

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 12 October 1983

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

PETROLEUM PIPELINES AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Shannon River: Petition

On motions by the Hon. A. A. Lewis, the following petition bearing the signatures of 1 878 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

To The Honourable The President and Members of the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled.

The Petition of the undersigned electors respectfully sheweth:

That they believe the Shannon Basin need not become a National Park to preserve it. Rather, they endorse the many years of knowledge, planning and work of the Forest Department in their multiple use management of the forest, providing for the present and future needs of all the community (Flora and Fauna, Recreation, Stream and Road Reserves). Further, to unnecessarily turn Shannon Basin into National Park would reduce the (renewable) resource available to the main economic base of the region and lead to a corresponding decline in future employment, business and services of the region.

In the light of the above, your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Council, in Parliament assembled, should refuse any move to make Shannon Basin a National Park in the present concept of National Park.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 313.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Robert Hetherington, the following petition bearing the signatures of 15

persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

To the Honourable President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned believe that advertising and promotion of cigarettes and tobacco products are some of the influences encouraging children to smoke. We urge the Council to demonstrate its commitment to protect children from beginning habits which are dangerous to their health by supporting legislation which will prevent advertising and promotion of cigarettes.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound will ever pray.

(See paper No. 314.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Petition

On the motions by the Hon. P. G. Pandal, the following petition bearing the signatures of 191 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and the Honourable Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned are school teachers and we believe that education programmes alone are ineffective in discouraging children from smoking and only by combining education with legislation to ban tobacco advertising can we expect that the uptake of smoking by children will be significantly reduced.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 315.)

ELECTORAL

Referendum: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Kay Hallahan, the following petition bearing the signatures of 47 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We the undersigned electors of Western Australia desire that the State Electoral System be reformed so as to incorporate the principle of 'one person-one vote-one value'.

We specifically request the reform of the Legislative Council of Western Australia to achieve:

1. A reduction in the number of Legislative Councillors from 34 to 22.
2. The retirement of half of the Members of the Legislative Council at each general election (ie. simultaneous elections).
3. The election of Legislative Councillors according to a system of proportional representation such as currently operates in Senate elections.

And that the above reforms be decided by the people voting at a referendum.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 316.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Mark Nevill, the following petition bearing the signatures of 24 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and the Honourable Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned are school teachers and we believe that education programmes alone are ineffective in discouraging children from smoking and only by combining education with legislation to ban tobacco advertising can we expect that the uptake of smoking by children will be significantly reduced.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 317.)

ELECTORAL

Referendum: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Robert Hetherington, the following petition bearing the signatures of 35 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We the undersigned electors of Western Australia desire that the State Electoral System be reformed so as to incorporate the principle of 'one person-one vote-one value'.

We specifically request the reform of the Legislative Council of Western Australia to achieve:

1. A reduction in the number of Legislative Councillors from 34 to 22.
2. The retirement of half of the Members of the Legislative Council at each general election (ie. simultaneous elections).
3. The election of Legislative Councillors according to a system of proportional representation such as currently operates in Senate elections.

And that the above reforms be decided by the people voting at a referendum.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 318.)

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Girrawheen-Marangaroo-Koonoola: Petition

On motions by the Hon. P. H. Wells, the following petition bearing the signatures of 418 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

To the Honorable The President and Members of the Legislative Council in Parliament Assembled.

The Petition of the undersigned concerned citizens and parents of schoolchildren in the Northern Suburbs respectfully sheweth:—

- (1) That the optimum number of schoolchildren in highschools should not exceed sixhundred & fifty-eighthundred & fifty (650-850) students at any one time.
- (2) That another highschool be built in the Girrawheen/Marangaroo/Koonoola area in time for that start of the 1985 school year.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled should:—

- (1) Ensure that the optimum number of students in highschools does not exceed

the above number by continual supervision of forward planning departments of the Education Department.

- (2) Ensure that any future highschool built in the above area and in any other area be built with the future in mind that they can either be transported to another site or adapted for community use or further educational advantages.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 319).

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Robert Hetherington, the following petition bearing the signatures of nine persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and the Honourable Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned are school teachers and we believe that education programmes alone are ineffective in discouraging children from smoking and only by combining education with legislation to ban tobacco advertising can we expect that the uptake of smoking by children will be significantly reduced.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 320.)

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT: HON. TOM STEPHENS

Assault: Personal Explanations

HON. TOM STEPHENS (North) [2.34 p.m.]: I seek leave to make a statement about a front page story in the *Daily News* this afternoon.

Leave granted.

HON. TOM STEPHENS: Last night an incident occurred in the corridors of Parliament House outside the members' bar, between it and the dining room. During that incident I was assaulted in an unprovoked fashion.

The exchange occurred as a result of a conversation at the members' bar when my colleague, the member for Kimberley, had just watched a news item about Dr Dadour in which it was made clear that Dr Dadour was to be castigated severely by his party. The member for Kimberley

expressed his concern that the place was falling apart. At that time the Hon. Phil Lockyer said that the only problem down in the Assembly was that the Government was making a farce of question time.

I turned to my colleague, Ernie Bridge, and commented to him that the only problem down in the Assembly was that the Government was facing an Opposition that was making an effort to persecute one of its members. I was then endeavouring to proceed home, because the Council had risen for the evening and, as I was leaving the members' bar—I had not had a drink and I cannot speak for any other members there; I had simply gone to the bar to have a sausage roll—the comment was made by the Hon. Phil Lockyer that that was a totally irresponsible thing to say.

I then walked into the corridor. As the doors closed behind me, I poked my head back through the door and said to the Hon. Phil Lockyer, "Lockyer, get nicked!" I said that in a fairly friendly fashion.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: Show us the gesture you used.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Until that time and even as the Hon. Phil Lockyer came striding through—

Hon. W. G. Atkinson: Did you use a gesture?

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I was eating a sausage roll, so I was unable to make any gestures.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are as weak as water!

Several members interjected.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I made no gestures.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: It is a pity you aren't at the Bar of the House, isn't it?

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Members may have these comments at the Bar of the House, or elsewhere if they wish. I value honesty and truth in this Chamber.

The Hon. Phil Lockyer came pounding through the doors and effectively grabbed me while I was in the middle of the corridor in front of the dining room. He grabbed me by my suit coat and said, "What did you say?" I realised the Hon. Phil Lockyer was not in the same convivial spirit as is sometimes demonstrated in our dealings in this Chamber and outside and was obviously endeavouring to menace me. I stepped back and unintentionally succeeded in tripping a steward who proceeded to watch the exchange in which I was thumped on the mouth by the Hon. Phil Lockyer.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: From whom were you running away—the steward or Mr Lockyer?

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I was quite stunned, also a little hurt, and quite surprised.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: And rather scared.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I recall that during the time the tobacco legislation was being debated at exactly the same location as that to which I have referred Dr Tom Dadour found himself evicted from the members' bar and chased down the corridor by the Hon. Phil Lockyer.

It is of concern to me that members should be menaced when legislation such as this, which is of concern to members of both sides, is being debated in the Parliament.

What are the options available to me as a member of this Chamber?

Hon. I. G. Pratt: What was the gesture?

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: The options available to me are: Firstly, I could ignore what occurred.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Grow up, would be the answer!

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Secondly, I could simply lay a complaint with the police and ask that criminal proceedings be taken against the Hon. Phil Lockyer.

Hon. Tom Knight: Which would be stupid.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Thirdly, I could take civil action against the Hon. Phil Lockyer and endeavour to obtain damages against him, which I would happily donate to our next campaign for Lower North Province.

Finally, I could address the whole question of privilege, and refer the matter to the privilege committee. I have been through the whole question of precedent, and I have referred to what has happened previously in this Chamber. I am aware of the incident of about 1919 concerning the Hon. H. P. Colebatch.

Hon. Tom Knight: You have studied it.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I am aware of other incidents of violence, and I am particularly aware of the incidents which occurred last year when the tobacco advertising legislation of that time was before the Parliament. Allegations were made at that time alleging violence related to the same issue.

I view this incident very dimly because I am a peaceful person. I value the whole question of peace—I am not violently disposed.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Except verbally.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I was shocked to find myself being assaulted by the Hon. Phil Lockyer, and more importantly I have been shocked by the tenor of the comments about this matter reported in the Press to have been made by the Hon. Phil Lockyer. It seems he is quite unrepentant. If the comments he has made were correctly reported to

me by the media, we can expect more of this sort of performance than we have experienced from this member. Previously that performance has been directed against his own colleagues, and now he has attacked a member of the Government.

My statement can be reduced to this: I hope he will be dealt with by his colleagues. As members appreciate, in this Chamber I have not the opportunity to move a motion concerning this matter.

Opposition members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I cannot move a motion that would give me any confidence as to its success, whether the motion be directed towards a breach of privilege or whether it be to refer this matter to the privilege committee, because this Chamber is dominated and controlled in a rock-like fashion—

Opposition members interjected.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: —by the Liberal Party, the colleagues of the Hon. Phil Lockyer. As unpalatable as that statement might be to members opposite, it represents the case. I am unable from this side of the Chamber to ensure that this matter is addressed in such a way that I can be hopeful of a just outcome to any complaint. Therefore, I have decided to wait for the opportunity to see whether members opposite will take disciplinary action against the Hon. Phil Lockyer. Such action was suggested previously by the previous Leader of the Opposition. The suggestion was that, if the Hon. Phil Lockyer continued to behave in the way he had—the way he did just recently—which is unbecoming to the Parliament, disciplinary action would be taken.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: You are acting like a child.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Is it appropriate that the Hon. Phil Lockyer should continue to display overt violence and threaten violence against not only me, but also his own colleagues? He has even displayed that violence against a present Minister of the Crown.

I will leave the matter in the hands of Opposition members at this stage. I will wait with great interest to determine the position they will arrive at on this question. Later I will make my decision as to whether the matter should be referred to the privilege committee. I cannot take action against the Hon. Phil Lockyer until the Parliament is prorogued, because he may be protected by the Parliament. I cannot do anything now in this Chamber because of the undemocratic and unfair way this Chamber is elected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member is enjoying the opportunity to make a personal state-

ment, which is afforded to him by Standing Order No. 75. The statement is not debatable and, therefore, it is incumbent upon the member not to introduce into his statement matters which are debatable. I suggest he bear that point in mind while completing his remarks.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I will try to ignore the interjections while finishing off. As far as I am concerned, I was assaulted in an unprovoked fashion in the corridors of this building, and I view that action dimly. Obviously the member opposite who committed that assault is unrepentant. I hope some of his colleagues through the process of their party seek some repentance from this member as a result of his activities, otherwise members of this Parliament will be open to intimidation over controversial legislation and the sort of behaviour exhibited by the Hon. Phil Lockyer.

I will not move any motion today because, as I have outlined, this Chamber places me in an unfair situation. Later I will consider whether to make a formal complaint to the police, or take action when the Parliament is prorogued.

Any assault is a serious matter. I do not know how other members of the Chamber would regard an assault. As legislators, I hope all members view an assault as a serious matter, especially when it is admitted, and bragged and boasted about. Seemingly this assault is defended by members opposite.

Opposition members interjected.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I hope members opposite take the matter into their own hands.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [2.46 p.m.]: I seek leave under Standing Order No. 75 to make a personal explanation concerning the subject brought to the attention of the House by the Hon. Tom Stephens.

Leave granted.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I listened carefully to the comments made by the Hon. Tom Stephens. I will bring a little clarity to the situation by telling you, Mr President, exactly what happened last evening. I regret the incident because of the embarrassment it has brought on the Parliament, but I do not regret my actions.

Yesterday evening after the House rose I and some other members proceeded to the bar area to watch the television news. I have regarded the bar area of the Parliament as one of the few places in which members of any political persuasion can mix freely with one another and talk on subjects with the assurance that the comments made do not leave the so-called hallowed halls.

After a couple of subjects had been reported on the television, I went to the bar with three of my colleagues and a member from the other side to discuss certain matters. The Hon. Tom Stephens was not, of course, involved in the matter discussed and he was not involved in our discussion. However, in a rude manner he voiced some comment. Firstly, it was ill-mannered, and, secondly, it was not in keeping with the place in which it was made. I reminded him in a polite way that the bar area was not the place to make that comment. He promptly left the place, and later returned like a bull through the bar door. While his version of what he said is not precisely the same as mine, I will not repeat his comments in this Chamber, and I will not refer to the gesture he made. From where I come, the north of the State, what he said is man's talk. In this Chamber he has the opportunity under parliamentary privilege to say the most despicable things, which he does, but which I will not tolerate outside this Chamber.

I left the bar area because the member was rapidly departing like a mongrel dog.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I grabbed him, and with a light backhand to the mouth reminded him of his manners, and informed him of what would happen to him the next time he made such comments to me. I do not make any apology to Mr Stephens or any other person—

Hon. Tom Stephens: You are a liar, and you—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I listened to the statement of the Hon. Tom Stephens in silence.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I didn't tell lies, though.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I then believed that the subject was closed, because the Hon. Tom Stephens knew why he got the clip on the mouth; I know the reason and so do many members of all political persuasions in this House. I went home and all would have been all right, had I not received a call from a member of the Press pointing out that he had received a report of an altercation in the House. I said that I had no comment because I believed it was a personal matter, and I inquired from where he got the information. I was surprised that he received the information from the Hon. Tom Stephens. I regret that because I was happy to let the matter drop.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Be quiet please, madam—when I listen to you it is a wonder why I would not support abortion.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will deal with the interjections one by one.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: What, in a physical and insulting way?

