Swan Valley Wine Producers and Grape Growers Association for the installation of a still.

The Hon. P. G. Pendar: They are doing that all around the State.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Putting in pot stills?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If the Labor Party is prepared to sell everything, mortgage everything, just to reach the ultimate goal of Government, God help the people of Western Australia. The Labor Party is prepared to sell out every other taxpayer in Western Australia for purely electoral advantage.

Members opposite believe that the Swan Valley may hold that responsibility—although it is somewhat remote—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You do not mean they are using it for political advantage?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: It is a somewhat minor point. Members opposite believe the possibility exists of taking the seat of Mundaring from the Liberal Party. I assure them they are wasting their time.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I was door-knocking there on Sunday; it is very lovely.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: They are wasting their time. Only the Government has done what the industry requires. That industry will prosper under a Liberal-Country Party Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have done my part for that industry, and so have a few other people I know.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Only a Liberal-Country Party Government understands what are the requirements of this industry. Therefore, if anyone wishes to intervene or to make outlandish statements, as has the Leader of the Opposition, they do so purely from the point of electoral advantage. May he continue to do so, because the people of the Swan Valley do not accept what he is saying.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will start drinking Hunter River wine if you like.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The people of the Swan Valley know the manner in which the Opposition operates. They come from a line of people who are used to a socialist environment and who are used to what was called social democracy. They are not prepared to take the chance. I warn the Opposition that when it says willy-nilly it will give those people \$300 000, those promises are falling on barren ground.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not a very apt comment.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

WATERWAYS CONSERVATION AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Labour and Industry), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill seeks to amend sections 3 and 48(5) of the Waterways Conservation Act, 1976.

The purpose of the amendment to section 3 is to expand the definition of "waters" to include canals constructed adjacent to natural waterways. This amendment is in line with the recommendations for the development of canal estates, which were adopted by the Government in August 1981. At present two canals are constructed adjacent to the waterways of the Peel Inlet Management Authority, but its jurisdiction extends only as far as the entrance to the canal. This amendment to the definition will extend the jurisdiction of the management authority to cover these waters.

The amendment to section 48 is to enable by-laws to be made by management authorities prohibiting or regulating the use of water closets and other prescribed sanitary appliances. By-laws made by an authority apply only within that authority's management area. In this case the Government has at some expense installed pump-out facilities at Barrack Street for the use of ferries and charter vessels usually moored there. At present the operators of these vessels are not obliged to use these facilities.

Concern is felt that it is possible these vessels may dispose of sewage and sillage directly into the river and such an offence would be most difficult to prove under the existing legislation.

It is proposed that by-laws will be prepared for the Swan River Management Authority so that it can control water closets and other sanitary appliances on ferries and charter boats so that these wastes are discharged into the sewer by way of the pump-out facilities installed at Barrack Street.

I commend the Bill to the House.

THE HON. FRED McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [8.45 p.m.]: This is a good Bill and we do not oppose it. It provides for amendments to two sections of the Waterways Conservation Act. As the Minister has explained, one is to provide for an extension of the jurisdiction to include canals constructed adjacent to natural waterways. That is necessary; some jurisdiction is needed over canals. Currently, the legislation provides for jurisdiction only as far as the entrance.

The other amendment, to section 48, provides for the disposal of sewage and sillage in a manner so that it does not finish up in the Swan River.

We support the Bill.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [8.47 p.m.]: I have only one question; it relates to the first part of the Bill where it refers to canals constructed adjacent to the present waterways. If canals are constructed further back, and further and further inland, they will not be adjacent to

the waterways as such, or as defined. What will happen about them? Will we have an amendment every year? Have we covered this properly now in dealing with only one or two canals instead of biting the whole cherry in one hit?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It will probably come in another Bill then.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.48 p.m.]: My understanding is that canal developments such as at Peel-Harvey Inlet which have access to the main waterways and rivers will come under the management authorities. I cannot think of any canal development which would not have access to the main waterways. I do not see how it could work because there must be a supply of water and the development must be close to the major waterway. If Mr Lewis suggests a possibility exists of a development such as he has outlined, I would be interested to know about it. Where a waterways management authority exists, such as the Peel-Harvey, Leschenault, or Swan River authority, it needs to have control of the waterway which is attached to the main waterway. These are man-made waterways, but nevertheless the main water supply flows through the canals and creates the water necessary for the development.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I was thinking of the situation in Adelaide where they are pumping water up and it drains out into the lakes.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I understand from the recommendations of the Government committee which studied canal developments it was made quite clear that where these developments take place very careful consideration must be given to the drainage and sewerage problems, and strict guidelines need to be laid down. A whole list of guidelines are laid down in the report which say that where a canal development takes place certain things must be done, such as for sewerage and drainage and the like. The waterways authorities that exist now are in control of the main waterways—Peel-Harvey, Leschenault, and the Swan. I understand the honourable member's question; we do not have that example of a canal development in this State now, but I suppose it could occur in the future.

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

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Labour and Industry) [8.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [8.52 p.m.]: I would like to ask the Minister a question. Where a canal is not adjacent to a waterway and in the ultimate planning—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. V. J. Ferry): Order! This is the third reading, and the honourable member may not raise a new matter at this stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JUSTICES AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

STATE FORESTS

Revocation of Dedication: Motion

Debate resumed from 9 November.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.53 p.m.]: The Opposition agrees with this motion, and with the plans which were laid on the Table of the House on 12 October. The matter was fully debated in another place, along with many other matters not included in the motion. I see no purpose in debating extensively something with which we agree.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Thank you.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 9 November.

THE HON. FRED MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [8.54 p.m.]: As indicated by earlier speakers, we are not opposed to this measure. However, I would like to comment that the Minister ought to be aware of the South Australian electoral situation as referred to in the *Daily News*. If the Chief Secretary is so keen to give people the opportunity not to vote, he ought to bring some balance to the situation by ensuring that people are given the opportunity to vote. Our present Electoral Act makes this very difficult, and the truth of my statement is borne out when one compares the figures for WA with those of SA. South Australia, with a population of about

3 000 more than the population of Western Australia, has 850 000 people on the roll. We have 730 000 people on the roll—about 120 000 fewer than SA. Putting that into percentages, it means that 64 per cent of the SA population are on the roll, while only 55 per cent of this State's population are on the roll.

The Hon. Tom Knight: Maybe we have more children here?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: That is quite possible.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Have you checked those figures, or have you just plucked them out of the newspaper?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I have not checked the figures.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should not really quote them as though they are fact.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I took them to be the current estimates.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Last time you spoke about a newspaper you reckoned they were the friends of the Liberals.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: We do not have recent figures. I will quote the latest figures which I have been able to obtain from the Bureau of Statistics.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Certified by the Australian Bureau of Statistics?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Absolutely.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: You do not want to take too much notice of the honourable member; he is just being difficult.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Never!

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: It is hard to believe, isn't it?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: These figures are not up to date. They are as at 30 June 1981, and it is common knowledge that WA's population is rising at a rate which is faster than that of any other State. It is now November 1982 so the difference in the populations of 3 000 as quoted in last night's *Daily News* would be fairly accurate.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Could you quote the authority?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I have here the figures as at 30 June 1981. The population in WA was 1 273 420. The South Australian population at the same date was 1 284 843. That is a difference of 11 000 about 16 or 17 months ago so I would not argue with the figures quoted in the *Daily News*.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: A very inexact way of comparing populations. I am surprised at someone of your intelligence doing that.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon tried to throw me, and I came up with those figures. Government members have been left flat.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: He is always flat.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not think that is right.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The figures from which I am quoting are those taken 18 months ago. This Government is not endeavouring to enrol people so that they can exercise their right to vote. The Government is very anxious to give people the right not to vote.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: It is a personal obligation.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The honourable member knows how difficult it is to have people enrolled. The conservative parties have been in Government for quite a long time and it is a simple matter for Government members to have justices of the peace appointed. It is much more difficult for us to do so.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Could I ask you a question?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: All the Government needs to do is to introduce a system of joint State-Commonwealth rolls. This would overcome the problem.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Have you ever had a justice of the peace refuse to witness an enrolment card?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: No, I have not.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: But you have to find a justice; that is what he is saying.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I said it is more difficult—

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Fair enough.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: —to encourage people to enrol. That is what we should be doing.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Yes.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: How do you mean it is difficult?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am aware that the Act provides an enrolment card may be witnessed by a police officer, an electoral officer, or a justice of the peace.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: I would be very concerned if I thought that justices of the peace were refusing to witness enrolment cards.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Nobody said they are doing that.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. V. J. Ferry): Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: You want to listen.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: We have 730 000 people on the roll, yet we have 87 parliamentary representatives and we are soon to increase that to 91. The South Australian Parliament has 47 members in the Legislative Assembly and 22 in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: Why is that the yardstick?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: This Government finds it easy to have new members of Parliament, but it should be borne in mind that its actions will cost the State \$2 million and I ask members how many people would that employ? The Government's only reason for having new members is that it needs them to keep up its numbers in the country in order that it can command control of this place and the other place.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Do your local authorities have a list of justices of the peace?

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Some do and some do not.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You should encourage them.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Attorney General sent me a booklet listing the justices of the peace. However, that is not the point. We should be encouraging people to enrol; yet we ask them to get a justice of the peace, who is the most accessible of the people listed, to witness their signatures. Therefore, people have to make the extra effort to hunt around and get a justice of the peace in order that they may enrol. That is quite unnecessary.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: We do not oppose the Bill, but I felt it important to indicate that it is disgraceful that a justice of the peace, policeman, or electoral officer is required to witness a person's signature before he may go on the roll, when that person may have been on the roll previously, but has since been struck off. We support 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. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Assembly.

CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 4 November.

THE HON. FRED McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [9.03 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill. It relates to a legal opinion obtained by the City of Perth as to the letting of parking facilities to charitable organisations for the conduct of business when the parking lots are not required. We do not have any argument with the Bill and we support it.

I make a comment in the hope that the Minister will convey it to the Minister in the other place: Since the Act was first written, it has been amended substantially and it would be easier to read if it were reprinted.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I agree.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I know this is a very minor matter, but it is an appropriate time to refer to it, because it is time the Act was reprinted.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I accept that.

The Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [9.04 p.m.]: The City of Perth has taken remedial action by requesting this Bill be presented to the House, because it found that technically, in law, it could not grant a group in my electorate, the Floreat Lions, the chance to continue the excellent work it was doing by using car park facilities for other purposes.

I place on record the thanks of the Floreat Lions and other charitable organisations which will now benefit from this provision and I express that thanks to the Lord Mayor and councillors of the City of Perth, for the rapid way in which they responded to the public demand for such a facility to be afforded to charitable organisations.

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.

STAMP AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 2 November.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [9.07 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill which seeks to introduce the stamp duty amendments referred to by the Treasurer in his Budget speech. I must confess that when I saw the reference to this in the Budget, I thought it was rather strange as we had just dealt with a Stamp Amendment Bill.

The amendments seek to develop a secondary market for mortgages and the Opposition has been pushing this proposition for at least four or five years.

This Bill has been debated fully in another place and I do not intend to labour the point.

We support the Bill.

THE HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [9.09 p.m.]: The only aspect of this Bill which concerns me is the transfer of property. The Bill is directed at people who have been trying to evade the payment of stamp duty on the transfer of property in discretionary trusts. I am somewhat confused about it and I would appreciate it if the Minister in charge of the Bill could explain the differentiation between a trust and a corporate body and the manner in which the transfer of property would not attract stamp duty.

From reading the Minister's second reading speech I understand that, in a discretionary trust or a trust company, property may be transferred within the trust, the directors of the trust may be changed, and the unit holders of the trust may be changed; therefore, stamp duty is not accrued. To me that is rather an extreme case, because I am not aware of how this can be done.

I would appreciate the Attorney's explaining to me how properties can be transferred without accruing *ad valorem* duty, not necessarily with discretionary trusts or in a trust situation, but in the normal corporate body situation, where shareholders have transferred properties from one cor-

porate body to another. Is this the forerunner of this sort of legislation?

The other point I cannot quite comprehend is how we transfer trust property without affecting the unit trust holdings. Does it involve the fact that within a trust, when a person transfers the units of a trust, he does not have to pay *ad valorem* stamp duty on the transfer of those units? This may be the reason for the legislation, because with normal changes in transfers within a corporate body, the transfer of the shares is assessed for stamp duty. Does this mean within a trust the transfer of units within that trust does not accrue stamp duty?

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [9.12 p.m.]: This Bill is designed to encourage the secondary mortgage market, and the method by which that is achieved is to reduce the stamp duty on transfers of mortgages. Instead of paying *ad valorem* stamp duty on the transfer of a mortgage—which means in accordance with the value of the consideration—a flat rate of \$10 will be paid. So this reduces the stamp duty; this is the basic premise of the Bill. The transfer from one company to another would occasion stamp duty; a transfer of any property at all would do so, whether it be a house, land, shares, or units in a unit trust, because any other property is covered, whether it be land or any other property, it all goes at a certain rate; whereas marketable securities or shares go at a different rate. But the units in the trust would go at the general property rate, and are definitely covered.

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 (Leader of the House), and passed.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 4 November.

THE HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [9.15 p.m.]: I would like to make a brief contribution to the debate on this Bill which will allow schools to expel students. In the five years I have been in this House, this is the most sensible Bill dealing with education matters I have seen

introduced. The support given to the Minister after the introduction of this legislation is an indication of the need for it. Overwhelming support has come from parents and teachers particularly, and from other citizens in the community. I am not sure of the support coming from students, but generally they are fairly quiet on these matters.

Many school students of course would be very pleased that this legislation has been introduced, because in some cases they will now be able to get down to doing some serious work without being interrupted and disturbed by students who, hopefully under this legislation, will now be expelled.

Having read some of the previous debate on this legislation I am a little concerned to find some members are of the opinion that now we have the situation developing in our schools which has caused this legislation to be introduced.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: That is what the Minister said.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That may be his position, too. It is my view that the behaviour of students in our schools these days is not any better or any worse than it has been for generations.

This Bill is before us as a result of the present Minister for Education's intestinal fortitude to introduce the measure. I suggest other Ministers have thought about doing so but have not been prepared to take this step. Now we have a Minister who is prepared to admit publicly that some students in our schools are incorrigible.

Incorrigible students have always been in our education system. None of the counselling, guidance, or other things we talk about as being behaviour modification tools would make any difference to the behaviour of some students. Regrettably some students, and not just high school students but also primary school students, essentially are criminals. In our society we deal with criminals by removing them from the community. In a sense expulsion from school is a similar type of punishment in that it removes these incorrigible young criminals from the school environment and prevents them from having an adverse effect on their peers, which is presently the case.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: There are no Opposition members in the Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Moore, did you notice Mr Frank Usher's comments?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No, I did not; but I have often read his comments, which seem to go on at great length. In view of the fact that no Opposition members are present, I will try to finish my speech as quickly as I can.

As a former deputy principal and principal of district high school, I had the overall responsibility for discipline in a school situation, particularly with boy students. In that position one becomes very aware of the effects these disruptive students have on the entire school environment.

In the Hon. Robert Hetherington's address on this matter he spoke about his young friend who is a 5ft. 2in. female teacher who wears sloppy clothes to school and allows her class to call her by her first name. He told us that this young lady experiences no disciplinary problems even though she is teaching a class in a senior high school in the city.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: That may be so.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That may be the case for that young lady, but I can recall the names of several students whom I taught who would quite happily call that lady by her first name as well as by a few other adjectives generally of four letters, and she would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to control some of those students.

Some students do not respond to the measures used to modify the behaviour of students. In a school environment where many people are in a confined area it is necessary to have a certain degree of conformity and it is necessary for the successful operation of the school for students to conform to the school's policy and standards of behaviour. If the students are not prepared to do this, what can the school do?

We can go to a guidance officer. Too few guidance officers are in schools; but the activities of guidance officers are not as successful as some would imagine them to be. Teachers have been taught what we call positive behavioural modification tools. These psychological tools can be used by teachers in schools to modify students' behaviour. If that does not work they can chastise the children, detain them after school, or even go as far as having them caned by the principal or deputy principal. If none of these methods works they can resort to suspension. Students are suspended usually for a week. In most cases students who are suspended regard the suspension as being a great holiday and when they return to school they are treated as heroes because they had a week off and the rest of the school did not.

Because none of these things works upon some students, we have to do something else. When I was teaching in Laverton a 6 ft. 2 in., 13 stone male student attacked a young female teacher. I had to call the police on that occasion and the student was charged with assault. That is an extreme set of circumstances. That student was the

type of student who should be expelled from school and not be allowed to re-enter it because that form of aggressive behaviour is just not on. The Bill provides for expulsion under very strict conditions which I think are necessary and will prevent indiscriminate use of this weapon.