Hon. Tom Stephens: You will punch her next.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Firstly, the same comments apply to the honourable member currently addressing the Chamber as those I made to the Hon. Tom Stephens in regard to the limitation of his statement. In the meantime, I suggest to all other honourable members that they refrain from interjecting, because I want these statements out of the way as quickly as possible.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Thank you, Mr President. I will ignore the rabble.

I repeat that this morning we had to suffer a report in the newspaper that was wrong and was obviously brought to the attention of the Press by the Hon. Tom Stephens, in which he tried to play off that I was abusing the member for Subiaco and he was defending him. That is absolutely absurd and he knows it is absurd. I put it to you, Mr President, that the honourable member has no intestinal fortitude and he will be ever regarded by his electorate and peers as being someone without any guts.

The Hon. Tom Stephens put forward some options available to him, and I give him another option: Any time he wants to step out to the flat I will finish the matter. I believe the subject is closed.

Let me assure the Hon. Tom Stephens and any of his colleagues who want to be assured in the same way that man's talk is man's talk. If he wants to carry on in an area that is normally sacrosanct—

Hon. Tom Stephens: You continue to lie.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have tolerated a couple of interjections because of the nature of this particular subject, but I will not tolerate the Hon. Tom Stephens or anybody else in this Chamber referring to an honourable member as a liar. It is totally out of order and I will not tolerate any repetition of it.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I deliberately did not ask the Hon. Tom Stephens to withdraw his remarks because they merely add up to what I am saying.

In my view the whole matter has been blown out of all proportion. Had it happened anywhere else but within the corridors of Parliament, not a word would have been said. Let me assure mem-

bers that if the Hon. Tom Stephens carried on in the same way in parts of his electorate he would be dealt with accordingly. All his bleatings and carryings on do him no good.

In my view the Hon. Tom Stephens' standing as a man has slipped below the Plimsoll line and no more will he be given the privilege of walking in areas that are sacrosanct. I suggest to him that he keeps out of my way and that he does not make comments like those he has made, otherwise he will receive similar treatment.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Select Committee: Interim Report

HON. J. M. BROWN (South-East) [3.08 p.m.]: I seek leave to present an interim report from the Select Committee on Committees.

Leave granted.

Hon. J. M. BROWN: I am directed to report that the Select Committee requests that it be empowered to adjourn from place to place and that the date fixed for its report be extended until Tuesday, 3 April 1984.

Mr President, I move—

That the report do lie upon the Table and be adopted and agreed to.

Question put and passed.

(See paper No. 321.)

PRISONERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [3.09 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable the second reading of the Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Bill to be taken at this day's sitting.

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members, this motion requires the concurrence of an absolute majority.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: I have counted the House and, there being an absolute majority present with no dissentient voice, I declare the motion carried with the concurrence of an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [3.10 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is part of a uniform scheme devised by the Standing Committee of Attorneys General in conjunction with the Ministers of the States and the Northern Territory responsible for prisons. The object of the Bill is to establish a legal framework to enable the transfer of prisoners between States. Western Australia is the only State which has not yet enacted the agreed uniform legislation, and once this Bill is passed, an Australia-wide scheme will become operational.

The Bill provides for the transfer of prisoners from one State to another, or from a State to a territory or a territory to a State, in the following circumstances: Firstly, where a prisoner requests the transfer and the transfer is for the purposes of the prisoner's welfare; in such a case, the consent of the relevant Ministers in both the "sending" and "receiving" States or territories is necessary. Secondly, where another State or territory requests the transfer of the prisoner, or the prisoner himself requests his transfer for the purpose of standing trial and being dealt with for offences committed in the other State or territory. Thirdly, where a prisoner is to be returned to a State or territory after trial or for the purpose of attending appeal proceedings.

The Bill does not provide for the transfer of prisoners serving sentences within a State for offences against Commonwealth law. The Commonwealth is preparing reciprocal legislation to provide for the transfer of those prisoners. When the Commonwealth legislation has been prepared and agreed upon by the States, complementary provisions will be inserted in the uniform State and territories legislation.

It is not possible at present to transfer a prisoner under sentence within a State to face trial on charges in another jurisdiction; that is, if a prisoner under sentence in Western Australia is wanted by the police in another State, the police must wait until the Western Australian sentence is served and the prisoner is eligible for release before extradition can proceed.

The delay involved can cause very great difficulties for the prosecution and the accused alike. Contact may be lost with witnesses, investigating police may be transferred or may retire, and recollections inevitably become less reliable.

The Bill, as I have indicated, also allows prisoners to be transferred interstate for welfare purposes. The welfare scheme is based on the concept

that, in some cases, it may not only be in the prisoner's interest to be transferred to serve his sentence in another State, but such a transfer may benefit the community in general.

The humanitarian arguments for prisoners' being transferred will be obvious. If a prisoner is in an institution located a great distance from his family, visits are difficult, and links may eventually break under the strain of separation. This lack of contact with family brings hardship to family members who have done no wrong, and is extremely unsettling for prisoners. If stable family and other social relationships can be maintained during a prison sentence, behaviour may be better and the chances of successful reintroduction into society after release are enhanced.

As I have indicated, the consent of the relevant Ministers of both the sending and receiving State is necessary before a transfer is possible. Once a prisoner is transferred, whether for trial or welfare reasons, he becomes subject to the laws of the receiving State or territory. Prisoners will take with them any remissions earned up to the time of transfer, but thereafter they become subject to the laws of the receiving State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. John Williams.

SUPERANNUATION*Defence Forces Retirement Benefit Funds:
Motion*

HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [3.14 p.m.]: I move—

That this House calls upon the Premier that as a matter of urgency he requests the Prime Minister to exclude Defence Forces Retirement Benefit Funds from the current proposals of the Federal Government to tax superannuation payments.

I thank the Government for this opportunity to move the motion. It has been on the Notice Paper for two sitting days, and I have not had the opportunity of bringing it forward due to a prior commitment I had last night. I hope that has not been a cause of inconvenience to the Government.

Without doubt the sentiment expressed in this motion will have the unanimous support of all members. The reason I bring it forward as a matter of urgency is that the defence forces of Australia are not in a particularly high state of morale. Various decisions have been made which have not been thought out adequately, and no doubt the Federal Government will correct the anomalies. I do not wish to labour the point, but

ultimately, if I do not see satisfactory moves by the Federal Government to correct these anomalies, I will move similar motions in this House.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Briefly, I refer to steaming time, flying time, and general activities in the defence forces. Another matter of concern is the popular move associated with Rottnest Island and the decisions by the Federal and State Labor Governments. I understand that situation could be resolved amicably over the next two or three months by the provision of similar facilities by the State Government, with the same requirements. Therefore, I will not labour that point in this motion.

This motion has no political overtones whatsoever. I hope that no member disagrees with it. I would not bring forward a motion that divided the people of Western Australia into those who are members of the defence forces and those who are part of the civilian population of the State. I would not be anxious to see that division occur; nor would I be anxious to see any move which would undermine the respect of the civilian population for members of the defence forces in Australia.

The need for consensus is a mark of our times. That seems to be accepted widely in the electorate. Therefore, I trust that the facts as I put them to members now will lead to agreement on this motion, and not to the opportunity for members to make political points.

As the motion clearly states, I ask this House to call upon the Premier, as a matter of urgency, to request the Prime Minister to exclude defence forces retirement benefit funds from the Federal Government's current proposals to tax superannuation payments.

For the benefit of members I will outline the historical actions that have lead to the present unacceptable system of superannuation payments by contributors to the defence forces retirement benefit funds. Initially, the Commonwealth Government sought to vary the differences between the private superannuation system that allows members to commute their pension to a lump sum payment on retirement, as against the Public Service superannuation scheme which permits public servants to commute only a percentage of their pension, and the remainder continues for the rest of their natural lives, and ultimately to their widows, who receive a proportion of that annual gratuity.

In the past, lump sums have attracted a nominal five per cent taxation, but after the recent Federal Budget they were to be subjected to nor-

mal taxation; they were to be grouped with normal income and taxed in the appropriate bracket, either 60 per cent, 42 per cent, or 30 per cent. What I am saying is that it was proposed that the lump sum would be included as normal income and taxed at the rate in the dollar at which the person's income in that year was taxed.

The historical follow-on was that the Australian Council of Trade Unions believed this was totally unacceptable and so made submissions to the Federal Government, in particular to Mr Keating as Federal Treasurer, insisting there be a reduction and a compromise in this computation of taxation on the lump sum. The Federal Government then reduced the rate in the dollar. It excluded the first \$50 000 of that lump sum from tax, apart from the five per cent which already existed, something to which I do not think anyone could take exception.

We know this particular compromise has proved unacceptable to other members of the community, and the recent airlines strike of last week is just one example of the discontent; but I will not argue that case. I want to argue the difference between members of the defence forces and members of the civilian population.

Basically, in our community the retiring age for males is between 60 and 65 years. I do not know whether the Hon. Lyla Elliott would disagree that there is some form of discrimination against females in that their retirement bracket ranges from 55 to 60 years. Perhaps Miss Elliott at some later time will explain this difference.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: I will let you guess.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I understand that females do live longer.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Perhaps that is why they live longer.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: But that is not the reason for their being able to retire earlier.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order!

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: In the defence forces certain compulsory retirement ages apply. For most it is 55 years, but the exception is senior ranking officers such as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but on this issue we should not be particularly concerned about them because their financial structure more than adequately covers them. The normal maximum retirement age comes after 20 years of service. Some members of the defence forces are eligible to retire a lot earlier than that; and it can vary from seven years down to two years. However that is not the particular issue I am discussing here; I am discussing

those members of the defence forces who receive DFRB payments on their retirement after 20 years of service.

Servicemen and servicewomen—these are the terms used and not on a discriminatory basis—may retire much earlier than 55 years of age. They can retire at 38 years of age. There is good reason for this and it has to do with the contingencies of service life. Basically, service life is more suited to the fairly youthful, particularly in the active arms of the services. The older members find it difficult to maintain a high level of efficiency for various reasons. They can find themselves re-allotted to some other position from the one they held when they first joined the services.

Hon. Graham Edwards: A 20-mile run in full pack and gear is heavy going for someone of 55.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Hon. Graham Edwards has interjected and given one reason that members of the defence forces may retire early. The form of service in the defence forces is certainly a little different from service under our current State and Federal awards. Servicemen are available for duty 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. They do not receive time-and-a-half, and if they work on Sundays all they get is a day in lieu.

The defence forces retirement benefit fund allows a member of the defence forces to commute approximately 35 per cent of his final year's income, whether that be after 20, 30, or more years of service; whenever he retires he obtains 35 per cent of his final years' income. I will not go into the technicalities of what happens to the remaining 65 per cent, because minor adjustments and sliding scales are involved. However, the remainder, the annuity, has recently been made subject to full Consumer Price Index adjustments in any one year.

Members of the defence forces find they can be posted to all sorts of hellish and crook spots at different times, along with their families, and they must hope that they can keep their family life together when they are posted all around Australia every two or three years. During this time they have little opportunity to purchase a home before retiring from the forces. They are in fact provided with a service home while they are members of the forces.

One of the first things a serviceman does on becoming an ex-serviceman is to commute a portion of his pension in order that he may use that money to purchase a home, and he also has the benefit of being able to avail himself of a defence service home loan. There is certainly nothing wrong with this; it is a condition of his service when he first joins.

An inducement to people to join the services is eligibility for a low-interest home loan. Of course, conditions of service do apply. I give the example of a non-commissioned officer, a sergeant on pay level 3, just an average salary, who has had 20 years of service and is 42 years of age. His salary would be \$22 094—what a magnificent sum. An amount of 35 per cent is added to that and he would be eligible for a payment of \$30 931.60. Further, he is eligible for a pension, but I will not go into the details of that. It is based on his likely lifespan. There is a technicality in regard to that if he retires at 42 years of age.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Wouldn't this motion be better put to your colleagues in the Federal Parliament?

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I am glad that the Leader of the House raised that point. I did not wish to get into the politics of this because I thought it would be of benefit to the House, but once before in an adjournment debate I pleaded with the Leader of the House to make representations to the Premier on a very serious matter which I will not bring into this debate; nothing was done about it. I happen to represent a large number of servicemen. The servicemen approached me wanting to know what is being done because a lot of water is passing under the bridge. Some people are getting out of the services. This may suit Mr Dans if he wants to see a depleted defence force in Australia.

I understand the new Premier prior to the last election made a lot of promises about defence. It is supposed to be a Federal matter, but he also appointed a Minister responsible for defence matters. For that reason, when members of the defence forces came to me and pointed out an anomaly and asked "When are things going to happen? We know you are a State member of Parliament", I said to them "We have a Minister responsible for this area".