The Hon. Mr Hetherington was concerned about what would happen to the students once they were expelled.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I still am.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: He was worried about their educational opportunities.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: They could become members of Parliament!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not worried about their educational opportunities whatsoever because any student who is so bad that he must be expelled from school is not the slightest bit interested in education and probably never will be.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: That is what I was saying, you great twit.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am simply saying that while the Hon. Mr Hetherington expresses some concern for their educational future, I do not, because these students have no interest in education at all.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I will express some other concerns later.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I support this legislation simply because it supports the teachers in our schools. At long last they have an ultimate—for want of a better word—"weapon" with which to deal with very disruptive and incorrigible students whom we fortunately find only occasionally in Western Australian schools, whose only aim in life is to disrupt the school and cause chaos.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Why do you think they got like that, or don't you care?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: There are many reasons for that.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Yes, I know.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The school environment where a teacher has 30 students to look after is not the appropriate place to sort out one child's terrible emotional and psychological problems which cause him to become almost a criminal. The reason that this legislation is necessary is simply the positive effect it will have upon the rest of the children in a school once the disruptive and incorrigible student has been removed. The school environment will be much better and it will be

easier for the students who wish to learn and to become part of the environment in the school.

With those remarks, I support the legislation.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [9.26 p.m.]: I did not intend to enter this debate until last Thursday when I heard some of the greatest drivel I have ever heard spoken by two members of this House, one from the Opposition side and one from this side. I am loyal to my colleagues, particularly ex-colleagues, but I take issue with the Hon. Peter Wells and his rash statements about the school guidance staff in this State, of which I am an ex-member. I say that proudly because they were a darned good bunch to work with and they were virtually the unsung salt of the education system at secondary level.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Some are not.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Teachers come into this category.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Of course they do. That is right.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Mr Hetherington knows that.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I know that.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: The Hon. Norman Moore has said that the Minister has had the intestinal fortitude to introduce this Bill. If the climate had been right at the time, the Hon. Graham MacKinnon, an ex-Minister for Education, would have introduced this Bill because it has been a recommendation of the department for many years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would have come down upon this Government like a tonne of bricks.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Does the honourable member mean because they do not know what they are talking about?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Now they support it.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: The responsibility for depriving the child or student of his education is sheeted home in this Bill to the top officer, the Minister. He has the responsibility, and in taking that responsibility much more is involved in the way that student is handled because under the power vested in the Minister, he has to stand in this Parliament and, if necessary, give reasons for a student's having to leave.

I have a lot of time for the Hon. Peter Wells. He is reputed to be one of the hardest working back-bench members of this House, and I will not quarrel with that. He is credited with doing adequate research before he gets on his feet to

speak. Just on one occasion he has got for himself the accolade of being a hard worker. I will not take that from him as I admire men who do research, but he must in the future remember that if he intends to speak on an emotional subject he must carry out his research in a more responsible manner. It could be that the Hon. Peter Wells was called upon to speak at short notice, because it was so unlike him to make some of the statements he made. For instance, on page 4740 of *Hansard* the member said this—

The final point I make relates to guidance officers. We take school children into our teaching colleges, and then employ them in schools—from school, to school, to school. They have virtually no outside experience before being appointed to their posts in schools. I wonder whether the department has explored fully the possibility of using consultants with practical experience in the field of child behaviour.

What a fatuous statement to make without knowing the facts! It is not fair. I want Mr Catterill to know about this, and I will send him my remarks. I asked Mr Catterill and his staff to provide me with certain facts and figures which I knew existed because that accusation has been levelled at the guidance branch before. Mr Catterill replied on 8 November and sent to me a document from which I will later quote briefly. If members want to look at it they may do so because it is not a private document. It was addressed to me. In 1978 an ex-colleague of mine, a senior guidance officer, Jim Ryall, with the assistance of a Mr Des Thornton, conducted a survey of all guidance officers to find out what outside experience they had. Perhaps many members here would say that from school to college and back to school is not too bad at the age of 31 when one has two children and one has some idea of what education is about.

They sent a questionnaire to 172 members of the staff. Replies were received from 119 staff members, which represents 70 per cent. Of the returned forms 49 per cent of the guidance officers had in excess of two years' work experience outside the department, 68 per cent had in excess of 12 months' work experience outside the department, and 82 per cent had in excess of six months' work experience outside the department. Only five per cent did not have in excess of one month's work experience outside the department. That survey was taken four years ago.

In 1981-82 the staff was increased by 18. I ask the House to judge the qualifications and experience of some of these people. A female staff member in 1981 was 36 years of age and she had a

Bachelor of Science (Psychology) degree from the University of WA, a Graduate Diploma in Psychology from WAIT and a Diploma of Education from Murdoch University.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I suggest she sounds like a good candidate for the Labor Party.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: The ages of both male and female staff range from 35 years upwards and at present the age of the senior female is 55 years. She obviously has had a family, and went back to work after she had raised her family.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Why is it obvious?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I happen to know her.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: It is not obvious from anything you have said.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: She earned a diploma in teaching from Wattle Park in 1958, a B.A. in Adelaide in 1964, and a Master's Degree in Psychology from the University of WA in 1968, and she was employed in 1981. That would suggest that the gap of 20 years would have allowed her to have her family and then go back into the work force. Despite the criticism of the branch, it does exist and it works well.

Mr Wells hit on a generic term which we all know but do not explore very often, and that is "hyperactive". If a child goes past primary school and has to be sorted out at high school level because he is hyperactive, something is extremely wrong with his parents. Pupils with medically orientated problems in our system are referred to outside consultants, whom Mr Wells called doctors, who are available privately to the parents; or the children can be referred to the Mental Health Services or to the school medical service. Half the problems of a child are known before he attends these centres. In relation to the primary school aged children who are severely or emotionally disturbed or hyperactive the guidance branch itself says, and I quote—

... employs a Senior Education Officer (with a Doctorate, an M.Sc. and an M.Ed.) in charge of 4 centres set up specifically for the treatment of these children's problems. Each Centre is staffed by a Guidance Officer who is a Registered Psychologist, or eligible to be registered as a psychologist, 2 teachers and 2 teacher aides. They have a maximum enrolment of 16 children at a time in each Centre, with the children being phased back into normal school as they can cope with the situation. It is assumed that this early

intervention will reduce the requirement for later involvement.

With reference to students of secondary school age the following procedure is adopted—

A Clinical Psychologist from the Branch provides a clinical consultancy service for guidance officers who service secondary schools and he carries a small case load as well. He also acts as the Education Department's liaison officer with the Mental Health Services Warwick Clinic class for secondary aged children, who are integrated into the Warwick High School when sufficiently stable to adjust to normal secondary school placement.

I hope I have put the record straight about my ex-colleagues in the guidance branch. It is easy for people to sit and skite because half the population do not know what services the Education Department provides.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington suggested there should be greater liaison. Of course greater liaison should exist between the officers. Mr MacKinnon went back almost to halcyon days when he spoke of a teacher who thrashed him and did a tremendous job on him and many other students. I am sure Mr MacKinnon would say he remembers that teacher with affection.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: He did say that.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: The ratbags that come up for expulsion, as the Hon. Norman Moore said, are carefully looked at in more than one sense. If the problem is physical violence, the student is expelled if there is an element of brutish thuggery.

My first teaching instruction when I went to a blackboard jungle school in the United Kingdom was, "Hit them first and you may survive." That was right for them, by and large.

No matter what the guidance officers do, there is no doubt that some people with grave mental disturbances who will not respond to treatment will cause disturbances in a class. The Hon. Norman Moore said that the Hon. Robert Hetherington mentioned a lady of 5 ft. 2 in. in height. She was in charge of children in an elective teaching class.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: Alternative class.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: There are many teachers who do a tremendous job with children and I do not recommend that any teacher should read *Hansard* to follow the dictum proposed here; nor do I suggest they follow the Hon.

Robert Hetherington's suggestion that the teacher walk into the classroom and say, "Call me by my Christian name." That may be his metier. I appreciate that the honourable member is an honest man and that he had difficulty in teaching at the secondary level, and when he was transferred to the tertiary level he was happy with that situation. The range of recommendations a guidance officer can suggest to a teacher is extraordinary.

Mr Hetherington asked, "What do we do about the cause?" I do not know. What do we do about a child at the age of 14 years whose mother is teaching her to be a prostitute in beautiful Western Australia? What do we do about cases like that? That child came from Mr President's electorate and he knows of the case of which I am speaking. It is unfortunate that this child was made to act like a woman after school. It was the teacher who revealed the problem because he noticed her sleeping in class and found out what had been happening to her. The child was observed, and then the whole sordid story came out: Every time the Japanese boats came in, by order of her mother, this 14-year-old girl had to go down to Fremantle.

That is why I say there are people within the school system who do neither the system nor themselves any good. After constant review of the situation, finally we have decided to give the ultimate authority to the Minister to say, "Yes, I agree; they should be expelled." That is the highest authority to which one can go in the Education Department, because that man reports to this Parliament.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. W. M. PIESSE (Lower Central) [9.41 p.m.]: I wholeheartedly support the legislation, albeit I see it as one of the saddest Bills ever brought before this place. Perhaps it is a sign of our affluence that we have come to this. We have come to regard education not as a privilege, but as a right. However, when we look at the situation in other countries, we see people elsewhere recognise that the education of their children is a privilege. The sooner parents and students return to a recognition that it is a privilege, the easier our education system will run.

One of the first lessons our students must learn if they are to live in this country is to respect the rights of others. However, these disruptive students never learn that lesson. Indeed, I believe the underlying cause of their disruptive behaviour is that they have never learnt to respect the rights of others, particularly the rights of those students who want to learn and who recognise what a privilege education is.

Corporal punishment in dealing with these cases has been proved to be somewhat of a failure. These disruptive students will not be denied an education; correspondence education will be available to them. However, I very much doubt whether many will bother to take up correspondence lessons. It may well be that they will rattle around in the world for a few years until they begin to realise just what they have thrown away. I have high hopes that many of these young people will come to recognise what they have thrown away, mend their ways, and take up some worth-while occupation; of course, I realise only some will be in this category.

It is some years now since I visited South Africa. At that time, rioting was occurring on the campuses at some American universities. I was in a party of tourists being shown around the university at Durban, and I asked, "Do you in South Africa have any problems with rioting students, and the disruption of the system?" They replied that they had recently experienced disruption, and the authorities immediately closed the university. When the students came to the authorities and said that they wanted the university to be opened again, the authorities replied that they had every right to close the university because the taxpayers were paying for the education of those young people. The students were told that if when they had completed their education they wanted to start rioting, it was up to them because they would be fending for themselves. The authorities told the students that the only way the university would be reopened was if the students agreed that the people responsible for the upheaval would be expelled immediately, while the remainder returned to study in a sensible way. Apparently, the students agreed to those terms and they have had no further trouble.

That was a very brave thing for a Government to do. Had rioting occurred in Western Australia at that time, I doubt whether our Government would have made a similar decision. People must recognise a problem for what it really is before having the courage to impose the necessary rules and regulations in order to avert further catastrophe.

On the matter of education being a privilege, while in South Africa it was evident that the people were hungry for the education of their children; this applied to both Dutch-descended South Africans and black South Africans. Indeed, if, say, a company wished to hire skilled labour, it was sure of obtaining a more than adequate supply of trained adults simply by guaranteeing education for their children. In other words, the people put education in front of everything else.

We must return to a recognition of the great privilege we have in education. Our parents, we, and our children have enjoyed tremendous assistance in the provision of a good education, and we cannot afford to allow that privilege to be destroyed by disruptive students.

THE HON. TOM KNIGHT (South) [9.46 p.m.]: I wish to have recorded my support for this Bill and, at the same time, to further project some of the views put forward by the Hon. Norman Moore. Over the last few weeks, a great deal of discussion has taken place on this Bill; the views of several people have come forth, and I felt those views should be expressed in this House.

As you would be aware, Mr President, I educated seven children. I well remember the comments they used to make about some of the activities which went on, particularly at high school. In fact, I recall saying to the then principal of the high school that if he knew of something untoward going on, where one of my children had stepped out of line, I wanted him to administer punishment to that child because I was of the view that sort of behaviour should not be permitted.

As the Hon. Norman Moore said, this legislation provides a much needed provision in the education field. Today, we see a lack of respect for discipline and authority which, in the long run, also shows a lack of respect for law and order. I believe this provision will make young people realise they cannot upset the system. Young people cannot do as they wish and run the world as they want it to be run; they cannot simply go out and "do their own thing".

I believe this lack of respect has evolved from a situation where, today, both parents usually work. When the child comes home from school neither his mother nor his father is there to greet him. As a result, he goes off down the street to play, and sometimes gets into trouble. Because the parents have not paid sufficient attention to the child, and have not administered discipline, authority, and punishment, they do not allow the school teacher to administer discipline. This situation develops over the years. Because the parents feel guilty that they have not paid sufficient attention to their child, and because as they both work they can afford it, the child is lavished with gifts at Christmas and on birthdays.

Finally, the child leaves home having experienced discipline neither in the home nor in the school. Because of the gifts which have been lavished upon him by his parents, he believes the world owes him a living. He goes out into the world with no respect for law and order.

This sort of provision has been required for a long time. In my day, discipline was effected at school and I believe we grew up to be better citizens as a result.

As I mentioned, over the last few weeks a number of groups with which I am involved have discussed the introduction of this legislation.

I put that forward because I support the Minister and the Government in what they are doing. This move will be beneficial to the future of many young people, and possibly it will make it easier for our policemen, to administer and enforce the laws that we lay down in this Parliament. The young people will respect them, because they will have experienced discipline in some form or other.

I support the Bill fully. It is a move in the right direction.

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan—Chief Secretary) [9.51 p.m.]: I thank the many members who have spoken on this Bill. I admit that in every instance the members have had more experience in this field than I have. I mention the excellent contribution made by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon as an ex-Minister.

I undertake to refer to the Minister the comments that have been made. They will be valuable to him when he is drafting the regulations which are necessary under the Bill, which I commend to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. V. J. Ferry) in the Chair; the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 20G inserted—

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: In discussing clause 3, we are really discussing the Bill. I will deal with it one piece at a time, if the Chief Secretary is happy about that.

I am heartened that a fairly rigorous process is to be followed before anybody is expelled. I will not make the kind of statements about people who may be expelled from schools which have been made by some schools which have been made by some people in this Chamber—statements about thugs, and various other things—as if the people involved were less than human. They are human beings who, for various reasons, have fallen by the wayside. We have to be very careful about this.

By implication, the Hon. John Williams was castigating me at one stage because, by

interjection when Mr Wells was speaking, I spoke about some psychologists who had never left school, who were educated on rats and who are behaviourists. Perhaps the Hon. John Williams did not hear what I said. I said that we had to be careful of people who have just left school. We have to be careful about this in teaching. It is my view that all teachers should be encouraged to take a year off from school at some time, because they would be better for it in their handling of the children. However, that is not what we are arguing about tonight.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not in accordance with the clause before the Chair, either.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: The point I am trying to make is that, for a number of reasons, sometimes the fault may not be with the child. Often the fault is not with the child; therefore I note with gratitude that the process to be gone through before expulsion is a very careful and considered one.

I am worried that the Minister in another place said that between 50 and 100 children could be expelled, even after they have gone through this process. However, I note that this is a good provision in the Bill.

I will now comment on subsection (5) of proposed new section 20G. In his second reading speech, the Chief Secretary said, "Well, we don't have to worry about them, because we now have correspondence education." That suggested that we would not be washing our hands of students who are expelled. If I might cite a statement made by the Minister elsewhere, we should not be like Pontius Pilate; the Minister agreed with this when discussing the Bill with other people. We cannot wash our hands of students who are expelled, because if we do they are not necessarily likely to rattle around for a while, and come back to school. They are likely to finish in gaol, if something is not done about them.

I was trying to make the point that the Hon. Win Piesse made, that these young people are not interested in education. Of course they are not, and therefore the correspondence school would not be useful at this stage.

I wonder if this clause has been put in the Bill so it can be seen that the Minister is thinking that he might do something, or whether he has any idea of what he might do. In other words, what kind of directions will the Minister see fit to make? I hope that this matter has been given some thought. I would be very surprised if it has not. If it has not been given any thought, it is high time that thought was given to it.

What kind of direction will the Minister give to a person who has been expelled from school—a 13-year-old or a 14-year-old who has been expelled? What would the Minister direct him to do? If the Minister gave him a direction that he was to stay at home and do his studies, that would be fatuous to the extreme. The Chief Secretary and the Minister elsewhere know that; and I think everybody knows that, because the very fact that the children have been expelled means that they will not be very interested in studying.

I wish I could agree with the Hon. Tom Knight that the fault lies with the wealthy families who have two people working; but in my electorate many children come from families in which nobody is working, or there is a single parent who is not working. There are other reasons for people feeling that they do not belong in society. It is not that they have been given too many gifts and too much love and affection, or that they have been neglected.

I wonder if the Hon. Norman Moore is right when he says that, in fact, we have always had the same proportion of people to whom the Minister should give directions. I wonder if the number has been growing since we have had increasing unemployment. I wonder if children at school are becoming more disruptive because their fathers are out of work, or because they can see no hope for themselves.