Hon. D. K. Dans: You would serve your constituents much better if you passed this motion on to your Federal colleagues.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Our Premier said he was very concerned about defence in Western Australia. The Western Australian and Federal Governments are of the same political persuasion, and the State Government might be able to exert some influence. I recently heard of a parliamentary candidate who was told that the Premier should make representations to the Prime Minister of Australia to get results. Mr Dans, I am putting that point forward—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Why don't you take a delegation of your defence people to the Premier? Let

me tell you: I have more defence personnel in a small part of my electorate than you have in the whole of your electorate.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Minister had better be careful.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I have. I have the Stirling Naval Base, the Leeuwin depot and the fort in Burt Street.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I was there last night and was told there has been a reduction of 50 per cent in some of them.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is correct. I am fully aware of it. There is a very big build-up at Stirling, though.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I have not bothered to find out how many are in my electorate, but I will do so.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You will do your constituents no service whatsoever.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I will also check on the other side of the coin. If that is the case and Mr Dans is correct, I presume he has already made representations and he probably could have saved the time of the House by advising us that he had made these representations.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Quite a number of representations will be made by myself and other members on this issue.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I will pass it down to HMAS *Leeuwin* tomorrow because some servicemen actually live in my area and raised this matter with me. I will inform them that Mr Dans has made those representations and that the last lot of representations made were successful. Because of Mr Dans' success rate, I will tell them the anomalous and iniquitous situation prevailing here will be resolved within the next 48 hours.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It has been put to me by a very senior member of the defence forces in Western Australia.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I return to the point that the amount of \$22 094 is being taxed at the rate of 30c in the dollar and it therefore makes it almost impossible for servicemen to re-establish themselves in the community at 42 years of age, even though they have the benefit of the defence service home loan—when they get it. It takes anything up to 10 to 12 months to get that home loan. Also people have to arrange bridging finance in the meantime, which is very expensive. A fellow in my electorate was discharged from the force and had no income qualifications to enable him to borrow bridging finance. It takes 11 months to have a loan approved through the defence service home loan scheme, so he had to take

a loan at a higher interest rate and did not get the opportunity to enjoy the benefit of that advertised incentive to join the service. That \$22 094 is presently subject to tax of 30c in the dollar when previously it was subject to only 5c in the dollar. I am sorry if I have agitated Mr Dans.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You haven't agitated me, but you are the greatest time waster in this House.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I seem to agitate the Leader of the House on many occasions. I suppose he is one of these people with a soft spot that I keep hitting.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I was going to make a rude suggestion.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Government might be able to pull a rabbit out of the hat like it did in the three weeks before the Mundaring by-election.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That rabbit had big ears, didn't it?

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If the Government can do it again without a by-election, good luck to it. The other point I want to make is that there is a technicality in the computation—I will not bother the House with it—which flows from the example I gave of a sergeant retiring at 42 years of age. His pension amounts to \$128 000 before tax and by the time he reaches the retiring age of 60 he will be penalised for making arrangements for his own retirement.

I do not think I need to continue much further on this point other than to say that the system is inequitable. The servicemen are being taxed unnecessarily. I know the matter is currently under review, but it seems to have been under review for a very long time and many servicemen are leaving the service. What is more inequitable is that the payment of 30 per cent after 25 years is such that it may even deny the basic soldiers, WRANS, sailors, WAAFS or airmen to claim for age pensions.

I do not believe the Federal Government should be embarrassed at being requested to review this matter expeditiously. Obviously, Mr Dans will now tell us he has more constituents in this category than any other member, and I know a lot of other members have servicemen and women in their electorates.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Wait until the fleet comes in next week; I will have a lot more.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I am amazed I am getting these interjections, Mr Deputy President. I do not want to antagonise Mr Dans, and I am sorry that I have antagonised him.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You do not antagonise me; you intrigue me.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: If servicemen and women are being treated fairly Mr Dans should say so. He should not interject; he should get on his feet and tell me they are being treated fairly and then send a copy of *Hansard* to HMAS Stirling. I did not believe I would get this sort of interjections. It is a very pleasant motion and one on which the House can agree. I seek the support of all members in the best interests of the servicemen and women of Western Australia.

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan) [3.42 p.m.]: I must admit I am rather surprised and pleased at the sudden concern being expressed by members of the Opposition in relation to recipients of the defence forces retirement and death benefit pension. I am also rather pleased that this motion has been raised in the House. I have no doubt whatever that if the motion is passed the Premier will prosecute and carry it out to his full ability. It is pleasing to see members opposite showing faith in that ability and recognising it by putting a motion such as this before the Chamber.

I hope all members will further support this issue by lobbying their Federal counterparts to seek a review of the situation as it applies to defence personnel in general, because this matter correctly lies within the Federal sphere. The defence forces retirement and death benefit provisions have been set up to help keep the Army young; that is, a member needs only to serve 20 years before he or she becomes eligible to retire, commute pension rights and receive a lump sum payment. The current situation is that a member can commute only four years' pension. If the Federal Government stands firm and refuses to exempt the services from its superannuation tax I believe a fair alternative would be to extend the pension commutation period from four years to five years. This would in effect restore the in-hand lump sum amount of money.

This is something I have been putting rather strongly to the Federal member for Stirling (Mr Ron Edwards). I am very pleased to say he and others have sought a review of this matter in Canberra and it is now being reviewed. I would hope that if defence service personnel cannot be exempt from tax, the Government would see the extension from four years to five years as a fair alternative. The service personnel who most concern me are those in field forces or similar units. They are the people whose private and family lifestyles are most adversely affected by the nature of their duties.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: Such Service personnel spend extended periods in harsh circumstances eking out an existence under conditions which would not be found or tolerated in any other area of the work force in this country. Field force personnel are more liable to be transferred and inherit the subsequent disruptions of those transfers. An example of that is the effect of that lifestyle on school-aged children. They can be transferred from State to State and they do not have the continuity of education provided in one State.

A further problem is the lack of ability of service personnel to establish roots in a community or to set up social links which most of us expect and take for granted.

One of the major and just rewards of this demanding type of lifestyle has been the lump sum payment made on retirement which, in the majority of cases, is used to purchase a family home and to repatriate to family life, something which I pointed out earlier is difficult for personnel serving under service conditions.

I have been through the mill as a serviceman and ex-serviceman under previous Liberal Governments and, as I said earlier, it is refreshing to see the change in attitude that has been introduced by the Hon. Mr Oliver. I hope that, under this Federal Government, we will see a complete review and update of the defence forces retirement benefit fund. This has been necessary for some time and, as a result of the change of Government, we may be able to achieve it so that all service personnel benefit.

I support the motion.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Minister for Inter-Governmental Relations and Defence Liaison) [4.03 p.m.]: I do not propose to enter into debate on the merits of the motion, but I suggest we keep the role of this House in proper perspective. Of course, occasions arise when it is appropriate to move beyond the limits of the State Parliament's area of jurisdiction. The recent motions on the two Korean tragedies fall into that category, but unless some such overriding considerations exist, I suggest we really would do better to keep to matters which we can affect directly or at least those that have some special component affecting specific State interests.

This motion is not of that sort. With due respect, it is a matter which Mr Oliver's constituents would have better put to their Federal representatives to be raised in the Federal Parliament. The alternative to that is to open the way in

this House to parallel debates to those which occur in the House of Representatives or the Senate on a whole gamut of subjects. We could discuss equally well the problem of the assets test, Medicare, immigration policy, taxation, or the way in which Australia should vote on Kampuchea in the United Nations.

I do not suggest for a moment that any of those issues should not attract our interest. It is just that, to put it baldly, debates and resolutions in this House are really irrelevant to them. I do not intend that to be in any way derogatory to the position of this House or the Parliament. I do not believe that it denigrates the House or the State Parliament to suggest, as I am doing, that we ought to recognise our limitations and to act within them.

Mr Oliver referred to my responsibilities in defence matters. As I have explained previously to the House, my duties are more limited than that and are restricted to defence liaison; that is, to questions of defence which are highly specific to the interests, activities, or the need for representation of the State.

As I have suggested, the motion before the House is not within that category. Without speaking for or against the arguments raised by the Hon. Neil Oliver and the Hon. Graham Edwards, I merely put it to the House for its future consideration that we would do better as a general rule to restrain and limit ourselves to matters where our opinion really does carry more weight, and that is in areas of State jurisdiction.

HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [4.07 p.m.]: I thank the Hon. Graham Edwards and the Minister for Inter-Governmental Relations and Defence Liaison for their contributions.

I put it to the Minister that defence has always been somewhat of a minor matter both on a Federal and State basis. The Australian people have always had a certain lack of awareness and concern for defence. I am not particularly appreciative of the attitudes of members of Parliament to the defence forces and the conditions under which they are required to serve and, indeed, do serve.

In the past it has not been necessary for me to raise matters of this nature in the House, but, were it not for the state of defence forces in this country at the time, I would not have sought endorsement as a member of Parliament. Indeed, when I sought endorsement that was one of the major reasons, because I saw a deterioration in the defence forces of Australia. In the circumstances, having been asked to stand for endorsement, I found myself the endorsed candidate for West Province.

I take note of what the Minister said. It is all very well to say debate on this matter should take place in a more appropriate forum, but that has been done already. These representations have been made already. I am very pleased that the Hon. Graham Edwards is pursuing this matter, but so far no results have been achieved. The reason I decided to move the motion was to add a little weight to the representations made by the Hon. Graham Edwards and myself, and I thought it would be better to do so in this manner in this House.

The other point I make for the benefit of the Minister is that per head of population more servicemen and servicewomen are enlisted in Western Australia than in any other State of Australia. When it comes to resettlement, for each 1 000 of population 50 per cent more Western Australians require resettlement than people in any of the other States of Australia. Therefore, this issue is germane to this State.

A matter such as this should be debated in the Parliament. I do not suggest we should follow the actions of the House of Commons which, when Russian tanks rolled into Hungary and fired on the civilians in the streets, called for an urgent session to debate the matter. The United Kingdom could do nothing about the invasion of Hungary by Russia.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! You are asked to speak to the motion.

HON. NEIL OLIVER: That is the point I am making. I am saying the motion is appropriate for debate here. The issue affects the people who are resettling in Western Australia. I drew a parallel between this motion and the fact that the House of Commons called an urgent session of Parliament to discuss a matter on which it had no possibility of making an impression, in order to show the futility of such an action.

I thank all members for their support. I thank the Leader of the House for his interjections, which enabled the debate to go further than he intended.

Question put and passed.

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT:
HON. P. H. LOCKYER

*Apology to Hon. Kay Hallahan:
Personal Explanation*

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.12 p.m.]: I seek leave under Standing Order No. 75 to make a further personal explanation to the House.

Leave granted.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: During my speech this afternoon on another subject by way of answer to an interjection I made a comment to the Hon. Kay Hallahan, a comment which I now deeply regret making. As soon as I sat down I sent her a letter of apology, and now I wish to apologise publicly to her. The retort was disgraceful, and I deeply regret it. The only option I have is to stand in this House and say that I humbly regret the remark.

I apologise to her for my making this uncalled for remark. It was made in the heat of the moment, but certainly that is no excuse for my making it. I hope the House accepts my apology as I hope the Hon. Kay Hallahan accepts it.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE INDUSTRY

Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed from 25 August.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.24 p.m.]: The terms of reference proposed by Mr Lockyer are very broad and provide the opportunity for examination of practically all aspects of the fruit and vegetable industries.

However, if a Select Committee attempted to examine the industries as proposed in the depth needed to make sound recommendations for the future, the study would need to extend for an extremely long period. On the other hand, a less detailed study of such a wide spectrum of activities might fail to provide sufficient knowledge on which to make meaningful suggestions for improvement. It is considered that it is more profitable to restrict such industry studies to specific problem areas so that investigations can be undertaken in the detail needed to provide a basis for practical solutions.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer has drawn attention to many changes that have occurred in the fruit and vegetable industries, but has not provided sufficient evidence of major problems in the industries to warrant the type of investigation he is proposing. Some of the areas about which he has expressed concern are already being examined by industry or interdepartmental committees. I suggest that at this stage the involvement of a Select Committee would be difficult to justify.

Particular reference is made to these areas of concern, which I will now outline in detail.

The comments made by the Hon. P. H. Lockyer regarding changes in the location of production of fruit and vegetables are true. Apple, pear, and stone fruit-growing areas, which once extended to the Mt. Barker-Albany area, are now centred in two main regions. These are the hills district near Perth, and the south-west districts of Donnybrook and Manjimup.

The decline of areas such as Bridgetown, Mt. Barker and Albany is due to the availability of suitable water supplies for irrigation to provide potential to meet increasing demands for greater productivity efficiency. Similarly in the vegetable industry there has been a shift in production from areas such as Osborne Park, Balcatta and Spearwood to areas further from the city, where conditions are suitable for vegetable growing and land is available at a lower cost.

However, over the past 15 years, the total area of vegetable crops grown in the State has not significantly altered, despite an increasing population. The needs of an expanding population and an increasing volume of export trade are being met with increasing yields through the adoption of improved varieties and growing techniques.