This is a highly complex problem. Even if we were to use the language that some members have used about the people who might be expelled—I am reminded of when the Hon. Phillip Pendal called a union secretary “vermin”—

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: He was called a monkey, first. Tit for tat!

The Hon. P. G. Pendal: He sat up there and acted—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is that clause 3 stand as printed.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I am directing myself to proposed new subsection (5) which is contained in that clause. I am saying it is important that the Minister give the right kind of directions.

I ask the Minister in this House whether he is in a position to say—I will forgive him if he is not—what kinds of instructions have been considered by the department as potentially proper for a Minister to give.

The Hon. W. M. PIESSE: I make it known how pleased I am that these amendments will be made to the Act. In particular I refer to proposed new section 20G(6) which says that an order

made in relation to a child may be varied or revoked by the Minister by further order. In other words, if it is found upon investigation that a different school might enable a child to achieve better, he can be sent to that school. The child may have a personality problem, or suffer from a problem in the home, and his being moved from that atmosphere may be in his best interests. All these options are open. I am pleased that a certain condition will not apply forever and a day, and that the Minister will have an opportunity to determine what can be done for a child in this situation. The option is available to the Minister to decide in his wisdom, and on the advice given to him, what other directions should be given.

Possibly the Minister can tell me whether certain circumstances apply. I have said before that a child removed from the school scene for perhaps a year or two may stabilise sufficiently to know what he is aiming at in life. Often one of the problems children experience today is that they are sent to school merely to learn something, and do not have a particular goal in sight. It often happens that children during adolescence consolidate their characters and determine what they want to be in life; they recognise that they want to become a particular type of person, and that they must finish a particular part of their education. We find many students who go through this process. I am very pleased that an option will be available.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: In my judgment far too many of the resources of the education system for far too long have been utilised to try to do something with disruptive and unruly children in our schools. I am a little worried that the Minister might try to set up some sort of additional apparatus to look after expelled children, an apparatus which will divert more and more of the resources of the Education Department from the average child, the child prepared to put his best into obtaining an education. My opinion is that perhaps we ought to wash our hands of this move.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: At the outset I recognise the absolute dichotomy of the arguments put by the Hon. Bob Hetherington and the Hon. Norman Moore. I will not try to steer a middle course, but I do say in answer to the points made by the Hon. Bob Hetherington in regard to proposed subsection (5) that I am advised correspondence education does not necessarily isolate a student from society, and the alternative to this exclusion is as has already been stated—an incredible disruption to a school's learning programme.

I am likewise advised that the emphasis required in pastoral care will be catered for. I rec-

ognise the compassionate view the Hon. Bob Hetherington put in this matter, and has put consistently during the years he has been in this Chamber. It is envisaged in regard to pastoral care that the role of the local panel will be to try to consider the causes of disruptive behaviour, and so determine appropriate recommendations to descend to the Minister through the Director General of Education. One must bear in mind it is envisaged the assistance of outside agencies and suspensions will be tried first, and that the local committee of the school, and community members, will likewise be consulted.

As the Hon. Bob Hetherington has pointed out rightly, it is difficult for me in charge of the Bill here, not being the Minister for Education, to be more particular than I have been, except to say that obviously the Minister has given a great deal of attention to the structure of the regulations, and the Chamber will have an opportunity to review that structure when the regulations come before it for approval.

I recollect that the point raised by the Hon. Win Piesse is similar to that made by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon. I agree totally that a degree of maturity comes upon these children, and very often we find an expelled child back at school at night, and is a different type of person. I can only give my personal opinion, and note the Chamber supports the Bill.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I do not want to take issue with the Minister. What he has said is probably fair enough. I do want to take issue with the Hon. Norman Moore. This matter does not relate merely to compassion, although that is one factor.

I have learnt from my study of rape in this community that a high percentage of rapes are committed by young men from the lower end of the socio-economic group—they have some grudge against society.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Is this in the Bill?

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I am referring to the directions the Minister might give in regard to an expelled student, and what the Minister might do in regard to the welfare of that student after expulsion. I am speaking specifically to this clause.

We cannot wash our hands of expelled students. Of course, some of them are like the people Win Piesse talked about; they get out in the world and find they need to return to the education system. We need to allow them to do that. Long ago I wrote this principle into Labor policy; it is not only my personal policy, but also my party's policy. If we just wash our hands of these

students, and do not give them the right instructions or treat them properly, they may end up criminals.

I do not necessarily think the Education Department should take over this responsibility; it might be more proper for the Minister to instruct expelled students to go to the Department for Community Welfare, or the whole range of bodies which the Minister might be able to instruct or suggest these students attend.

We should seek to rehabilitate these people, otherwise we might find they enter the ranks of criminals, which is something we must worry about. We cannot merely expel these students and wash our hands of them if we are interested in law and order in our society. We cannot shoot them—that is not our philosophy. We believe that each human being must be left to live a life. Because we must live together in this society we must try to do something for these people—particularly in this modern and complex society we have.

This clause is terribly important; it will give the Minister wide powers. In any order made under this provision the Minister may give such further directions as he thinks fit relating to the education of the child for whom the order is made. I emphasise the words "such directions as he thinks fit". The power is wide, and it is a power which must be used carefully. It places a grave responsibility on the Minister, and it is one that I as a Minister for Education would not relish. The responsibility is real; if the Minister does not do the right thing we may finish up with another murderer or other type of criminal. We do not know who we will finish up with.

I suggest that the Minister—as the Minister in this place indicated—seems to be aware of the problem and is taking it up. I am not sure whether he has examined it yet in sufficient depth. I will be interested to see the regulations, and certainly I will be interested to hear such further explanation of his intentions as he may give to us, because I do think this is important.

Even if we do not think each individual, no matter how depraved, is a brand to be plucked from the burning, we should try to help those who are incapable of helping themselves and those who seem to be a positive menace to our society. Even if we do not think this way, we should think of the good of society. We are not going to shoot them and we are not going to kill them off, so we have to try to make sure that they can be developed as worth-while citizens and can learn to live with other people.

This is a serious problem as is our whole education system. We need to develop our education system further. There is much to be done, and in saying that I am not criticising the people who are in the system. There are good, bad and indifferent; they are all human.

When we think about directions for the future we must remember that people change their minds. What the Labor Party did in the past is not necessarily what I would do now. I was responsible for changing the words in our platform about certain aspects in our education policy because I have learned something and I would not do now the things I would have done even five years ago. My information then was incorrect and I have learned and developed, as we all must do.

That is the reason the Minister cannot say precisely what he will do. That is why his wide powers must be used wisely. I think future Ministers for Education will be aware that they are under very fierce scrutiny by members of Parliament and other people when they exercise their powers, and they should be.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What has been forgotten is that the whole process of educating children has been a progressive one and this was highlighted in the speech made by the Hon. John Williams.

I mentioned that fact when the Hon. Norman Moore was speaking, and asked if he had any comment to make on Mr Frank Usher's remarks in the paper because Frank Usher is an advanced teacher with one aberration—he tends to favour the other side of politics; apart from that I find him to be a very worth-while chap.

When I was Minister for Education, Mr Usher, in conjunction with me, started the experiment at the Hamilton High School of running multiple schools on the one campus and it was found to be quite a success.

Mr Usher used a method which was a forerunner to and an attempt to avoid this piece of legislation. He had a youth officer attached to the school. When Mr Usher took over it was a difficult school and I say that as a marked understatement. He really had quite a remarkable effect on the school; in fact, the general behaviour of the school—which had the sort of difficulties Mr Hetherington mentioned—underwent quite a metamorphosis.

The sorts of organisations to which a child—such as Mr Hetherington mentioned—would be sent already exist and I would suggest that long before any child is actually expelled from school he would have been put under the control of all sorts of people. He would go to a

guidance officer—Mr Williams spoke at length about guidance officers. Guidance officers were so hard to come by that we introduced a new position, one which is not as highly qualified. We must bear in mind that a guidance officer is a qualified teacher who has a qualification in psychology.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: I wish the same situation applied in private schools.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: One cannot have everything. The best equipped and best managed schools in this State today are Government schools and perhaps with a little more discipline we may be able to make them shine entirely.

We introduced this other officer and I am quite certain that any child who was likely to face the sort of problems we have mentioned would have been referred to a number of people long before any desperate step, such as the one suggested in this legislation, was taken.

Mr Hetherington asked whether the Education Department was washing its hands of the child. Education has always washed its hands of certain children in a community. There are some who are classed as uneducable and a statutory figure sets the minimum IQ at 60 or 65—I cannot remember exactly. Below that figure children are classed as uneducable and they go to a particular type of training centre. Above that figure they go to the ordinary stream of education and they are passed up, year after year, until they turn 15 and are allowed to leave school. There is no need for anyone to point out that even below that figure many children are in fact educable if toilet training, hygiene training and those sorts of things, which are part of one's total education, can be taught. In that context they are educable and indeed educated. It is amazing what patience, love and care will teach these children.