The changes occurring in regard to location or production are to be expected, as the specialisation in production involving larger areas of each crop per grower increases, and the number of growers involved in the industry decreases. If anyone goes to Spearwood he will notice that significant change. Some growers grow only onions and carrots, and other growers grow only cauliflower and cabbages, and so on.

The need for zoning of rural areas—particularly those suitable for production of horticultural crops—in town planning schemes, and the control of subdivision in these areas, is well recognised and is assisting in the preservation of areas such as the market gardens at Wanneroo, the hills orchards, and the viticulture areas in the Swan Valley.

If it is the member's intention that a Select Committee would further examine ways of preserving agricultural areas specially suited to intensive horticultural production, it should be noted that a great deal of effort has already been devoted to this task. In 1977 a study relating to the use, subdivision and development of rural land was commissioned by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Town Planning Board of Western Australia. Special attention was given to small-holding development.

More recently, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has been preparing a statement of planning policy for the Swan Valley. This

study has involved consultation with a wide range of Government departments, agencies and industry associations, and has not been, as yet, been finalised.

Examination of factors related to the shift in areas of production of a range of horticultural crops, and a study of methods of preserving valuable horticultural land, would be a daunting task on its own for a steering committee, without its considering the many other aspects of the fruit and vegetable industry which the Hon. P. H. Lockyer has listed for examination. He has referred particularly to the apple industry, and the changes that have occurred which have necessitated the removal of apple trees to maintain viability in the industry.

This industry is in the process of being restructured to overcome problems associated with unsatisfactory returns from marketing Granny Smith apples in the United Kingdom and the European Continent. The programme of restructuring has been carefully planned by a committee made up of representatives of the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association and the Department of Agriculture.

Following the IAC inquiry in 1979 into the apple and pear industry to determine whether assistance should continue to be provided to stabilise returns to growers from exports of fresh apples and pears beyond the 1980 season, the Federal Government decided to phase out this assistance over a four-year period. The industry in this State then developed the restructuring programme that is presently in progress.

The Commonwealth and this State agreed to jointly provide financial assistance amounting to \$1.33 million over the four years for the programme 1981-1984. This allocation has enabled payments to be made to growers willing to remove Granny Smith apple trees, or to rework trees to red varieties, for which there is a demand in South-East Asia.

It has also enabled research to be undertaken on the handling, storage and marketing of red apples to improve their quality, storage life and market acceptance. The second year of the programme has just been completed, and approximately 12 per cent of the apple trees growing at the commencement of the programme have been removed.

Meanwhile there has already been a strong move towards the growing of red varieties, and it is anticipated that the ratio of red to green varieties that will result will enable growers to better satisfy the demand for apples in South-East Asia.

Other studies that have recently been undertaken in the fruit industry, or are presently in progress, include the examination of the Manjimup cannery, and the feasibility of increasing the volume of apples processed for juice by Bulmer Australia Limited.

The directors of the Manjimup cannery early this year engaged Price Waterhouse Associates Pty. to review the Manjimup cannery operation. The report indicates that on the basis of the assumptions made regarding future supplies of fruit for processing and development of sales, the cannery will cease to require Government subsidies by either 1986 or 1987—hopefully.

The report has been passed to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology and with recommendations from the directors of the cannery it is aimed to improve the efficiency and long-term viability of the cannery, which is of vital importance to many of the State's orchardists.

Bulmer Australia Limited, which has been processing apples at Capel to produce apple juice concentrate, has recently discussed with representatives of the apple industry the possibility of increasing the intake of apples to enable the company to export to overseas areas.

Last year approximately 8 500 tonnes of apples were processed and it is proposed that this figure could be lifted to 15 000 tonnes if agreement can be reached with growers to a two level price arrangement. This would involve payment of the minimum price recommended by the Interstate Apple and Pear Processing Committee for 8 500 tonnes of fruit and a lower price for the additional 6 500 tonnes. It is anticipated that a decision will be made prior to the commencement of the 1984 apple season.

These examples of studies in the fruit-growing industry are mentioned to indicate that in the industry there is concern regarding the future and that planning is being undertaken to ensure continuing viability. Close liaison exists between the industry and the Department of Agriculture in regard to planning for the future of the industry.

Departmental officers attend the meetings of the various committees of the Fruit Growers' Association, which include—

- the Stone Fruit Committee;
- the Central Citrus Council;
- the Apple and Pear Council;
- the executive meeting of the WA Fruit Growers' Association; and
- the annual conference of the WA Fruit Growers' Association.

In addition district liaison groups made up of representatives of the fruit growers and the Department of Agriculture meet regularly, to discuss the research and extension needs of the industry.

Such groups include—

- the Hills Orchard Improvement Group;
- the Bridgetown-Manjimup Horticultural Advisory Committee; and
- the Donnybrook Horticultural Liaison Committee.

A number of references were made by the Hon. P. H. Lockyer to marketing of produce, including comments on the following—

- Sunday markets;
- direct sales from growers to retailers;
- relocation of the Metropolitan Markets;
- delivery and trading times at the Metropolitan Markets;
- commission rates;
- country markets;
- interstate and overseas marketing.

Some of these marketing matters are presently under examination and their further study by a Select Committee would be hard to justify. Others are logical marketing developments that do not call for Government intervention.

The following comments on each of the marketing items raised by the Hon. P. H. Lockyer support these views.

The operation of Sunday markets in the metropolitan region is controlled by local government bodies—and involves retail sales only. This is a problem within my portfolio. It is causing great concern.

The provisions of the Metropolitan Market Act prohibit the establishment of a market other than the Metropolitan Market for the wholesale selling of fruit and vegetables within a radius of 70 kilometres from the General Post Office at Perth.

While stall holders in an area set aside as a Sunday market may have much lower overhead costs than shopkeepers in the same area, this is a matter for attention by the relevant shires rather than for a Select Committee.

Direct sales from growers to retailers is an option open to growers who can consistently produce the quality and quantity of produce to satisfy direct buyers.

It is tending to encourage growers to specialise in the production of particular crops. I mentioned this earlier in my speech. It is not considered that the practice is more prevalent in this State than in other States of Australia.

With regard to the relocation of the Metropolitan Markets, the Metropolitan Market Trust has devoted a lot of attention in recent years to planning and implementing developments and improvements at the market at West Perth to facilitate the selling, buying and transport of produce.

It is the view of the trust that the present facilities at West Perth will be adequate for the needs of the industry for at least the next 10 years. However, the trust is also keenly aware of the need to plan for the long-term requirements of central marketing and the eventual relocation of the market to a much larger strategically placed location.

The trust is keen to secure a new site and to make its location known to both existing and potential future market tenants so that they may plan any developments for their businesses accordingly.

A number of sites have been suggested as suitable for a new market complex, including the Midland Abattoir area and a nearby stock holding paddock, and an area in the Canning Vale industrial estate. The relative merits and costs of development of these sites is presently being studied by an interdepartmental committee.

It is expected that the committee will report to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology and the Minister for Agriculture within the next few weeks.

I now refer to delivery and trading times at the Metropolitan Markets. Following the introduction of new by-laws under the Metropolitan Market Act on 1 April 1983, the Metropolitan Market Trust brought in trial winter market hours commencing from 1 May 1983. A survey of the effect on market users of the schedule was then undertaken by the marketing and economics branch of the Department of Agriculture in collaboration with staff of the Metropolitan Market Trust.

A reply paid mail questionnaire has been sent to growers, buyers, wholesalers, agents and transport operators seeking comments on how the market hours affect their operations. While essentially the same questionnaire has been used appropriate questions have been addressed to each group to determine its special requirements.

The responses are now being received and the information collated. Depending on the responses further in person interviews may be conducted to follow-up particular issues.

It is planned that a report on the summary will be finalised by October this year and that it will provide a practical and, if necessary, compromise solution to the question of market hours, or

alternatives to enable the trust to determine the hours it considers best meet the needs of central marketing.

The report is expected to provide factual information on the separate and interacting pressures on market hours so that the decision taken by the trust will recognise the needs of the industry as a whole.

It is understandable that in the present climate of rapidly escalating production costs growers are concerned about commission rates. The Metropolitan Market Trust has no control over commission rates and agents may set their own charges. However, the provisions of the Trade Practices Act prevent agents from meeting together to establish a new uniform commission rate. Each firm must act independently. This means that the first agent to increase his commission rate is likely to lose growers to agents offering lower rates.

This competition for growers tends to keep each agent's commission from rising. However market agents are also affected by rising costs and the commission rate charged by each agent must be at a level to maintain the viability of his operation.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer also suggested that a Select Committee might consider, in some depth, the need for market facilities throughout the State to overcome the wasteful trucking of produce to Perth and the return of some of the same produce to the area of origin to meet local requirements. This is essentially a matter for private enterprise.

As the range of horticultural crops produced in a country area increases it becomes more practicable for a wholesaler or retailer in that area to use locally grown produce as the basis for his trade. Therefore, in many country areas there is an oversupply of a limited range of products for a short period of the year and the local wholesaler or retailer is then dependent on products from Perth for the remainder of the year.

In order to maintain a good relationship with his agent in Perth and to satisfy the needs of his customers the local supplier usually finds it more convenient to arrange for all of his produce to be provided by his Perth agent even though, at times, this means purchasing products from an area where Government intercession is warranted to ensure that sufficient locally grown produce is retained in the district to meet consumer demand in that area and perhaps other districts in the same direction from Perth as the area of production.

Interstate and overseas marketing is another area that the Hon. P. H. Lockyer suggests needs to be studied.

In the case of apples and pears, overseas marketing is carefully monitored by the Australian Apple and Pear Corporation although sales are arranged by individual export firms. Because of the phasing out of exports to the United Kingdom and the Continent the export industry is now concentrated on South-East Asia.

During the past two years the volume of exports forwarded late in the year has increased considerably and exporters are extremely active in further extending sales in that area.

With regard to vegetables the volume of exports to South-East Asia has increased rapidly over the last four or five years, as I will outline shortly. The present value of vegetable exports from the State is now in the order of \$10 million a year. The following quantities were exported in 1978 and 1982—

Variety	Tonnes Exported	
	1978	1982
Carrots	2 853	8 979
Cauliflower	2 000	4 022
Celery	102	539
Lettuce	166	625
Onions	1 698	3 385
Potatoes	1 207	6 598
Chinese Cabbage	—	328

Although the Hon. P. H. Lockyer made no mention of fruit and vegetable imports perhaps it is the area of greatest concern in this State, particularly in regard to processed vegetables.

The value of imported, frozen, canned and processed vegetables into Western Australia from the Eastern States and overseas in 1981-82 was approximately \$34 million. We exported \$10 million and we imported \$34 million-worth of products. One only has to walk in the supermarkets to realise why this is so. It is something that astounded me some years ago when I was a member of a Select Committee inquiring into the potato industry.

The value of vegetable production in Western Australia is estimated to be approximately \$51.5 million. Allowing for exports valued at \$10 million the value of locally produced vegetables marketed locally is \$41.5 million. Suggesting that 40c of each consumer dollar spent on vegetables in this State goes to the purchase of imported processed vegetables.

The isolation of the State from other markets and the multiplicity of products needed to effectively compete in the processed vegetable market makes the viability of expansion of the limited

vegetable processing operation in this State extremely doubtful.

The operation of the Manjimup cannery limits the volume of processed fruits imported.

Although the member has suggested that the general use of pesticides needs to be examined no indication has been given of a specific problem related to the use of chemicals in the horticulture industry. For many years Western Australia has taken an important part in a national survey of pesticides residues in horticultural produce, and samples are regularly taken for analysis by Commonwealth laboratories.

Mr President, in view of the comments I have made and the investigations I have carried out, I must oppose the motion of the Hon. P. H. Lockyer for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into and report on the fruit and vegetable industry.

I oppose it for the reasons I have given to the House and, more importantly, as I have pointed out, because if the job were done properly it would be a mammoth task. I do not believe the money is available to do that in view of the other industry committees that are at work. To spend a large amount of money to carry out the rather limited inquiry proposed by the Hon. Phil Lockyer would, in my opinion, be squandering public funds.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.44 p.m.]: I am sorry that the Leader of the Government does not see fit to support my motion. I appreciate the research he has done into this subject and I can only say that he would be a valuable witness to call before the committee.

I disagree that it would not be possible to form sufficient findings in broad areas from the guidelines provided. The reason for specifying broad areas was to give the committee the opportunity to investigate any areas it sees fit. While several Government and other agencies are looking at individual problems, they are not committees of the Parliament and it is important that Parliament be given the opportunity to look at the industry as a whole.

It is also important that the comments made by the Leader of the House regarding squandering of the public purse be rejected. In my view, and certainly in the view of a large proportion of people within the industry with whom I have spoken, it would be money well spent. The industry needs to be looked at by a parliamentary committee. It needs a balanced committee and, for this reason, if the House accepts the motion that a Select Committee be formed, it should be made up of two members from each political per-

suation. This is an area that can be investigated with balance; it is not a political question, but a question of the industry being looked at by Parliament in an even-handed way.