The doubts voiced by Mr Hetherington are the doubts which have been considered by everybody and they are the doubts which amount to the basic reason for this Bill. However, with the fullness of time and when a considerable number of agencies have been established which can help and assist in looking after recalcitrant children, a time must come when the ultimate group to look after such people are the police and the crime prevention officers. It is unfortunate that some people find their way into that method of being cared for, but that is a fact of life and it is unavoidable.

We hope that along the way all these steps can be taken and that the inevitable consequence will not be reached. Mr Hetherington mentioned that these children could go back to education. I was

fortunate enough to institute a procedure whereby in this State adults could go back to high school, not just technical schools.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: A very good move, too.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Terribly expensive.

The Hon. G. G. MacKINNON: It is one of those things of which I am entirely proud and it was not expensive. It is the universities that are expensive.

We pride ourselves now that anybody who wants any sort of education, whether it be from the absurdities of wine tasting through to the realities of domestic economy, can obtain that education without having to qualify by some extraneous examination. That education can be obtained by proving a desire to learn. I hope that will allay some of Mr Hetherington's concern. A number of high schools at present have adults attending.

I issued an injunction that teachers be requested not to smoke in the classrooms or in front of the children, which has some bearing on today's activities. I was aware that most of the children could teach them a thing or two. Any of these people who a year or two later find themselves a little behind the eight-ball and wishing to get the sort of education they need can without any great trouble rejoin the educational stream and go as far as their capacity permits. While I agree we have to be careful about this weapon that has been placed in the hands of the Minister, from my experience it will be used with care. I assure the Hon. Robert Hetherington that most of the agencies necessary to look after the children are currently in existence and have proved their ability to look after children who have severe adjustment defects.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I rise to support this clause in order to set straight a little misunderstanding. When we rose after my second reading speech we did not sit the next day and I was unable to get back to correct *Hansard*. I should point out a slight uncorrected error that was made. I said at one stage that one of the problems we had with children causing disruption in the classrooms was due to our raising the school age from 14 to 15; in other words, the year in which children turn 14 and 15. I then said that a great deal of trouble was caused because 15-year-olds wanted to leave school. I can understand the *Hansard* reporter's misunderstanding when it was recorded that the trouble was caused when we raised the age from 15 to 16. Had any of my colleagues read this they would have thought I knew nothing about the educational system. I take the

opportunity to write into the *Hansard* record of this Parliament that I was referring to the raising of the school leaving age from the year in which children turn 14 to the year in which they turn 15.

I support the clause.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: May I very briefly correct a misunderstanding the Hon. Robert Hetherington has in respect of what I said earlier. When I referred to washing our hands of students I was talking about the educational system washing its hands of these students.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: I accept that.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: They then become the responsibility of some other agency in our society. There are plenty of those agencies, as the Hon. Graham MacKinnon mentioned. I do not think the resources of the Education Department should be used to help these children because of the numbers involved. Mr Hetherington mentioned 50 to 100.

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: That is what the Minister said; 50 to 100 a year, he thought.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: If we look at this number of students and the total student population of Western Australia being, say, 200 000, we are looking at only a very small percentage; in fact, the number is probably less than the percentage of people in society who are in solitary confinement in gaols. We are looking at the hard core of incorrigible students who are in our schools. The percentage is very small indeed.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I always enjoy the Hon. Graham MacKinnon's speeches and quite often, as tonight, I agree with almost everything he says, except his final conclusions. In fact, I think he makes my point. I take up the point he made, quite properly, that things are indeed progressive and there are now children who are educable who we would have once thought were uneducable.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Right.

The Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: We are improving all the time. I would hate the Minister under this clause ever to make the assumption that these people will never be rehabilitated; in fact, new methods might arise and we must always be progressive and flexible. The honourable gentleman helped me make my point and for that I thank him.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. R. G. Pike (Chief Secretary), and passed.

LAPORTE INDUSTRIAL FACTORY AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The principal purpose of this Bill is to obtain the approval of Parliament to an amendment of the Laporte Industrial Factory Agreement Act 1961-1965 so that the State may acquire additional land for the disposal of effluent from the Laporte Australia Limited factory at Australind. This was a recommendation in the report of the Laporte effluent disposal committee.

However, as explained in the Laporte effluent disposal committee's report, direct disposal of the factory effluent into the ocean through an outfall at the surf zone proved unsatisfactory, and was abandoned in 1968. Since that year, all the factory effluent has been discharged into dunes on the peninsula between Leschenault Inlet and the ocean.

In observing that the technically preferred option for the effluent discharge is a managed combination of dune disposal, bore injection, and marine pipeline discharge, the report has concluded a need exists for additional land to allow for satisfactory long-term management and for occasions when the flow to the marine pipeline will need to be temporarily diverted to land.

The Bill seeks also parliamentary ratification of the agreement made on 15 October 1982 between the State and Laporte Australia Limited to vary the provisions of the agreement scheduled to the principal Act for the same purpose.

The report to which I referred summarises the findings and conclusions of the committee, which was formed by arrangements made in 1974 between the State and Laporte Australia Limited, to undertake an extensive and jointly funded investigation of the options available for disposal

of the factory effluent. The report also contains details of the examination of a wide range of effluent disposal options, including chemical treatment, barging, marine pipeline disposal and land disposal.

The recommendations of the committee, as detailed in the report, have been accepted by the Government, but it is necessary to broaden the existing provisions of the principal Act in relation to the power of the State to acquire land before the additional land needed for disposal of the factory effluent can be obtained.

At present the Act provides that the State may acquire land which it requires for the discharge of effluent from the Laporte works site into the ocean, and it is likely this was considered to be the only suitable means of effluent disposal when the legislation was passed in 1961.

Following the usual opening provisions for ratification of the variation agreement referred to in the Bill, is an amendment to the land provisions of the principal Act to delete the passage "into the ocean". This amendment will enable the State to proceed with its intention to act on the recommendation of the Laporte effluent disposal committee that access to additional land on Leschenault Inlet be secured immediately.

Turning to the variation agreement, the relevant clause is that providing for deletion of the words "in the ocean" from the existing agreement under which the State has total responsibility for the disposal of all effluent from the Laporte works site.

By agreeing to these amendments, the State will be able to secure under the Act and the agreement, the land necessary for the proper and long-term management of the disposal of effluent.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Fred McKenzie.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.31 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11.30 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRANSPORT: BUSES

MTT: Offensive Behaviour

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

- (1) If a person travelling on a Metropolitan Transport Trust bus behaves in a manner considered to be offensive to other passengers on the bus, can the person be requested by the driver to leave the bus?
- (2) If the person refuses to leave the bus when ordered to, what action is the driver permitted to take to ensure that the person is removed?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Notify the MTT via two-way radio or telephone or, in an emergency, seek police assistance.

HOSPITAL

Roebourne

704. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What alterations are proposed for the Roebourne Hospital?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of the work?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

- (1) Alterations proposed involve—
 - (a) removal of substandard ward accommodation and services buildings from the site;
 - (b) relocation of ward units from Dampier to provide a newly designed 14 bed air-conditioned ward unit with all necessary service facilities;
 - (c) upgrading and air-conditioning of the kitchen; and
 - (d) minor alterations to existing buildings to link with the new facilities.
- (2) As this project is about to go to tender, I believe the estimated cost of the work is a matter which the member should refer to the Minister for Health for a personal reply.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Agriculture

705. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In respect of salary and wage adjustments for the agriculture division,

what total amount was registered as 1981-82 expenditure?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

Total wage and salary adjustments granted and paid during 1981-82 against the Consolidated Revenue Fund votes of the agriculture division amounted to \$1 455 million.

As pointed out by the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer to the member in his reply to question 650 of 28 October, a number of factors other than award increases influence the outlays by departments on salaries and wages.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Railways and Transport

706. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Transport:

In respect of salary and wage adjustments for each of—

- (a) WA Government Railways Commission; and
- (b) Metropolitan Transport Trust;

what total amounts were registered as 1981-82 expenditure?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

The total salary and wage adjustments in respect of the Railways Commission and the Metropolitan Transport Trust which were granted and paid during 1981-82 from these divisions under the Consolidated Revenue Fund were as follows—

- (a) Western Australian Government Railways Commission—\$9.63 million;
- (b) Metropolitan Transport Trust—\$4.3 million.