I am sorry that the Government has seen fit to oppose the motion. In my speech to the House I put forward valid reasons for the committee to be set up; people in the industry, and the retail and transport industries want a group away from Government agencies to come up with findings that will not be biased in any way. I think a committee made up of four members of Parliament—two from the Liberal Party and two from the Labor Party—would be a balanced one.

Question put and passed.

Appointment of Select Committee

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the Select Committee on the Fruit and Vegetable Industry comprise the Hons. G. C. MacKinnon, Kay Hallahan, S. M. Piantadosi and the mover, and that any three members shall form a quorum, and that it have power to adjourn from place to place and sit on those days over which the Council stands adjourned and that it have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Questions: Answers

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [4.49 p.m.]: I shall not apologise, as is the usual custom when keeping the House. I have comments to make concerning the standard of answers given to members in this House. It appears to me that either the Government is misleading the House by telling half-truths, or it is just playing with its answers. The Government cannot be accused of giving too many straight answers to the House, and I intend to deal with just a few of the anomalies that I see. The first one refers to the Shannon River basin.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members, there is far too much audible conversation. When the President calls, "Order!", all conversation must stop. Certainly I cannot even hear the member who is addressing the House.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Numerous questions have been asked about the proposed Shannon national park. On 4 August, in question 123 I asked the Attorney General—

Who will be responsible for fire control in the Shannon national park when it is created?

The Attorney General replied—

The Premier has announced that the Shannon River Basin will remain under the Forests Department's control and management pending the outcome of a review by the task force on land resources management.

He went on further to talk about a working group.

On 16 August when asked what extra staff would be allocated to the National Parks Authority to control the proposed national park, the reply was—

As indicated in the answer to the member's earlier question 123, the Shannon River basin will remain under the Forests Department's control and management pending the outcome of a review by the task force on land resources management. This review is expected to take about one year, and in the meantime the Shannon basin is to be managed as if it were a national park.

No decisions have yet been taken in respect of National Parks Authority staff if the Shannon basin eventually passes into the authority's control.

In another place on 22 September the Premier was asked—

- (1) Will the committee which is to review all Government functions and all services it provides be asked to give priority to reviewing the Government's decision, which was made against all available scientific advice, to excise the Shannon River basin from State forests and allocate it to national parks?

- (2) If not, why not?

The Premier replied—

(1) and (2) This question follows the line of several of its predecessors that display a fundamental misapprehension on the part of the Opposition of the review of functions announced by the Government. The matter referred to by the Leader of the Opposition will not be examined by the committee.

After the following interjection by Mr O'Connor—

Does the Shannon River basin come under the area of responsibility of the Forests Department?

The Premier added—

No, it does not.

I do not know whether that misled the Parliament. Two directly opposed answers were given and if it was not intended to mislead the Houses of Parliament, at least it was one of the worst pieces of administration I have seen. We are used to that, of course. We have seen it demonstrated by the Government in the spheres of power, coal, national parks, forests, and everything else this Government has mismanaged in the area of State resources.

With reference to the committee's development working plan, we have been told that two people will develop this plan. The combined area of the national park, made up of the south coast national park and the Shannon basin, is equal to the area of Kakaduo National Park in the Northern Territory. The management plan for the Kakaduo National Park is a very large one. How long does the House imagine it will take two people to compile the sort of information contained in the volume I have in my hand? For example, I refer to the types of fish detailed. The names of every species are provided—I will not go into the Latin names, but some common names are as follows—

- primitive archer fish;
- sharp-nosed grunter;
- sooty grunter or blackbream;
- Gilbert's grunter;
- saratogan;
- toothless catfish.

The management plan refers also to the barramundi, which is a very interesting fish, because it undergoes sex inversion during its life cycle. Juveniles mature as males at three or four years of age and, in the fifth year, they change to females. They do not know whether they are Arthur or Martha, and nor does this Government.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You are a bit of a perch yourself.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It appears this Government thinks it is funny.

Hon. Peter Dowding: We think the honourable member has a good sense of humour.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad the member has a good sense of humour and I am glad he thinks this is amusing. However, we cannot get straight answers from either the Minister or the Premier. I am not blaming the Ministers in this House, because they are only lackeys who do as they are told and the Premier is leading them by the nose as well.

The committee does not get the right amount of back-up. How can it compile the necessary data to create the national parks plan if it does not

have more staff? One of the committee members, Dr Watson, is out of the State on a scholarship, which leaves one man on the committee. As the Hon. Fred McKenzie knows, that man, Dr Per Christianson, is a great and very capable person who has a great deal of information about the south coast, but he cannot create a plan by himself and get all the details needed.

Who is responsible for fire in the Shannon basin? We have read various opinions and we are aware that the friends of the ALP, the conservationists, think the sole reason for fires in forest areas or parks is to protect the farmers around them. That is typical of the sort of mentality we are dealing with. Fire is used for regeneration, and for the safety of the towns. Do we want to get ourselves into a situation such as exists in Victoria and Tasmania? I was in Mundaring last week to assist people with fire protection, and I wondered if we were getting ourselves into that situation.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Were you the one responsible for the Labor victory or was it someone else?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is an interesting comment from Mr Dowding—one of his better comments. If he stopped quelling riots and insulting policemen he would be doing a great job. If he knew anything about the seriousness of fire in the bush one could take his interjections seriously at any time. Of course he does not. He tries to be frivolous and he fails.

We have heard about the great creation of jobs in the proposed national park. The Minister flew in, giving members in the area about 12 hours' notice. The visit lasted for 20 minutes. I wonder at whose expense the visit was made. The Minister made a statement about the creation of jobs in the proposed Shannon national park. He made a mistake, saying it was the Shannon national park when it was only a proposed park. He and his colleague, the member for Warren, the Minister Assisting the Minister for Forests—who has to bear a lot of the blame in this business because he is giving the answers—had their photographs in the local Press. In the same edition of the Press the national parks southern region superintendent set out what he believed were the priorities for the National Parks Authority, which are the dune restoration to the Mandalay Beach, Circular Pool, and a few other minor things like the maintenance of approximately 80 kilometres of park roads.

What does the Minister for Employment do? He creates 29 jobs. What are these jobs to consist of? They will build walking tracks round the Shannon townsite, extend the Bibbulmun track, create back-pack camping areas, and rehabilitate clear-fell areas and landings. That is very

interesting. The sum of \$200 000 is being spent in the Shannon townsite. We will see the Budget brought down and I will bet anybody who is prepared to take a wager—and the Hon. Fred McKenzie understands exactly what I am talking about—that there will be no money to do the things which a committee of this House has recommended. This money has been thrown into this area purely to play politics.

Mr Parker and Mr Evans produced this illusion of creating jobs. I will deal with Mr Evans and his inept comments a little later. This is not for the benefit of a national park but for the benefit of city people, for the benefit of those who will visit a national park. Ninety per cent of the people who go into a national park do not travel more than 300 yards from their motorcars. So the Premier, his assistant Minister, and Mr Parker will turn the Shannon townsite into a playground with the odd walking trail, and camping and caravan sites.

I have asked the question today, "Who will manage the camping and caravan grounds?" The Hon. Fred McKenzie will know the recommendations we came up with on that and who we thought ought to manage the camping and caravan grounds. Yet against all professional advice, against the advice of a committee of this House which the Government may say was biased—I am sure the Hon. Fred McKenzie will not say it was biased in any way—the Government goes ahead.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Both Governments.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Thank you for that interjection.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is all right for you to attack this Government.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When did the previous Government put \$200 000 into an area to create walking tracks which may not be suitable without a management plan? This Government has just gone in and put the walking tracks there. Mr McKenzie will remember that we had an example of the National Parks Authority bulldozing an area which was a prime breeding ground for pigmy possums. The trees were bulldozed out of the way to build a ranger's house. What I am getting at is that the planning has not been done. I know that Mr McKenzie agrees that the planning must be done and that we are wasting money.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I would not say that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I would.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: At least the money is being spent, which is more than the last Government did.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr McKenzie says it does not matter how the money is spent so long as it is spent. That is what he is saying.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I am not saying that at all.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is very interesting, because it sounds like that. As long as this Government spends it—the last Government did not spend any money in that way—that is all right.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It does not necessarily need a management plan. I do not agree with what you say.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The member does not agree that it needs a management plan?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Not necessarily.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yet the member signed a document with me saying that we believe management plans ought to be drawn up, and we ought to follow the IUCN recommendations.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Generally, yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Generally or not generally, one either believes what one signs or one does not believe what one signs. I may seem to be severe on the Hon. Fred McKenzie because he is an old friend of mine, but I think he has got himself trapped.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I have not.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is unfortunate he has got himself trapped.

Let us go on to this misleading, lying, or whatever it is from the Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that he refrain from using that type of language when he is addressing the House.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: May I use the word "misleading"? I do not know what other word, to use when in reply to question 61, the Government, when asked where the pines will be grown, says they will be grown on alienated land. In reply to another question—423—the Government says, "It will be on Crown land". In the reply to question 378 the Government says: "A wide range of areas is being considered". What does the Government mean? Is it to be on alienated land, on Crown land, or on a wide range of land? The Government then comes out with magnificent quotes in the Press by the Premier and Mr Evans again—they are really clever men, clever at misleading the public.

The Minister for Agriculture and Minister Assisting the Minister for Forests—and I quote from

the *Warren-Blackwood Times* of 7 September 1983—said the following—

There was no reason any conflict of land use should arise in that area. Both forestry and agriculture had the potential to provide increasing industry and employment.

Then he went on to talk about how it was to be used. He said the Government was investigating the use of a mix of Crown land which currently had no forest cover. We are not foresters, but how does the Minister expect to get trees to grow—and I am not using my information, I am using professional foresters' information—where there is no forest cover now? This was farm land which was only marginally suitable for agricultural production.

I asked a question in this place, "Does the Forests Department consider land which is only marginally suitable for agriculture suitable for pine growing?" The reply was, "Land which is only marginally suitable for agriculture is unlikely to be suitable for pine growing". It does not take me long to make up my mind that the Government has made a complete and utter hash of the whole Shannon basin issue and its alternatives.

The Government is rumoured to have done a deal with the conservationists, and there are many of them in Government ranks. We have people like Mr Bartholomaeus, who has said stream and road reserves do not matter. Evidence was given by the South-West Forest Defence Foundation, "To hell with road and stream reserves, just give us the Shannon". That is what this Government is doing now. It has done a deal with the conservationists. It is letting the touring public of this State down because it will have all those road and stream reserves taken away from the public so that those people who drive through the Shannon basin will know there are only a couple of roads they can use. All the other areas have been saved as road and stream reserves. This Government, under this Premier, misleads this House, and the Premier will get his answer tomorrow if he is game enough to turn up at Manjimup. His attitude to most things is that he gets his name on the invitation list, then he does not turn up—he sends somebody else.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do not be silly, you know better than that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We on this side of the House can prove conclusively that Mr Burke has accepted invitations. Last month I represented the Leader of the Opposition on three occasions. On each occasion, two within 12 hours, the Premier was still coming—

Hon. Peter Dowding: Where was that?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the honourable member wants to know, I will give him details afterwards. I am talking about forestry. These were social engagements at which I represented the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier said he would arrive by 10 o'clock. What was he doing? Swanning it up in the Swan Districts, playing around somewhere else when he told people he was going to come. If he is not coming, people want to know what he is doing.

If that is not letting people down, I want to know what is.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He is still the most popular Premier in Australia.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That may be so for the time being, but gradually he is outwearing his welcome everywhere, just as the Minister for Mines is doing. If members talk to people now about the "riot breaker", they will find out what people think about him.

This Government says it is interested in the forests, but what has it done with the position of Conservator of Forests, the position of the leader of the whole Forests Department?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It has given him a promotion.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Why has there not been another conservator appointed?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Give us a chance. We want the best man for the job.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: How long will it take the Government to get the best man?

Hon. Peter Dowding: As long as we wish.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You don't understand the circumstances.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have a fair idea. This Government is trying to gut the Forests Department because the officers of the department, the professionals in the business, have stood up to the Government and the conservationists for years. The Government is therefore going out of its way to reduce the effectiveness of the department's work. Neither Mr McKenzie nor the Minister has read what his Premier has said. The Premier has said, "The matter will be considered when the current review by the land reserves management committee has been completed". In answer to a question the Premier has said that that will be in 12 months' time.

Let us deal with the land reserves management committee and then let us hear what the yappers on the other side have to say; they have put themselves further and further in it every time they have interjected. The committee is chaired by Dr Morris Mulcahy for whom I have the greatest re-

gard. Is it any coincidence that Dr Mulcahy has been made the chairman of the land reserves management committee and that the committee is not allowed to look at the Shannon basin in its deliberations? Members might say that this would not matter, but the undertones of this are that Dr Mulcahy was the chairman of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee, which committee rejected the Shannon basin as a national park. Would members think there were any sinister undertones there? It might appear that the Government was bowing to its conservationist mates rather than taking the best scientific advice when making this man chairman of a committee but removing this piece of land from his deliberations, a piece of land he has recommended should not be a national park. Despite that advice from him, the Government still wants him as the chairman of the committee.

Consider the latest amendments to the working plan No. 87, which the Government says it will adhere to except that it will pull out all of the Shannon basin. Before the elections this year a pamphlet was floated about the Lower Central Province asking, "Do you want a job after February 19? Do you want a business after February 19?" People in some quarters laughed at it. The Premier and the Minister for Agriculture took it fairly seriously and arranged special radio programmes to say it was all untrue, and that the Government was not going to declare the Shannon basin a national park and was not going to endanger people's jobs. This same Mr Evans was the bloke who stamped out of the Labor Party's conference last year, and there was doubt about his remaining a member of the ALP because of the actions of the conference in regard to the Shannon basin. He was the man who said 300 jobs would be lost and \$3 million in wages would be lost if the Shannon basin was created a national park. He did not tell the people that he and the Premier would be party to the breaking of all the conventions of forestry relating to road and stream reserves; he did not tell them he would totally reject the advice of the Forests Department.

We all know why the Government is in trouble now. The Hon. Peter Dowding laughs, and I will tell the people in Manjimup tomorrow night that the only Minister in the House at the moment thinks it is very funny that their jobs and their wages are going down the drain. He is acting as he did with the Collie coalminers; he will not give them a go. His only defence is that he says the Opposition is creating mischief. When he met the union he learnt that this was not so. He has not

apologised yet; he is not the sort of bloke to stand up and apologise, ever.

The Minister for Agriculture and the Premier are leading the Government into the trap of taking no professional advice. Instead they are taking the advice of their advisers, and in so doing they are undermining the morale of the Forests Department. They will not give the department any leadership. How long can they go on doing this? How long can the Premier continue to pull the wool over the eyes of the public? How long can he remain in the conservationists' pockets? What is the payoff? I am afraid the payoff will be the loss of jobs for the people I represent.

Already in one fell swoop he has moved the planting of pines from the sunklands into Manjimup, not keeping on with the project until he has other areas to plant pines. He cut that out; he removed more money and jobs from the Forests Department in Nannup. All this is crippling the town of Nannup which, incidentally, the Minister for Agriculture represents—or is alleged to represent. The people of Nannup know what he is doing to them. The people of Manjimup know what he is doing to them. They all know what Mr Burke is doing to them.

Recently the Premier had discussions with the Manjimup Shire. Unfortunately I was away at the time of the meeting; if I had been present, there might have been a worse confrontation than the one we heard about today. The Premier walked into the shire office and said, "There you have it, gentlemen; there is my Press statement. I will answer questions about it, but this is what will happen". That is the sort of sinister situation we get with this Premier. He is a little baby who sucks his dummy when he does not get his own way.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You are dribbling.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He is like Mr Dowding—is that what Mr McKenzie said?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I didn't open my mouth. You accuse me of everything.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: These are the sorts of people my electors have to deal with. These people are unconscionable. They wipe off the professionals. The reason we are not getting good answers is that the Forests Department is not allowed to give answers. Instead, the Government's advisers are giving the answers—the political advisers, the conservationists.

The Premier has virtually alleged that the Forests Department has not managed the forests properly for years; he has gone on record as saying that. The people of Warren will catch up with him. It may not be this week, or next week, or the

week after; but they know who is double crossing them, they know who is telling them untruths, they know who is misleading their members of Parliament. This Government will pay for it and pay for it severely. This will not be so only with respect to forests, but also with respect to mineral sands and other areas. Was not the Government's Press release about the northern jarrah forest very interesting? Where is the Minister for Mines standing up for bauxite mining? He is just lying down because a deal has been done with the conservationists. To hell with any progress. I say this without being a rabid push-it-down, knock-it-over, shoot-it-on-sight person.

This Government has fallen for the three-card trick and has been led by the nose in a completely unbalanced way. This imbalance will topple it in the finish. I therefore implore the Government to do something about following established guidelines, because there are hundreds of them that can be used and that should be used. It has professional guidelines that the people could support and that I could support. The Government should explain to the people what it is doing. It does not do that and it continues to give diametrically opposed answers to questions while its members sit opposite and joke and grin about it. It is a disgrace that we in this place should have to put up with the sorts of answers and the attitudes we get from the Government. Men's jobs are on the line, yet these people think it is funny. They are disgraceful.

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Mines) [5.29 p.m.]: The House should not adjourn until I have had a chance to comment on the remarks made by the Hon. Sandy Lewis, who made a rather intemperate attack on the Government. It was quite confusing in the sense that he seemed to be unsure of his target, but to the extent he feels he made any sensible suggestions, I will give an undertaking to convey his remarks to the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture in the hope they can, with some detailed analysis of what the honourable member has said, work out whether there was anything useful in his remarks.

I suppose if we look at it, the reality is that the sooty grunter can be found much closer to this House than we previously thought.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you a fourth or fifth year barramundi?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The honourable member's description of the sooty grunter gave me a sense of *deja vu* in regard to his own performance.

A couple of remarks need to be made and the first regards the honourable member's complaints

about questions. Honourable members opposite have asked more questions in this sitting than have been asked in previous sittings of this House.

Hon. N. F. Moore: That is because you were slack.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about 1980? Why so few answers?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: 1980 is a comparable year in which we had a similar amount of sitting time, and in the whole year only 526 questions on notice were asked. We have already reached that number this year.

Hon. N. F. Moore: You were just a slack Opposition.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: We are only just into this session and that is indicative of the fact that the Government has given the Opposition a great deal of latitude in putting the departments to a tremendous amount of work.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Don't be so condescending; it is our right.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: They do this in order to get the material honourable members want before the House.

Several members interjected.

Hon. Neil Oliver: If you answered the questions you would not keep getting them again.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The Hon. Sandy Lewis who for years has traditionally railed against question asking and railed because the cost was so high—

Hon. A. A. Lewis: When?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —is hoisted with his own petard to some extent.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are misleading the House again.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Nevertheless, I believe the Government has given very fair, frank and illuminative answers to the questions that have been asked.

Hon. N. F. Moore: What rot!

Hon. Neil Oliver: Rubbish! You don't even give an answer. You say the matter is under discussion.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: It is simply playing a political game which I suppose everybody in Opposition plays to complain about it. If we were in Opposition we would probably do the same thing.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not going to tolerate this unruly behaviour from honourable members. Standing Orders, which belong to members of this House, ought to be complied with.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Everyone who observes Parliament understands why people play these games. I assume the Opposition will continue to do so without restraint. It is important for the sake of the people affected by these decisions to say that the Government has been very careful to create a plan which will give the opportunity for employment because we recognise that that is fundamental and that its timing is urgent. We must be in the business of creating jobs at the earliest opportunity. Longer-term management plans can be worked out in conjunction with the use of the area and the employment opportunities that are now being created.

Hon P. G. Pandal interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The second point is that it is very important to understand that the Hon. Sandy Lewis has accused the Government of mismanaging the State's resources. He has cited the announcement about the northern jarrah forests.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Get back to what I really asked you.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: What the Hon. Sandy Lewis apparently does not know and has not bothered to find out, is the attitude of the mining companies concerned in that issue. We have had a very favourable response, not only to the general principles enunciated by this Government, but also to the specifics—

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You repeat it. Do not kowtow—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I know the member does not like the truth.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: I never get it, not from you.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: You wouldn't recognise it.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The truth is that the mining companies concerned have recognised their need to play a role in contributing towards achieving a balance between the interests that they represent and the wider interests of the community. They behaved like responsible corporate citizens, and the plans have been worked out in consultation with them and have their approval.

Hon. N. F. Moore: A bit like Argyle?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Yes.

Hon. N. F. Moore: They are twisting their arms behind their backs.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: There was no arm twisting. The Liberal Government made the company enter into an agreement that required the company to build a town. The company did not regard it to be in the interests of the community.

Hon. P. G. Pental: We got the best deal for the State. We did that for 20 years.

Hon. N. F. Moore: That is blackmail and you know it.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The people of Kunnunurra and the Kimberley did not regard it to be in the best interests of the community that the town be built. In fact, no group other than the Opposition took up to the role of knockers and complainers urging the building of the town. I challenge the Hon. Norman Moore or anyone else on the Opposition benches to find responsible interests that wanted that town built. If the Opposition is suggesting that the Government has done something bad to the people of Western Australia—

Hon. N. F. Moore: I am talking about the company.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —in ensuring that the company made an input into the economy of Western Australia which at least compensates for the loss of \$80 million-odd that it would cost to build the town, let it do so.

Hon. N. F. Moore: It is not your money.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If members opposite think that the Government is suggesting and negotiating with the company a mechanism—

Hon. P. G. Pental: Or with industry.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —by which the company agreed to put in that amount of money to the State, I challenge them to find that because they will not find it.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Absolute socialism, a black-mailing Government!

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If the member thinks that a 5 per cent interest in a major company gives the Government some sort of control over the operations of that company, members opposite are slower than I thought they were.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about money for schools?

Hon. N. F. Moore: There will be more of it, will there?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: It is important to say this: The response we are getting from the resources development community is that for the

first time they feel they are dealing with a Government that has been honest with them.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You have got to be joking.

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Charlie Court forgot more than you blokes will ever learn.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: We do not try to do deals for political purposes.

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The companies are now making clear that they were driven into it.

Hon. P. G. Pental: I hope Dave Evans is not listening.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: \$3 million.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. A. A. Lewis to stop his constant interjections. He made one enormously long speech—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Very dreary.

The PRESIDENT: —and I suggest he is not entitled to make another one.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I do not intend to simply respond to the Hon. Sandy Lewis in a defensive way; some positives need to be indicated. I do regret, however, that he chose to make a very unfair personal attack on the Premier knowing, of course, that the Premier has no opportunity to respond, and knowing also that no one here knows what the Hon. Sandy Lewis is talking about. It needs to be put on record that with the exception of members opposite who want to play politics—good luck to them because this is a parliamentary system—very few people in Western Australia do not feel that the Premier is doing an excellent job, and very few people in Western Australia—

Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! For goodness' sake!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —would not acknowledge that he is an extremely hard-working Premier who is probably doing as much as one could expect of any human being.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Hear, hear!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: It was a silly assertion. It was his political enthusiasm which led the Hon. Sandy Lewis to make that claim. He is not a bad bloke when he is not playing politics, and at some stage he will realise he overstepped the mark and will at least properly concede to the Premier that it was an unfair criticism of him. I have given an undertaking that the remarks of the Hon. Sandy Lewis will be carefully screened. Any sensible contributions that may be found in them

by those who look very closely at them will be examined.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You will have to look very closely.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The reality is that he does his electors a disservice because in truth he does know a bit about the area. He has represented his electors over an extended period.

Hon. P. G. Penda: At least he knows them.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Whether or not he chooses to carry on like a sooty grunter, he does in fact have something to contribute and it is a pity he did not do so in a sensible way but preferred to use this sort of abuse of the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture.

HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [5.42 p.m.]: We should not adjourn until we restate very fairly and clearly the main reason for the Hon. Sandy Lewis' speech tonight and not allow it to be drowned in rhetoric such as has flowed from the Minister. The main reason that the Hon. Sandy Lewis spoke tonight was to point out very clearly to this House and to the people of Western Australia that he had in a very short time received very conflicting sets of answers to three questions. It was not a matter, as the honourable member said, of nobody knowing what the Hon. Sandy Lewis was talking about, because he was quoting answers supplied by Ministers of this Government and if they could not be understood it reflects very poorly on the ability of Ministers of this Government to answer questions. He received three vastly different answers to basically the same question. The Minister said that anyone who observes Parliament understands why people play these games. I wish he had taken the time to explain to this house and to the people of Western Australia why this Government is playing this game and giving misleading information to members who have a responsibility to represent their electors in Parliament.

I commend the Hon. Sandy Lewis for his actions on behalf of the people he represents. We all have the right to ask questions and we should receive truthful and accurate answers to them. If the Government is playing, to quote Mr Dowding, "these games" I think it is about time it came clean and specified just what these games are that it is playing any why it gave misleading answers or three different sets of answers to the same question. I repeat that I commend the Hon. Sandy Lewis for his actions. I am most disappointed that we should receive that sort of answer from a man who holds responsibility as a Minister of the Crown in this State.

Tobacco Advertising: Advertisements

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [5.45 p.m.]: If the House allows me to do so I intend to raise briefly three areas of concern. The first is that while attending to one of my constituents this morning my radio was tuned to the "Sattler File" and an interview with Don Odgers of Odgers Advertising Pty. Ltd. The interviewer was questioning Mr Odgers in relation to tobacco advertising which reportedly used children whose parents had not been contacted. It appears that that question has not been answered and that the advertising agency used by the Government acknowledged with speed that it may well have erred or did not get the right information.

That has been followed up elsewhere. What concerns me is that when the question was asked as to whether the offending advertisements would be removed the principal of the advertising agency said they were listed to appear until Thursday of this week and there would be some difficulty in removing them. It is intolerable that the Government should allow an advertisement which contains questionable material. Protests have been made about it and people have indicated clearly they did not wish their children to be involved.