I would also refer the member to the answer to his question 705 provided by the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Agriculture.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Public Works

707. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Works:

In respect of salary and wage adjustments for the public works and buildings division, what total amount was registered as 1981-82 expenditure?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

Total salary and wage adjustments granted and paid during 1981-82 against the Consolidated Revenue Fund votes of the Public Works Department and buildings division amounted to \$2 079 million.

I would also refer the member to the answer to his question 705 provided by the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Agriculture.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Health

708. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Health:

In respect of salary and wage adjustments for each of—

- (a) public health division; and
- (b) Mental Health Services division;

what total amounts were registered as 1981-82 expenditure?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

The total salary and wage adjustments granted and paid during 1981-82 in respect of the public health and mental health divisions under the Consolidated Revenue Fund were as follows—

- (a) Public Health\$1 712 million;
- (b) Mental Health\$2 689 million.

I would also refer the member to the answer to his question 705 provided by the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Agriculture.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Police

709. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Police and Prisons:

In respect of salary and wage adjustments for what were previously the

Police and Road Traffic Authority divisions, what total amount was registered as 1981-82 expenditure?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

Total salary and wage adjustments granted and paid during 1981-82 in respect of the police and road traffic divisions under the Consolidated Revenue Fund amounted to \$2 026 million.

I would also refer the member to the answer to his question 705 provided by the Minister for Labour and Industry representing the Minister for Agriculture.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Cost

710. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In respect of the current year's State Housing Commission building programme of rental accommodation in the metropolitan area, what is the estimated cost per unit of—

- (a) land;
- (b) building;

for each of the following classes of accommodation—

- (i) one-bedroomed pensioner units;
- (ii) two-bedroomed units;
- (iii) three-bedroomed units;
- (iv) four-bedroomed units;
- (v) five-bedroomed units;
- (vi) one-bedroomed pensioner flats;
- (vii) townhouses;
- (viii) duplexes;
- (ix) single detached houses?

- (2) What is the anticipated average size per unit of each of the above classes of accommodations?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The information sought will take some time to collate and therefore I will reply to the question by letter.

HOSPITALS

Roebourne and Wickham

711. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister for Health:

Would the Minister supply details of the staff classifications and numbers and

staff hours for each of Roebourne and Wickham Hospitals in 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE replied:

WICKHAM
FINANCIAL YEARS

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	Average for 82-83 to 10/82
NURSING SERVICES					
Matron	1.00	1.01	0.99	1.04	1.01
Double certificate RGN	3.76	3.82	3.97	4.04	4.38
Single certificate RGN	2.08	2.12	2.19	2.31	2.46
Enrolled nurse	2.93	3.13	4.12	4.65	6.17
Nursing assistant	1.01	0.82	0.14	—	—
	10.80	10.90	11.41	12.04	14.02
ADMINISTRATION AND CLERICAL					
Administrator	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.97	1.38
Clerk	1.00	1.00	0.91	1.17	1.98
Clerical assistant	0.50	0.40	1.04	0.82	—
	2.50	2.40	2.91	2.96	3.36
MEDICAL SUPPORT					
Radiographer	1.00	1.03	1.01	1.06	1.15
HOSTEL SERVICES					
Food Maid	1.00	1.01	0.99	1.02	1.02
Laundry worker	1.00	0.99	0.98	1.01	1.31
Cleaning maid	4.11	4.10	4.73	5.19	4.53
Orderly	1.90	1.80	1.92	2.16	2.11
	8.01	7.9	8.62	9.38	8.97
MAINTENANCE SERVICES					
Gardener	0.99	0.97	0.81	1.00	0.97
Handyman	0.98	0.99	1.04	1.05	1.00
REMO	1.01	1.00	0.96	1.01	1.00
	2.98	2.96	2.81	3.06	2.97
	25.29	25.19	26.76	28.50	30.47

ROEBOURNE
FINANCIAL YEARS

	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	Average for 82-83 to 10/82
NURSING SERVICES					
Matron	1.07	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.10
Double certificate RGN	1.80	1.80	1.68	1.88	1.80
Single certificate RGN	3.30	4.75	4.71	4.86	3.33
Enrolled nurse	3.53	2.90	4.15	4.25	4.20
Nursing assistant	0.60	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.50
	10.30	11.10	12.15	12.56	10.93
ADMINISTRATION AND CLERICAL					
Clerk	1.30	1.60	1.59	1.35	1.60
Clerical assistant	0.50	0.30	—	0.14	0.34
	1.80	1.90	1.59	1.49	1.94
HOSTEL SERVICES					
Food maid	2.46	2.48	2.54	2.56	2.09
Cook	1.48	1.51	1.52	1.58	1.50
Laundry worker	1.15	1.16	1.18	1.16	1.10
Cleaning maid	1.99	1.85	2.76	2.56	2.00
Orderly	1.12	1.10	1.10	1.13	1.10
	8.20	8.10	9.10	8.99	7.79

MAINTENANCE SERVICES
VICE Gardener

0.90	1.00	1.15	1.22	1.02
0.90	1.00	1.15	1.22	1.02
21.20	22.10	23.99	24.26	21.68

*Totals for main service headings are correct. Detailed staff classifications are estimates.

All staffing figures are in full time equivalent terms i.e. the average per fortnight of all hours worked and paid for annual and sick leave for each financial year of each classification of staff related to each functional service in the Hospitals.

WATER RESOURCES

South-west Shires

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

- (1) What new water schemes or other major capital works involving water supplies, have been built in—
 - (a) each of the shires in South Province; and
 - (b) Katanning and Broomehill Shires;
 during the last 12 financial years?
- (2) What projects—
 - (a) are to be undertaken following this year's capital works programme; and
 - (b) are expected to be undertaken following current planning?
- (3) What was the value of these projects?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) to (3) As the information requested by the member is not readily available the Minister for Works has undertaken to reply to this question in writing.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

174. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Attorney General:

I refer the Attorney General to the documents given to him yesterday on behalf of the company Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. and I ask—

- (1) What inquiries or investigations has he instituted, if any, in relation to the possible avoidance of Western Australian stamp duty?
- (2) What are the results of his inquiries or investigations?

- (3) Has he referred the matter to the Treasurer to see whether an agreement between the Government and the company in relation to the advance of money may have been breached?

- (4) If not, why not?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) to (4) I have referred the matter to the Commissioner of State Taxation and the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. I have not at this stage referred it to anyone else. I am awaiting the results of my inquiries.

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

175. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is he aware that Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. is a company to which the Western Australian Government under the authority of the Treasurer had made substantial advances and given substantial guarantees?
- (2) In those circumstances, will he not accept that this is an appropriate matter for him to refer to the Treasurer?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is outside my portfolio. If the honourable member wishes to address the question to the Treasurer he is at liberty to do so.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Poland: Similarity

176. The Hon. TOM STEPHENS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Has the Minister seen the advertisement on page 51 of *The West Australian* of 27 October 1982 which drew parallels between the Western Australian Government and the Government of Poland?
- (2) Does he acknowledge the existence of this parallel or similarity between the legislation of this Government and that of the Polish Government with particular reference to the Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill (No. 2)?

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: What absolutely disgraceful comments!

The Hon. Garry Kelly: True though.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that this question is seeking an opinion and is therefore out of order.

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

177. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Does he not in this House represent the Treasurer?
- (2) In those circumstances, does he not regard the matter that has been raised with him in relation to Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. as a matter appropriate for him to refer to the Treasurer?
- (3) If not, why not?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) to (3) The President has already given a ruling on this matter. I have indicated that the matter is outside my portfolio. Of course I represent the Treasurer in this House, but that does not alter the fact that Ministers are not required to answer, nor should they be asked to, questions in relation to another Minister's portfolio.

The Hon P. G. Pandal: Hear, hear!

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

178. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Leader of the House and Minister representing the Treasurer:

Will he refer to the Treasurer the matters raised in this House regarding Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. and the possible avoidance of Western Australian stamp duty?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that he is asking a question without notice in contravention of the ruling that I gave that he cannot ask a question without notice of a Minister in respect of his representation of a Minister in another place.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: With respect, Sir, I have asked him that question in his capacity as Leader of the House, not in his capacity as representing the Premier.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member referred to the Leader of the House and the Minister representing the Treasurer and in that regard the member is out of order. I ask the honourable member if he wants to direct a question to the Attorney General in the capacity of his portfolios. It is perfectly clear that he can do so.

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

179. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) I observe as a preface to my question that he also represents, in this case, the Treasurer and I ask him in his capacity as Leader of the House will he refer to the Treasurer, the Minister he represents in this place, the matters raised by me about Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. and the waste of public money and avoidance of stamp duty?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) The honourable member is seeking to make a fuss about something I answered yesterday. I said yesterday that I would have inquiries made into the matters raised by him. I stand by that reply and have nothing further to add to it.

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

180. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Leader of the House:

Is he aware the Government apparently has financial commitments and obligations in respect of Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd., and in those circumstances would he regard this matter as urgent and refer it to the Treasurer?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

I do not know how much longer I am expected to answer the same question. I have already said that if the member wishes to address a question to the Treasurer he may do so. He knows that perfectly well. I have indicated to him that the matter raised by him yesterday will be the subject of an inquiry. That is as far as I can take it. There is nothing further I can add to the matter and I do

not intend to answer any further questions to the same effect.

STATE FINANCE: STAMP DUTY

Avoidance: Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd.

181. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Attorney General:

Will he undertake to the House that he will report as to the results of the investigations in relation to the Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. affair before Parliament rises so that this House can be fully apprised of the matter?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The honourable member will receive a reply in answer to the question he asked yesterday as soon as I am able to give it.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd.

182. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Did he this evening receive a deputation from the sacked workers from Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd., in WA, some 200 of whom were at the front of Parliament House?
- (2) Did he give them any indication of action the Government was taking to protect their jobs?
- (3) What proposals, if any, does he or the Government have to give them some hope for employment?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes, I did meet a deputation led by the President of the TLC and representing a number of those workers who have been retrenched by Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd. I also met with some unions on Thursday last and with the company on Friday. I met with the unions again today and I will meet the company officers tomorrow.

Obviously the Government is most concerned with the retrenchment of 290 people from Chamberlain John Deere and will be pursuing all avenues possible to get jobs for them or to retain their jobs in one way or another; that is the reason I am meeting with the company tomorrow.

The State Government has already committed something like \$1 billion to capi-

tal works. The Premier has requested that these works be brought forward immediately in order that these people may be employed as a result of the generous works programme of the State Government and the Premier of the day.

A commitment of \$35 to \$40 million has been made by the Government for apprenticeship schemes. Some 13 per cent of all apprentices in WA are employed by Government departments. That is over 1 800 apprentices and does not include those apprentices who will be employed in the new projects proposed by the Government. The Commonwealth Government has been approached in relation to some new schemes and I will phone the Commonwealth Minister (Mr Macphree) tomorrow morning to obtain more support from the Commonwealth Government.

The company's position is clear. It needs to retrench workers if it is to keep its head above water, or some 1 400 people will be affected in total. Therefore, the company has a problem. Nevertheless, the State Government is clearly committed to take all the action it is possible to take to protect those jobs. I will assist in any possible way to see that the jobs are maintained. I will not make this a political exercise. I am as concerned as anyone else; it is a disaster for a person to be placed in this position. We will do the same as the Opposition would do if in Government.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd.

183. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

When was he informed by the company first that a massive lay-off of workers was likely to occur and what action did he take after he was informed, if he was informed before the lay-offs occurred?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I thought suggestions were made earlier in the year that lay-offs might occur. I understand this was in April and May. The first knowledge I had that the lay-off of 290 people was to occur was when I read it in the newspaper early one morning in this House. Obviously after that I got my department to contact the

company to find out what had happened and arrangements were made for me to meet with Peter Cook from the TLC. I met with the company and I will do all I can in relation to meetings with the company and the Premier.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd.

184. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Since everyone in Western Australia knows of the difficult conditions that exist in country areas for some months now, will the Minister say why neither he nor his department has taken action to liaise with the company employing a labour force the size of that at Chamberlain John Deere Pty. Ltd. before the lay-offs occurred?
- (2) Why is it the Minister was not aware of events until he read of them in the newspaper?
- (3) What action has he taken to improve his liaison with industry?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) to (3) In answer to the glamour boy who has just asked this question—

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I guess it is what we can expect—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Robert Hetherington: What a fatuous remark.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I say again the Government is concerned with the unemployment and retrenchments of these 290 workers. The company, I guess, makes its own decision as to when it will communicate its problems to the Government. I understand the company had some lengthy discussions with the shop stewards; that is what I was told. The member talks about unemployment in country areas; of course we know there is unemployment in country areas as there is in the metropolitan area. Nevertheless we are trying to cover the whole State with the new budgeting programmes involving expenditure of \$1 billion. This money will be spent throughout the State. If certain indus-

tries are under pressure the Government will have to do what it can to assist. In the short term the Government wants to create employment so that in the long term these companies will find themselves in a better position to employ people.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Retrenchments: Companies Involved

185. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of other companies in which lay-offs are about to occur?
- (2) If so, what action has the Minister taken in respect of those companies?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) and (2) I have no certain knowledge of this matter.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You do not know much at all.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: If you are going to be rude, you should not ask questions.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Hon. Peter Dowding wants a reply, let him keep quiet; if he does not keep quiet, he can place his question on notice. It is up to him. To continue: The Government has been informed retrenchments may occur in other areas; however, we have no certain information on this matter.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: In which areas?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The information is coming forward, and as soon as I receive it, I will inform members. However, it is quite clear from Press releases and Press reports that companies are under pressure. The Government and the department continually are monitoring the situation.

The Hon. Tom Stephens: Watching while Rome burns.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I took the trouble to inform the Leader of the Opposition of this matter and to provide him with details of the figures in the Government's possession at that time; I will continue to do so. I share the concern of members opposite. These problems are no secret, and we are doing our best to overcome them.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Retrenchments: Companies Involved

186. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

As the Minister has indicated he has read in the Press that lay-offs may occur at certain companies, will he now say in what specific areas is he aware these lay-offs may occur, and what specific action the Government is taking to ensure these lay-offs do not occur?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

I will answer this question, and then ask the member to place on notice further questions relating to this matter. My answer is as follows—

Some pressure is being experienced in the heavy engineering and engineering industries and in some building areas. I have no specific instances, but I do know of many companies experiencing difficulties at this time. Many of these companies will overcome these difficulties by various arrangements—perhaps by different methods of management, and the like. It may be that the work force can make alternative arrangements regarding working hours, and that sort of thing. Like other members, I am aware difficulties are being experienced; however, I have nothing specific to give to the Hon. Peter Dowding.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You have a department to keep you informed on these matters.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Hon. Peter Dowding cares to state in writing exactly what he wants to know, I will take the trouble to obtain the details for him.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Midland Brick Co. Pty. Ltd.

187. The Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is he aware Midland Brick Co. Pty. Ltd. is contemplating closing its premises for a period?
- (2) If not, will he make inquiries and advise the House at the next sitting?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) No, I am not aware of that situation.
- (2) Yes, if there is a need to inform the member as he wishes, I certainly will do so.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Retrenchments: Companies Involved

188. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

This is my final question on this matter, and I preface it by asking the Minister to be specific instead of simply generalising. I ask—

- (1) Does he, as Minister, know or does he not know which industries and companies are at risk in terms of lay-offs?
- (2) If not—

Government members interjected.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: —will he take steps to inform this House in respect of—

Government members interjected.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You simply want to panic the public.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: I know members opposite think the retrenchment of 250 workers is a bit of a giggle.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Do not be so stupid!

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: To repeat the second part of my question—

- (2) If not, will the Minister obtain the specific information and specifically inform this House before Parliament rises exactly what the Government is doing in these specific areas?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) and (2) I take heart that the member has announced this is his final question. Perhaps he can take heart from my suggestion that he place it on notice so that I may obtain an answer for him.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Aren't you hopeless?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. Tom Stephens interjected.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Don't you talk; you are under a cloud.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: If anyone took you seriously—

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Belt up, you twit!

Withdrawal of Remark

The Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Mr President, I seek your guidance on this matter. The Hon. P. H. Lockyer has just suggested I am under some sort of cloud, and I ask that he be made to withdraw the remark or that I be given the right to make some sort of explanation regarding the matter.

The PRESIDENT: Order! What are the words the honourable member wants withdrawn, and who made the comment?

The Hon. TOM STEPHENS: The Hon. P. H. Lockyer twice suggested to me that I was under some sort of cloud, and I request you to ask Mr Lockyer to withdraw those remarks.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to know what were the comments, because I did not hear them. If the honourable member would tell me the specific comment made—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: He said he was under a cloud.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want the Hon. Tom Stephens to tell me, not somebody else.

The Hon. TOM STEPHENS: On two occasions, the Hon. P. H. Lockyer said that I was under a cloud. I regard that as an offensive remark and I ask that he be required to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. P. H. Lockyer to withdraw the comments and suggest he should not interject with unparliamentary comments.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I withdraw, Mr President; I did not realise the remark was unparliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask all members to cease interjecting, and remind members that when they take up a parliamentary life, sensitivity is one emotion they cannot afford.