I trust the Government has taken the necessary action; to say there was some difficulty in removing the advertisement is a lot of twaddle. This matter was raised early in the morning. We have all been involved in arranging advertising and we know that if an advertisement is prepared and one finds something wrong with it, one tells the agent to get it out. One most certainly would not pay for it. It appears to me the agent has to accept some of the blame for this error; the agent must accept some responsibility. One cannot say the Government directed it, but it would appear the error has been made because of the pressure put on the advertising agency by the Government. That pressure created standards which are not acceptable to the community. I trust when I read the paper tomorrow I will not see advertisements that appear to use children illegally without the approval of their parents.

Legislative Council: Dignity

The second matter I wish to raise relates to comments made by the Attorney General this evening about the dignity of this House and the type of business brought before it. It concerns me that we are continually under attack for the type of business brought before the House. The Government of the day claims that certain business coming before the House would be better

not brought here. That was said in connection with the motion discussed earlier this evening.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He was making a suggestion about a better way to deal with it.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I suppose the same could be said about another motion of some importance which the Hon. Fred McKenzie brought before the House. If the Government attaches labels to one motion it must also look at the others. I refer to the motion moved by Mr McKenzie relating to the excise on grape spirit. I accept he had the right to bring it before the House, but I ask him to accept the motion moved this afternoon in the same light. I go further and refer to a motion relating to defence moved in May 1982 by the then Leader of the Opposition and now Premier. He saw fit at that time to move a motion connected with defence, and I took the trouble to look it up.

It irritates me that if we in Opposition dare to introduce a motion even though it may be on similar lines to one previously presented by the Government, the Government says it is wrong and we should not do it. We are under continual attack. The Government has made a great grab for power and is telling us we cannot do certain things. In the same way the Minister for Mines started to attack the questions we have been asking. He ran into trouble because his mathematics are rusty and he got tied up in legal jargon.

If the Minister took the time to check he would see the reason fewer questions had been asked at this time last year was because there were fewer members then on the Opposition side of the Chamber. If the Minister divides the number of questions by the number of members of his party and refers to the number of days he will find roughly 1.5 questions per member were asked each day. The present figure is slightly less than 1.5 questions.

Hon. Neil Oliver: We also gave answers to those questions when we were in Government. We have to ask the questions more than once to get an answer now.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: So far, 526 questions have been asked which is roughly 27 questions per member. Is the Minister for Mines saying we cannot ask as many questions as did the Hon. Fred McKenzie and the Hon. Peter Dowding, who both asked more than 150? Would he like me to give the number of questions asked in the other place?

The Government appears to be attacking the Opposition on almost every front when we exercise the rights which the present Government thought it should have, and which it took when in

Opposition. Now, it is wrong for us to do that. It was all right then; today it is wrong.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Nothing much has changed then, has it?

Hon. Neil Oliver: It has got worse.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am saying "Fair go". I usually have a lot of respect for the Attorney General, but it is nonsense for him to say the motion moved this afternoon is not the type of business to be brought before the House when the Premier previously moved a motion relating to defence, and the Hon. Fred McKenzie moved a motion calling for representations to the Federal Government. Members of this Parliament have a right to represent their electorates and if that means telling the Government to get on the phone to the Prime Minister and telling a Minister to get off his tail and do something, this is the place and forum for that.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Had you asked the Government to do things they might have been done.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Government members used to move urgency motions when they were in Opposition, seeking representations to the Prime Minister.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Obviously the wax in the ears of the Leader of the House has not been removed.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You have just blasted it out.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: His own leader moved motions in similar terms to that moved tonight. If he checks *Hansard* he will see it occurred not once but a number of times. The Premier moved a motion on defence in 1982. I have no argument with that because this is the forum for members of Parliament to bring issues affecting people in this State.

The Hon. Neil Oliver's motion affected a large number of people in this State, as did the Hon. Fred McKenzie's motion, and that of the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition. The freedom is given to us to use the forum of this House.

The Minister carried on tonight in the same vein, attacking the Hon. Sandy Lewis; yet he as Minister got the Hon. Tom Stephens to ask a question about the total cost of questions in this House. That was aimed at the Opposition. The Government is saying to us "Do not ask any questions or seek any information about what is going on in this Government". The same attitude is being adopted elsewhere in this Parliament. In another place members fell into the trap of changing the sitting hours and the Government said Parliament would sit reasonable times. Look at the ludicrous situation in the other House last

night. Then the Government tells us not to speak too long on motions. It says we are the ones at fault. I can see that an error was made in accommodating the Government and agreeing to the extended hours of sitting because this Government will give an inch and take a mile.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We took a mile from you in Mundaring.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. WELLS: As the Leader of the House has raised the subject, I ask him what the Government has gained. How can it win any more than it had? The Minister is trying to read all sorts of things into that result. As one of the Government's members told me on his way out, one needs to be careful about reading too much into figures.

Education: Warwick Senior High School

The last matter I had intended to raise—and I say “intended” because it depends on what issues are raised as I make my speech—relates to a public meeting at Warwick Senior High School which I was able to attend last week when the House rose early. I have raised this matter previously in the House.

The Minister for Education in his statement in the House spoke in terms of the cost and of being able to find money to start the building immediately. It disturbs me that a Minister can speak in that way and yet the Government was able to find the money for the Perth-Fremantle railway. It has found money on numerous occasions for various matters, and on other occasions it claims it does not have the money and that it has to wait until

the Budget is brought down before it can decide an issue. The accommodation problem at the Warwick Senior High School is becoming acute because of an abnormal increase in numbers. The Minister said the previous Government did not make any allowance for that. My argument has been that a Minister has a fair number of options at his disposal, as does the Government. It has been able to put on advisers and reopen the Perth-Fremantle railway, and do a number of things since coming to power which involved spending quite substantial amounts of money. The Government did not wait for this House to approve that expenditure. The education of our children has a greater priority than the Perth-Fremantle railway and the employment of a number of advisers. It is the education of future leaders of this State.

Warwick Senior High School is one of the large high schools in the area; it was made a senior high school by the previous Minister (Mr Clarko) which enabled it to come under the requirements of the building programme. The Government has options available and Ministers have tremendous power, and the Minister for Education could have found the money to have started not the whole programme, but the accommodation aspect of it. It is a matter of timing and I am sorry the Minister chose to take the attitude that appears to occur continually when issues of concern are discussed—it becomes “them” and “us”. If we continue in that way we will not achieve a lot. The Government should give consideration to matters raised by members.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Inquiry: Judicial Services

493. Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Attorney General:

(1) Will "the committee to review all Government functions and all the services it provides" assess the following services—

- (a) judicial services;
- (b) court and legal administrative services;
- (c) legal aid; and
- (d) services provided by the Crown Law Department?

(2) When is it anticipated the review will be carried out?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) (a) to (d) The Western Australian Government Functional Review Committee has been established to make the most basic appraisal and far-ranging review of Government functions and services and in the Government's view it would be inappropriate to specifically exclude any areas of Government activity if the fullest benefits from the review are to be obtained.

In the Premier's news release of 19 September he stated—

No area of Government activity would be exempted from the review

(2) The Functional Review Committee is meeting regularly, a working group is being established and some initiatives are already under way.

It is expected that the review will take at least two years.

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Advertisements

494. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

(1) Would the Minister advise the cost of the three advertisements appearing at pages 17, 19 and 21 of *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 11 October 1983, and three in the *Daily News* on pages 27, 29 and 31, on the same day, under

the name of the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation?

(2) Was payment for these advertisements made from the department's budget?

(3) If "No" to (2), who is responsible for payment?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

(1) The cost of the advertisements in *The West Australian* totalled \$8 079 and the *Daily News* \$4 410.

(2) No.

(3) The Department of Premier and Cabinet.

AGRICULTURE

Department: Bunbury

495. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many are employed at the present time in the Bunbury Division of the Department of Agriculture?

(2) How many were employed in this division as at—

- (a) 30 September 1980;
- (b) 30 September 1981; and
- (c) 30 September 1982?

(3) What staffing policy changes have been effected in the Bunbury division since 19 February 1983?

(4) What other policy changes in the working of the division have been effected since 19 February 1983?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) 55.

(2) (a) 55;

(b) 49;

(c) 57.

(3) and (4) None.

496. *This question was postponed.*

EDUCATION

Hostel: Port Hedland

497. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Education:

Is it a fact that the Port Hedland Senior High School Hostel will not reopen in 1984?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

No. The possibility of the hostel remaining open, following the withdrawal of Goldworthy Mining from operating the hostel, is being urgently considered by the Government.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Warwick: Statistics

498. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister please provide the following details for the Warwick High School and each of the feeder primary schools for the years 1982, 1983 and anticipated in 1984—

- (a) the number of students;
- (b) the number of transportable or temporary classrooms;
- (c) the number of full-time and part-time personnel employed as—
 - (i) teachers;
 - (ii) gardeners;
 - (iii) cleaners;
 - (iv) library aides; and
 - (v) other categories;
- (d) building additions or maintenance, including cost or anticipated cost; and
- (e) the date or expected date any new building will be or was available for use by the school?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(a)	Enrolments	1982	1983	1984
Warwick High School		351	600	850-900
Allenswood Primary		684	710	730-740
East Greenwood Primary		355	396	410-420
East Hamersley Primary		323	341	345-355
Glendale Primary		649	622	590-600
Hawker Park		163	221	260-270
Warwick Primary		642	617	560-570

Allenswood and East Greenwood also contribute to the Greenwood Senior High School. The primary enrolments also include pre-primary numbers except for Glendale.

(b)	Temporary Class-rooms	1982	1983	Probable 1984
Warwick High School		1	1	12-15
Allenswood		—	2	2
East Greenwood		2	3	4
East Hamersley		2	2	2
Glendale		4	3	1
Hawker Park		—	—	—
Warwick		2	2	1

In addition East Greenwood and Warwick Primary Schools have transportable pre-primary centres and East Greenwood has a transportable library resource centre.

- (c) This information is not readily available and an answer will be provided by letter.
- (d) Building Works 1982-1983

Warwick High School—Stage 2 (1982) \$900 000

Allenswood Primary—nil

East Greenwood Primary—nil

East Hamersley Primary—nil

Glendale Primary—New Library (1982) \$80 750

Hawker Park Primary—New School (1982) \$695 850

Warwick Primary—nil
- (d) and (e) Information about the 1984 capital works programme is not available until the Budget is presented to Parliament.

FISHERIES

Snapper: Traps

499. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is the use of snapper traps in the Carnarvon, Exmouth and Onslow fisheries area permitted?
- (2) If so, who gives permission for this type of fishing to take place?
- (3) If it is illegal, why have prosecutions not been instigated?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Carnarvon: No, in respect of State waters, and yes in respect of Commonwealth waters.
- Exmouth: Yes.
- Onslow: Yes.

- (2) The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.
- (3) The department has no evidence of the illegal use of snapper traps.

HORTICULTURE

Biodegradable Pots

500. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to carry out an investigation to ascertain the reason why biodegradable net pots containing shrubs or young plants purchased from retail nurseries have a poor rate of survival in country areas?
- (2) If "No", will the Minister agree to have the Nurseryman's Association provide the Department of Agriculture with details of the percentage of failures occurring in—
 - (a) the metropolitan area;
 - (b) country regions?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No. The Department of Agriculture has no evidence of a poor rate of survival of plants purchased in biodegradable net pots.
- (2) Yes.

ABORIGINES

Portfolio: Election Promise

501. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Premier, whilst he was Leader of the Opposition, promised the National Aboriginal Conference that he would personally assume the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio upon being elected to office?
- (2) If so, why did he renege on this promise?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The Premier cannot recall making such a commitment.
- (2) Not applicable.

LIQUOR

Drinking: Under-age

502. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many people are engaged in the work of detecting under-age drinkers?

- (2) In each of the last three years, how many minors were charged with—
 - (a) drinking on licensed premises;
 - (b) drinking in other public places; and
 - (c) other offences related to under-age drinking?
- (3) How many licensees have been charged with offences relating to—
 - (a) serving of liquor to under-age persons;
 - (b) allowing under-age persons on licensed premises?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) It is the function of police generally throughout the State to detect under-age drinkers. In the metropolitan area there are 46 liquor and gaming branch personnel responsible for general surveillance of licensed premises duties, including the detection of under-age drinkers.

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
(2) (a) Purchasing or obtaining liquor (section 129(1)(g)(i) Liquor Act). Juveniles on licensed premises where liquor is served (section 129(1)(h) Liquor Act).	51	36	42
(b) The ages of offenders are not recorded.	197	250	233
(c) Statistics are not kept.			
(3) (a) Supply liquor on licensed premises to under-age persons (section 129(1)(e) Liquor Act).	7	6	10
(b) Allowing under-age persons on licensed premises (section 127(1)(b)(ii), Liquor Act).	31	13	35

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Metropolitan Water Authority

503. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) How many vehicles are under the control of the metropolitan board of works Shenton Park Depot?
- (2) How many are—
 - (a) trucks;
 - (b) utilities; and
 - (c) cars?
- (3) How many of these vehicles in each category are used after hours by employees?

- (4) What criteria are used to determine which employees are eligible to make use of the vehicles, as private transport, in either going from or to the Shenton Park Depot?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I presume the member when he refers to the metropolitan board of works means the Metropolitan Water Authority. If so, the answer is as follows—

- (1) 177 vehicles are based at Shenton Park Depot
- (2) (a) to (c)
 - 46 trucks
 - 48 vans
 - 22 utilities
 - 61 cars
- (3) 2 trucks
 - 4 vans
 - 9 utilities
 - 27 cars
- (4) Those vehicles used after hours are
 - (i) for approved standby;
 - (ii) for employees subject to call out of hours; or
 - (iii) for approved employees to start or finish away from their normal base.

HOUSING

Carnarvon

504. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Housing:

What is the waiting list for State Housing Commission homes in Carnarvon for—

- (a) emergency; and
- (b) ordinary; applications?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Applications on hand for Carnarvon as at 30 September 1983—

- (a) Emergent applications—Nil
- (b) Ordinary applications—

B/S PC1BR2BR3BR4BR5BR

Commonwealth/State							
Rental	23	7	16	33	23	1	0
Aboriginal.....	3	0	5	14	11	1	0

Key:

B/S Bed-sitter
PC Pension Couples
BR Bedrooms

AGED PERSONS

Senior Citizens' Centres

505. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney-General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) What funds will be available to local government authorities in the next 12 months, to build senior citizens' centres?
- (2) When will these funds be available?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Under the agreed funding arrangements, the Commonwealth shares with the participating States, on a \$2 for \$1 basis, up to a maximum of two-thirds of the approved capital cost of senior citizens' centres. In accordance with existing policy, the State Government's contribution is limited to \$20 000 per centre. Therefore, the present cost-sharing formula for senior citizens' centre capital grants is—
Commonwealth—two-thirds
State—one-sixth (to a maximum of \$20 000)

Local authority—one-sixth

Provision for the State contributions to local authorities for senior citizens' centre capital projects will be made in the Public Health Department's expenditure vote in the 1983-84 Budget Estimates which are scheduled to be delivered tomorrow.

- (2) The Public Health Department arranges capital grant payments during the course of the year based on claims for recoups of expenditure by local authorities. The department, in turn, claims reimbursement from the Commonwealth for its share of the costs.

MINING: SALT

Lake MacLeod: Future

506. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Has a decision been reached with regard to the operation of Dampier Salt at Lake MacLeod at Carnarvon?
- (2) If not, when is a decision expected?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Negotiations are still continuing between all parties.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

Vehicles: Warning Lights

507. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What is the department's policy with regard to having flashing warning lights fitted to vehicles used by volunteer State Emergency Service workers?
- (2) For the safety of voluntary workers, in potentially dangerous situations, will the Government equip all emergency service vehicles with flashing warning lights?
- (3) Would approval be given to the installation of flashing warning lights on State Emergency Service vehicles if local government authorities were prepared to meet the installation costs?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The Police Department policy in respect to the fitting and use of flashing warning lamps on vehicles, is determined by the provisions of regulation 404 of the vehicle standards regulations, and regulation 1210 of the Road Traffic Code.

Approval has been granted in the past under regulation 404 of the vehicle standards regulations to allow the fitting of amber flashing lamps to vehicles used by volunteer groups of the State Emergency Service.

The vehicles concerned have been defined as "special purpose vehicles" under the Road Traffic Code, and use of the lamps has been approved subject to the conditions contained in regulation 1210 of the code.

These conditions restrict use of the lamps while the vehicle concerned is occupying a hazardous position on a road, while stationary or manoeuvring at a speed not exceeding 10 kilometres per hour.

- (2) In respect of vehicles used in emergency situations, owned by Government departments, the decision as to whether flashing lights should be fitted is one for determination by the department concerned.

Provision is made under regulation 1210 of the Road Traffic Code to cater for such requirements.

- (3) Yes, provided the vehicle concerned is used either as an emergency vehicle or special purpose vehicle as defined in the Road Traffic Code.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Carnarvon Shire Council

508. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the investigation into the operation of the Carnarvon Shire health services been completed?
- (2) If so, will the findings be made public?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) If the investigation is not completed, when does the Minister expect it to be completed?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The member is referred to his question 290 of 25 August.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) End of October.

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Advertising: Advertisements

509. Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Health:

With reference to an advertisement appearing in the *Claremont Post* of 11 October 1983, in the name of the Australian Council on Smoking and Health, in which members of the public are invited to phone or write to me and the Hon. John Williams, would the Minister please indicate whether the cost of this advertisement is or will be charged either in whole or in part against any Government or other similar public funds?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The advertisement was paid for by ACOSH.

JETTY

Carnarvon

510. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to close the Carnarvon jetty?
- (2) If not, will the Minister give an undertaking that the jetty will be maintained in a safe condition?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes. The jetty will be maintained in a safe condition commensurate with the nature of its use.

511. *This question was postponed.*

LOTTERIES

Instant: Distributions

512. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

What are the specific grants given out from instant lottery funds since 1 July 1983?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

Cultural grants approved from instant lottery funds since 1 July 1983, are as follows—

		\$			\$
Harvey Art Gallery Committee	Exhibition stands and pegboard	745	Pingrup Players' Drama Club Inc.	Footlights, dimmers and floodlights	755
Wanneroo Recreation Assn	Kiln	820	Williams Art & Craft (Inc)	Cupboard, kiln and photographic equipment	1 100
The University of WA Under-craft Galleries	Frames	950	Narrogin Town Council	Yamaha grand piano	2 255
Kiln Craft/Meredin Shire Council	Pottery Kiln	1 115	Perth Potters' Club (Inc)	Kiln and attachments	1 785
Stirling City Council	Electronic relays for organ	770	Perth Philharmonic Society and Teachers' Choral Society	Musical choral works, compositions	250
"Guzuma" Craft Cottage	Gas kiln and pyrometer	800	Graduate College of Dance	Video equipment	1 540
Hedland Spinners & Weavers	Loom and weaving equipment	240	Geraldton Potters' Club	Kiln, potters' wheel	1 340
WA Youth Orchestra	Answering machine, Photocopier	400	The African Cultural Group of WA Inc.	Costumes, props	1 000
WA Sri Lanka Association	Drums, costumes and sound equipment	1 010	Junjuwe Community	Musical equipment	2 850
Mundaring Community Arts and Crafts Centre	Photocopy machine, Typewriter, office chairs, cabinets and boards	1 700	Narembeen Shire Council	Modular stage	400
Chung Wah Association	String instruments and drums	650	Sandalwood Arts & Crafts Centre	Kiln	620
WA Youth Concert Band (Inc)	Instrument cases	970	Western Australian Band Association	Reprint of 10 WA Brass Band compositions by WA Composer Richard Johns	600
The Darkan Music & Drama Group Inc.	Lighting board (mini pak)	1 275	Channel Seven Concert Band	2 French Horns	1 800
Murray Music and Drama Club	House curtains and 23 channel dimming system	4 425	Western Australian Youth Concert Band (Inc.)	Purchase French Horn	900
Royal Scottish Country Dancing Society (WA Branch)	Marantz super scope	335	Dampier and District Repertory Club Inc.	Piano	1 200
Perth Highland Pipe Band	Uniforms and badges	4 000	Workshop Camera Club	Slide projector with accessories	400
Esperance Pottery Club	Gas fired kiln	1 055	Bridgetown Art & Craft Centre	Kiln	405
Mandurah Arts & Crafts Society	Kilns, looms and reference books	2 520	Bunbury Repertory Club	Modifications to The Little Theatre	2 000
Donnybrook Arts & Crafts Group	Loom and pottery wheels	485	Port Hedland Playhouse (Inc.)	Modifications to Old School House	5 700
Kalamunda Community Learning Centre	Spinning wheels, easels, wood-carving files, potters' wheel and sewing machine	1 105	Darlington Theatre Players (Inc.)	Modifications to Darlington Theatre	5 600
			Plantagenet Players Inc.	Renovation of club-rooms	4 000
			Collie Art Group Inc.	Roofing Police Station exercise yard	1 185
			Old Cannery Management Committee Inc.	Modifications to centre	4 000
			Busselton Repertory Club Inc.	Renovations to back stage area	5 920
			Mullewa Arts, Crafts and Community Centre	Community centre	3 200
			Glyde-In Community Group	Modifications to centre	3 140
			Film & Television Institute (WA) Inc.	Installation stained glass windows; Building modifications/fittings	175 000
			Quairading Creative Arts Society	Carpet for music room	50
			Roleystone Choral and Dramatic Society	Renovations to theatre	9 800
			Borden Craft Club	Install ceiling, breeze way and flue for gas kiln	500
			Esperance Shire Council	Upgrading Civic Centre	3 180
			Wyndham-East Kimberley Shire	Modifications to Wyndham Community Centre to provide dressing room facilities	3 070
			Wyalkatchem Arts Group	Theatrical furnishing and equipment	2 700
			Cunderdin Repertory Club	Building renovations and equipment restorations	6 920
			Museum Association of Australia (WA Branch)	Conference and AGM Melbourne July 1983	380
			The Perth Latvian Folk	33rd Australian Latvian Arts Festival, Melbourne, December 1983	4 085
			The Girl Guides Association of WA (Inc.)	"Entore '83" Tasmania August/September 1983	4 000
			Hedland & District Historical Society	Stockmans Hall of Fame exhibition Geraldton and Port Hedland	365
			Royal Scottish Country Dancing Society (WA Branch)	Travel costs for teacher/examiner (Sydney/Perth return)	640
			Narembeen Tourist and Information Centre	Performance by Kariinyup Symphony Orchestra	1 200
			Alliance Francaise de Perth	Centenary exhibition 1983	3 000

		\$
Pillara Music Festival	Adjudication, scholarship and award, Festival expenses	500
Koorinda Agricultural Society	Gorn Dolly workshops and adjudication	425
Corrigin Junior Ballet Group	Travel expenses for teacher	1 976
Authors' Advisory Service	Establishment costs	1 000
Kinetikos Dance Theatre	Supplementary grant for 1983	10 000
Playback Theatre	Administration costs over 12 months	15 120
Children's Activities Time Society (CATS)	Publish "PERTH FOR KIDS"	15 000
University of WA English Department	Special issue of "WESTERLY"	2 500
The Victoria Park Public Library Inc. (VCL)	Mobile Theatre	12 170
Opera Viva Inc.	"The Marriage of Figaro"	12 000
WA Sri Lankan Assn.	Choreographer to Perth	1 300
Shinju Matsuri Festival	Assistance with festival costs	2 500
Collie Coal Centenary Committee	Centenary celebrations	2 500
The Praxis Group	Typewriter, photocopy, tape recorder	5 060
Gold of Undergraduates	Kilm	2 415
CATS Unrubbish	Exhibition	875
Festival of Perth	Finnish National Radio Symphony Orchestra	31 625
Public Television (WA)	Engineering Feasibility study and programme research for licence application	33 500
Winter Theatre		10 000
Space-Peeps Puppet Theatre		5 000
National Trust of Australia (WA)		250 000
Western Australian Symphony Orchestra Tour Foundation		60 000
Indian Ocean Festival		50 000

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Children: Abuse

513. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

In each of the last five years—

- (1) How many cases of child abuse have been reported to the department?
- (2) What are the main categories of child abuse, and how many cases of child abuse have been reported in each of these categories?
- (3) In each of these categories of child abuse, what is the sum total of each yearly penalties?
- (4) What numbers of children abused were—
 - (a) boys;
 - (b) girls,
 and what was their respective average age?
- (5) What was the minimum age for a reported child abuse for—
 - (a) boys;
 - (b) girls?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (5) All of the information sought is not readily available within the Department for Community Welfare. It will take some time to collate what data is available and when such material is developed, the Minister will write to the member.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Mining: Redress

514. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Does a pastoralist have any redress if mining activity on his lease becomes so intense that his property is no longer viable?
- (2) If so, what is the form of this redress?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I refer the member to section 123 of the Mining Act 1978-81.

TRANSPORT

Air: Intrastate

515. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

When does the Minister expect a decision to be made concerning the possible opening of internal airline routes in Western Australia?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier announced this morning that Skywest Airlines is the successful licensee for operation of competitive passenger air services linking Perth with Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Karratha and Port Hedland.

516. *This question was postponed.*

PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Mining: Dry Blowers

517. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Mines Department increased its inspectorial staff to cope with complaints from pastoralists of surface stripping by operators of dry blowers in pastoral areas?

- (2) If "Yes", how many additional inspectors have been appointed since 19 February 1983?
- (3) If "No" to (1), will the Minister consider increasing the staff to cope with what is becoming a very serious problem in pastoral areas?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Consideration is given to the appointment of additional staff to check on surface stripping, rehabilitation and environmental matters generally, but such appointments are dependent on the availability of funds.

518. *This question was postponed.*

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

MINISTER OF THE CROWN—MINISTER FOR MINES

Roebourne Disturbance

130. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Mines:

It was reported in Monday's edition of *The West Australian* that the Minister publicly disagreed last weekend with a member of the Police Force at Roebourne. If the report is correct, did the Minister in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown disagree with a member of the Police Force?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

In my capacity as a Minister of the Crown I have not disagreed with any police officer.
